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SUMMARY

At the best of times, education policy implementation is a difficult and uncertain process. Taking this as a point of departure, the researcher advanced the hypothesis that education policy implementation in a society in transition:

- is accompanied by a fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence in interpersonal relations among policy actors;
- is affected by a heightening of value conflicts and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes;
- is influenced by the perceived self-interest of policy actors;
- is affected by changing power relationships and structural adjustments; and
- reflects a general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages that had evolved in pre-transition years.

The Indian education system in South Africa was studied as an exemplar of a system located in a society in transition.

The data collated by means of three research strategies - historical report, questionnaire, and structured interview - gave strong support to the hypothesis. In addition, they pointed to the significance of variables such as policy content and policy quality, political interference and pressure, bias and favouritism among senior officials, religious, sectional, and language loyalties of participants, and loss of job satisfaction and morale among policy actors.

These findings were discussed against the background of relevant literature. This concluded in the development of a theoretical model to explain education policy implementation in a society in transition. Basically, the model suggests that socio-political struggles in the larger society tend to be replicated in the micro-contexts of the education system, producing fundamental alterations in the interpersonal, cultural, and structural aspects of the system, a general weakening of system linkages, and a progressive de-coupling of system components. All these changes recursively impact on and are impacted on by policymaking and policy implementation processes and outcomes. These impacts, however, tend to occur in a non-standard, nonlinear manner. The theoretical underpinnings of the model emerge from general systems theory, modern social systems theory, chaos/complexity theory, conflict theory, structuration theory, organisation change theory, and loosely coupled systems theory.

Finally, the study concludes with general propositions relating to education policy implementation in a society in transition and a set of research and management-oriented recommendations.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Focus of the study

The management of change in education has proved a difficult and complex process, even in relatively stable social settings (Baldridge and Deal, 1983: 6). As shall be shown in Chapters 4 to 6, the possibilities of failure are greatly increased when the process is located in a society undergoing fundamental political and social change. Nevertheless, such a situation provides a natural experiment that enables a researcher to study the process of management of change closely, to observe a wide range of interacting variables operating in an accelerated fashion under pressure from a turbulent environment. The Indian education system in South Africa in the early 1990s provided such an opportunity: it was an education system located in a larger context characterised by change and transition. The larger society in which it was located was committed to the processes of transition to democracy and regime change. Taking these factors as points of departure, the focus of this study is education policy implementation in a society in transition.

1.1.2 Transition to democracy

In South Africa, the waves of change that followed the 2 February 1990 announcements of President F W de Klerk surged through all spheres of life. In the socio-political sphere democratisation was the focus of change; the earlier government policy of liberalisation was rejected as an inappropriate course of action. Commenting on the pace of change in 1990, President de Klerk, in his opening address to Parliament on 1 February 1991 stated (The Daily News, February 1, 1991, p.5):

From this chamber a year ago tomorrow, South Africa was placed finally on a new course. Events succeeded one another in rapid succession and I have no doubt that our country is irrevocably on the road to a new dispensation. The goal, with the removal of discrimination, is to give all South Africans full rights in every sphere of life. In the short span of a single year, substantial progress was made. The Government is
determined to build on the foundations laid purposefully, efficiently and with the speed.

South Africa cannot allow or permit the dynamic process of reform to slow down.

Consequently the process of fundamental reform and all it entails, is the first priority, not only among politicians, but among all. Organisations, columnists, academics, churches and especially the man in the street are thinking and talking about reform continuously. It could hardly be otherwise, since it is, indeed, the future of our country and every one of its people that is at stake.

Negotiations towards the new future proceeded, though, at times, disappointingly slowly. Commenting on this in mid-1993, New Nation (4 June - 10 June 1993, p.8) observed: 'After three years of 'talks about talks', bickering, the exchange of memoranda and ultimations, the negotiations process is finally poised to yield some results.' As a result, by September 1993 legislation for joint government - the Transitional Executive Bill - was ready for presentation to Parliament (The Daily News, September 16, 1993, p.2). And finally, on 10 May 1994, South Africa was at least symbolically, a new, fully democratic nation. Thus in four years, South Africa successfully made the transition from an apartheid state to a country espousing democracy, which, in the words of President Mandela, had committed itself to liberating its people 'from the continuing bondage of poverty, deprivation, suffering and gender and other discrimination' (The Daily News, May 10, 1994, p.1).

1.1.3 Transition in education

1.1.3.1 Education as 'own affairs'

The segregated South African school system was brought to its full realisation in 1984. Underpinning this racially divided system was the principle of education as an 'own affair.' Penny et al. (1993: 412 - 413) summarise the essential characteristics of this system as follows:

"Own education" was rooted in the view that the aim of education was to lead children to responsible adulthood, defined within the parameters of a reified notion of the child's cultural heritage. Culture in this model corresponded to race, ethnicity, and language, and segregated structures were accordingly consolidated to nurture and reproduce these "own" cultures ....

Accompanying the "own affairs" ideology was a complex, confusing, and incoherent administrative structure. There was separation of control between "homeland" and "white" areas, although these were often contiguous, and within the "white" area there were four administrations, each with its own schools. The overarching task of the Department of National Education was to co-ordinate standards and determine service conditions for teachers.
However, after 2 February 1990 the process of transition to a new education system was clearly set in motion.

1.1.3.2 Education in the 1990's

While transition to democracy was in progress in the larger society, the process of transition in education had also begun. By the end of 1990, for example, legislation was enacted to enable the admission of black pupils into white schools (Penny et al., 1993 : 412). As in the field of politics, however, the process of transition was characterised by conflict, accommodation, further conflict, resistance and a slow emergence of ideas about the future unitary system of education. In his 1 February 1991 opening address to Parliament, President de Klerk said (The Daily News, February 1, 1991, p.5):

The present educational system shall and must be changed. Work on this is being done on the political and educational levels. In the meantime, education has to continue in an orderly manner.

We are determined that our ultimate system of education shall enjoy the acceptance and support of the majority of our population. It will have to be an educational system that will be affordable and in which appropriate education is offered. In addition, it will have to keep abreast of changing needs and trends in our society.

The crises and problems President de Klerk referred to were themselves the result of a variety of problems, including apartheid structures in education, the intensification of the political struggle, the removal of repressive laws of the past, and the emergence of competing ideologies and interpretive schemes (see Chapters 4 and 5).

1.1.3.3 Department of Education Coordination

As a result of the constant pressure exerted on the government for a unitary system of education and also as a result of the growing education crisis, in January 1993, President de Klerk announced that 'far reaching steps' would be taken in education 'to prepare the way for a completely new dispensation' (The Daily News, January 29, 1993, p.1). He announced that a new department, with its own Minister and accounting officer, would be established on 1 April 1993. Its primary functions would be to:

- coordinate the provision of education during the transition phase
- prepare new legislation on education
manage the entire process of change.

The unilateral creation of this department, however, immediately evoked criticism and opposition from extra-parliamentary groups. The African National Congress education head, Mr J Samuel, for example, said (Maurice, 1993: 1):

> We are happy that there has been a shift by government, but there is no way they can be the sole managers of the transitional process. Despite its rhetoric that it will not restructure without consultation, this is an implementation plan. The polite phrase they use is "rearranging"... We are not interested in rubberstamping.

The lack of consultation with extra-parliamentary groups in establishing the Department of Education Coordination became a major barrier to its smooth functioning.

The Department received co-operation mainly from the various education departments in the country. The researcher himself served on one of its committees as a representative of the Department of Education and Culture: House of Delegates (DEC). When the matter of the committee's legitimacy came up for discussion at the initial meeting, members were informed that every effort had been made to invite participation from extra-parliamentary education groups but to no avail. These outside bodies had instead vigorously pressed for the creation of a National Education and Training Forum.

1.1.3.4 National Education and Training Forum

By May 1993 the country was facing simultaneous education crises in various education departments. One of the issues contributing to the general state of crisis was the government's reluctance to accede to the demand of the National Education Coordinating Committee (NECC) and other extra-parliamentary groups and teacher organisations for the establishment of an independent education forum. Breier (1993: 23) examined the differences of opinion at the heart of the problem. He saw the conflict as a contest of control over the transition process. First, he maintained, the government was agreeable to the concept of an education forum provided that it was an advisory body, thus enabling it to retain for itself the real power over the restructuring and transition process; the extra-parliamentary groups such as the NECC and teacher organisations such as the South African Teachers' Democratic Union (SADTU), in contrast, wanted the forum to have real powers so that the government's unilateral restructuring programme could be halted. Second, the government wanted the new system of education to be planned by senior education officials; the extra-parliamentary groups, in contrast, wanted
a broad, inclusive representation. Finally, underlying this conflict on
the form and function of the education forum was the struggle for control
of the form and goals of the unitary system of education.

In May 1993, the African National Congress (ANC) warned the government
that unless a national education forum was established immediately to
allow all stakeholders a say in education, 'the situation could explode'
(The Daily News, May 5, 1993, p.15). Despite this, it was only after
months of lobbying that the National Education and Training Forum (NETF)
held its official launch in August 1993. Its crisis committee, however,
had begun functioning during July 1993 to address the education crisis
in the Department of Education and Culture: House of Representatives.
Commenting on the success of this component of the NETF, spokesman
Alan Tonkin said that it had accomplished more within two weeks than the
government and teacher bodies had in years (The Weekly Mail and Guardian,
August 6 to August 12, 1993, p.12).

1.1.3.5 Summary

The most salient point that emerges from the background presented is that
the socio-political system was undergoing a rapid transition. Within
this larger sphere of change, the education system also was in a process
of transition from an 'apartheid education' system to a unitary system
based on principles of equality, non-racialism, and democracy.

Transition in education, in turn, was characterised by a background of
continuing and deepening education crisis in the country: black pupils
had lost respect for authority and many teachers were driven more by
ideals of political activism than those of education and social service
(Molefe, 1993: 8); violence and vandalism disrupted the functioning of
many township schools and accelerated the process of decline (New Nation,
August 28 - September 3, 1992, p.6); a general breakdown in discipline
was common in black education with pupils engaging in regular school
boycotts (Latakgoma, 1992: 8); and the educational administration and
control role of education department officials in black education was

At the beginning of 1990 when one referred to the education crisis, it
was invariably a term limited to conditions in black schools. From
2 February 1990, however, the education crisis spread to incorporate, in
varying degrees, disruptions and problems in other education departments.
Teacher strikes and chalkdowns began to be regularly experienced in
Indian and Coloured schools, which had hitherto been relatively stable.
Each specific crisis episode generated tensions both in schools and
community and each produced some policy change in the particular
education system and, incrementally, contributed to the transition process in education. The whole process might well be seen as a dialectical struggle over ownership and control of education. Margaret Archer's (1979; 1984) work on the evolution of education systems is relevant here (see section 2.2.4.4): from 1990, the control of the education department was systematically eroded by assertive challenges by hierarchically subordinate groups which had hitherto been professionally and politically lacking in power.

1.2 THE PROBLEM

1.2.1 Policy implementation in a system in transition

In the literature on schools and organisations, there is general consensus that organisations must adapt to changes in their environment if they are to survive. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978, cited by Levin, 1993: 4) express this view as follows:

When environments change, organisations face the prospect either of not surviving or of changing their activities in response to these environmental factors.

This process of adjustment to environmental pressures, however, becomes a process that is complex and fraught with possibilities of failure when the world around the education system is in a process of rapid, fundamental change and transition.

In the Indian education system, the problem was further exacerbated by the Department's unsuccessful efforts to adapt to the changes generated by policy implementation failures and rapid changes in the environment. From 1990 to 1993, for example, the age of admission was progressively lowered and then restored to what it was in the pre-1990 period (DEC, 1990c; 1990f; 1991a; 1993g; 1993h); policies relating to control of academic standards were reviewed (DEC, 1992c); monitoring policy relating to educators' work performance was defined and amended (DEC, 1994a; 1994b); policies relating to visits of superintendents of education to schools were defined and revised (DEC, 1990d; 1991f; 1992c); and new teacher evaluation and promotion procedures were introduced each year (DEC, 1990b; 1990e; 1991c; 1991d; 1991g; 1992a; 1992b; 1993c; 1993d; 1993e; 1993f; 1994c; 1994d).

Each of these policies was either criticised, implemented with several adjustments and adaptations, or rejected outright. In the process, there was a general fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence in the interpersonal relations among policy actors and a general breakdown of
value systems.

The problem also spilled out of schools into the community through newspaper reports of disagreements between the Department and educators over policy issues. Topics such as the formation of parent-teacher associations, monetary allocation for books, teacher evaluation and promotion procedures, the handling of cleaners' wage dispute, chalkdowns and teacher sit-ins and strikes, and the controversy over merit recognition awards were all fully aired in the press. A newspaper article, headlined 'Catalogue of disaster,' for example, summarised some of the major education crises in the DEC in 1990 and 1991 (Sunday Tribune Herald, February 9, 1992, p.3):

- In 1990, the Department used a teacher promotion system that was heavily criticised in Parliament and in the press.

- In 1991 there was an extended sit-in at Indian schools lasting for a fortnight as a result of teachers' rejection of the staffing and class size norms issued in E.C. Circular No. 2 of 1991.

- The cleaners' strike at Indian schools in September 1991 resulted in 'chaos' for several weeks, bringing education to a total standstill for this period.

- The allegation of irregularities in the promotion procedure of 1991 led to successful court cases against the Department in 1991 and 1992.

These developments suggest that fundamental changes had begun to occur in the system. The period was, indeed, characterised by frequent teacher chalkdowns, sit-ins at individual schools, systemwide teacher strikes, and pupil and parent support for teacher non-compliance with new policies (see Chapter 4). The overall result was repeated policy failures and policy dysfunctions followed by repeated policy changes to address each policy crisis. Each policy change, in turn, was greeted with criticism or rejection. The coherence of the structure, as this suggests, was progressively affected by alterations in power relations.

The most embarrassing description of the Department's failure came from Minister of Education Mrs D Govender in her farewell speech to the Acting Director-General, Mr M Pillay and his management committee on 31 March 1994. In the speech, which was delivered to mark the dissolution of the House of Delegates, she said, inter alia (Sunday Times Extra, April 17, 1994, p.3):

- The education bureaucracy's 'buck passing, hidden agendas,' and 'inability to confront situations' were factors contributing to the crises facing Indian education.
Some officials had 'developed excuse-making to a fine art in preference to getting on with the job in a positive and flexible manner.'

The demise of the department was 'being greeted with much relief and rejoicing by people on the ground.'

When this speech was delivered on 31 March 1994, it 'caused a bit of stir' among the senior officials of the Department and 'sections had to be deleted on the computer' (Sunday Times Extra, April 17, 1994, p.3). There was thus a suggestion that at least some actions, both at Departmental and school level, were motivated by perceived self-interest.

Furthermore, extra-parliamentary groups and the organised teacher body also used the various policy failures as platforms to attack the legitimacy of the Department as an authentic expression of the Indian people's will. The Indian education department thus soon displayed all the characteristics of what Dror (1986: 3) has called 'policymaking under adversity': it faced all 'forms of massive difficulties' in policymaking and policy implementation in a situation characterised by fragmentation of interpersonal relations, divergence of value systems, alterations in power relations, and the operation of self-interest.

1.2.2 The essential problem

The problem of policy implementation in an education system in transition traces back to five facts. First, there is the fact that policy implementation in education does not flow inevitably from the finalisation of education policies. In fact, there is often a wide gap between policy intentions and policy outcomes. Elmore (1978: 186) notes that research consistently reveals that relationship between the two is that of 'grand pretensions, faulty execution, puny results.' Second, educational administrators - both at state and school level - often forget that policy implementation is far more than just enforcing compliance with policies. Indeed, even if educators comply with policies there is no guarantee that the policy outcomes envisaged by the policymakers will be achieved. Third, a system in transition is one in which the internal anchoring points of values, norms, attitudes, established organisational relationships, and structures tend to lose their force because of the influence of internal changes and environmental turbulence. Fourth, schools themselves, as subsystems, are also subjected to the internal and environmental pressures of transition. Confronted by this situation, will schools comply with policy demands, will they resist change, will they subvert policy initiatives, will they modify policies to satisfy their own subsystem needs? Questions such
as these define the essential problem of educational policy implementation in a system in transition. Fifth, any education system is directed at the reproduction of the cultural, political, and economic vision of the dominant group. Therefore when the political ideology and control of the dominant elite are under attack, the education system also becomes an arena of struggle. Contestation over control of the system becomes a fundamental aspect of both education policymaking and policy implementation processes.

The hypothesis for this study therefore is that education policy implementation in a society in transition:

- is accompanied by a fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence in interpersonal relations among the key policy actors through emergent conflicts and tensions
- is affected by a heightening of value conflicts and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes
- is influenced by the perceived self-interest of the key policy actors as individuals and sub-groups in the system
- is affected by changing power relationships and structural adjustments
- reflects globally a general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages that had evolved in the system in pre-transition years.

The relationship between these various parameters is neither stable nor of fixed pattern but rather is the result of the unique conditions that apply.

1.3 \hspace{1cm} RESEARCH PURPOSES AND PARAMETERS

1.3.1 \hspace{1cm} Basic research purposes

The literature on policy implementation suggests that the translation of education policies into reality is a fragile, complex process that regularly ends in failure. The process is likely to become greater in complexity and fragility when the education system is racked by pressures for change both from within the system and from an environment in a state of turbulence and transition. To deal with this complexity the researcher needs, according to Levin (1993: 15):
... to think in terms of a complex interplay between so-called external features, features of the school as an organization, and the specifics of a given time, place, and group of people ... to conduct research revealing the role of the environment in shaping the design, mission and strategy of organizations.

During a period of socio-political transition this task is further complicated by the fact that groups, both within the organisation and the larger system, are driven by self-interest and values and goals that may be in a state of unresolved conflict. In a situation such as this, the world in which the education system is located becomes disorderly and 'chaotic', a world which is simultaneously logical, sequential and linear and nonlogical, non-sequential and nonlinear. Because of conditions such as this, in recent years, some policy analysts have turned to the emerging science of chaos to guide investigations and explorations of the policy process, especially policy implementation (Geller and Johnston, 1990; Reavis, 1990).

This study focusses attention on the DEC and a sample of its schools in the Greater Durban area. The primary purposes are to unravel the dynamics of education policy implementation in a society in transition and to clarify conceptually and analytically the many complexities of the process at system level. Such findings as are obtained can then, in later studies, be tested in order to determine whether they also apply generally in other, more stable environments and stable systems.

1.3.2 Epistemological framework

The researcher shall use multiple research paradigms in pursuing the primary purposes of the study. This will enable a comprehensive examination of the complexities and subtleties of education policy implementation process in a society in transition.

1.3.2.1 Reasons for multiple research paradigms

Each paradigm is founded on a particular set of assumptions about reality. Each set of assumptions, in turn, leads to particular theories and particular research methodologies. However, it needs to be stressed that no one theoretical perspective is superior to the others: what is pertinent is that each perspective enables the identification of different facets and sub-processes of policy implementation. That this is so, of course, is understandable: all organisations are combinations of technical-rational characteristics, structural features, cultural
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elements and micropolitical processes. Rational features, for example, are evident in the hierarchy of authority and the formal co-ordination and control structures. Similarly, cultural and micropolitical aspects are visible in the performance norms, informal power relationships, and coalitions which exist in the organisation (Nakamura and Smallwood, 1980; Clune, 1983; Hoyle, 1986; Ball, 1987; Ball and Bowe, 1992) (also see section 2.2.3.4). But because each of these theoretical approaches is not likely to provide a rounded insight into organisational behaviour, writers such as Louis (1984) and Cook (1985) suggest the use of multitheoretical approaches.

1.3.2.2 Research paradigms

Loosely defined, a paradigm is a world view, a creative ideology, a guide by which problems are framed for study and results of experiments and observations interpreted (Snyder and Anderson, 1986: 38-39; Reavis, 1990: 68; Bhola, 1992: 104). This study draws on several paradigms in constructing its research methodology.

1.3.2.2.1 Logical positivism

Logical positivists take as an epistemological given the view that knowledge about both natural and social phenomena are the same. They argue that the scientific methodology associated with the natural sciences is equally valid for the social sciences. In essence, as Lakoff (1987: 265) notes, adherents of this view, in fact, maintain 'that there is only one fully correct way in which the world can be correctly divided into objects, properties and reflections.' And that correct way, they assert, is the way of logical positivism. Bhola (1992: 105) therefore asserts that the 'highest aspiration of logical positivists is to make statements about the world that are true and thereby universally generalizable.' He summarises the research methodology emanating from a logical positivist perspective as follows:

The methodology is based on reductionism, whereby complex reality is broken down into independent and dependent variables for study; those variables are subjected to experimental conditions whereby experimental treatment is applied to some variables under control, but not others; and finally, statistical methods are used to make normative statements. Criteria of goodness of research are validity and reliability.

Logical positivism and core ideas emanating from it have had much influence on the functioning of education bureaucracies. When confronted with a problem, for example, educational administrators, as Reavis (1990:
observes, generally adopt a rational-sequential model: they tend to 'isolate' the problem, 'prescribe a solution for it, monitor results, and modify the solution as needed.'

1.3.2.2.2 Constructivist paradigm

It is now accepted that reality is also socially constructed: individuals and groups observe the world through the prism of their values, beliefs and past cognitions. Over a period of time, this process results in experiences of the world falling into meaningful units which are then taken to constitute 'reality.' The specific configuration of this reality emerges from the way individuals and groups perceive their world. As Berger and Luckman (1966: 19-20) observe:

The world of everyday life ... is ... taken for granted as reality by ordinary members of society in the subjectively meaningful conduct of their lives; it is a world that originates in their thought and actions and is maintained as real by these.

Drawing attention to the effect of this awareness on researchers in education, Rist (1981: vii) states:

Our understanding of ... education is undergoing profound and swift changes. Instrumental in this process is the turning away from a near exclusive reliance on quantitative research methods as the only acceptable means by which to analyze and interpret the realities of education. In fact, one of the basic themes of this shift now underway is that there are multiple ways of "knowing" and no one method can answer all our questions or offer all the necessary perspectives.

The fact that reality is at least partially socially constructed and that there are multiple ways of knowing is of particular significance in the study of education policy formulation and policy implementation where the various individuals and groups in the policy arena have their own professional, cultural, ideological, political, and social viewpoints and goal orientations and their own 'constructions' of the policy problems and the policy solutions. The polarisation of shared meanings, the impermanence of intersubjective meanings in a turbulent environment, and conflicts generated by this situation can be expected to emerge with greater frequency and force when the system is in transition towards a sometimes vaguely perceived future state.

1.3.2.2.3 Critical theory paradigm

Critical theory links knowledge and the emergence of an intersubjective
world to the operation of historical forces of social power within a set of social relations. Bhola (1992: 107) states that four ideas are relevant to this approach to social reality:

- scientific rules and criteria are socially formed;
- the distinction between objective and subjective are misleading;
- production of knowledge is also production of values;
- claims of disinterest hide interest.

As Yeakey (1987: 27) points out, critical theory 'seeks to analyze organizations and their structural and ideological features within the larger social context they inhabit.'

A critical theory approach also enables the researcher to examine how policies and procedures that govern education have embedded in them the values of the ruling elite. As Prunty (1984: 42-44) observes, critical theory 'strives to expose the sources of domination, repression, and exploitation that are entrenched in, and legitimated by, education policy.' This approach may be particularly relevant to the study of policy implementation in a system in transition from an education and political system that lacked legitimacy to one where this lack, one hopes, is corrected.

1.3.2.2.4 Chaos paradigm

Reavis (1990: 70), lists the significant differences between 'conventional', logical-positivist, rational view of the world and the 'chaos' view:

1. While conventional science has increasingly focused attention on parts and elements, chaos is concerned with patterns and wholes.

2. While conventional science has ignored irregularities in data as noise (thus producing the illusion of a logical, sequential world order), chaos suggests that small irregularities grow to major ones over time and thus should not be ignored.

3. While conventional science has despaired of understanding unstable conditions such as smoke rising, water flowing, or a flag waving, chaos has found a patterned regularity in unstable phenomena.

4. While conventional science founded laboratory experiments in controlled environments with linear problems, chaos deals with real world problems that appear random (population, ecology, weather).

... nonlinearity magnifies pulses from 'outside' the ostensible system ... a single brief encounter can turn a life course into one channel rather than another.

The researcher adopting a chaos approach searches in the unique series of events for family resemblances and connections. Cronbach (1988: 47) cites a vivid example from Chaos to illustrate the idea of a connection which is distant and seemingly insignificant: a butterfly in Peking, making this move and not that, can affect next month's storm in New York.

In an education system, nonlinearity may magnify impulses from both within and outside the system. Seemingly insignificant events may then have a cascade effect on the policy implementation process, producing far-reaching interpersonal, cultural, and structural consequences. This is suggested by Geller and Johnston (1990: 59-60) in their application of the science of chaos to the study of policy implementation:

The science of chaos does not suggest randomness or a world without order. Rather, the order in chaos focuses on the irregular rather than the regular, the nonlinear rather than the linear, and a sense of the world in motion, sometimes turbulent, and exploding with uncertainty ...

Nonlinearity is the byword in the language of chaos ... An example of nonlinearity seen in the implementation studies demonstrates that even a small seemingly inconsequential 'variable' can have inconceivable consequences ... small, often unexpected events or unanticipated consequences have large effects in naturally occurring or ... socially constructed systems.

This study shall also draw upon this model in analysing education policy implementation in a system in transition (see section 6.3.2.3).

1.3.2.2.5 Loosely coupled systems paradigm

A significant departure from the dominant rational-bureaucratic model of education systems came in the form of Weick's (1976) conceptualisation of educational institutions as 'loosely coupled systems.' Weick (1976) rejects the idea of tight linkages in educational organisations as presented in the rational-classical model. Instead, he advances the view that educational organisations are, in reality, made up of vertical and lateral components that are loosely coupled with one another. Each of these components are linked in such a way that one unit has limited control or direct impact on other, proximate units. In education, for example, teachers' professional status also provides them with an alternate source of authority that often enables them to exercise a high level of autonomy in their own domain. Far from being dysfunctional, Weick (1976: 4) argues that loose coupling is actually functional to educational organisations in several clearly defined ways. Some of these
are:

- Parts of the organisation enjoy protection of their identity.
- Parts of the organisation can react swiftly to environmental changes.
- Actors in each subsystem can enjoy a high level of autonomy.

Weick maintains that features such as these enable educational organisations to function adequately despite problems in the system.

Weick's (1976) model of loose coupling was refined by Meyer and Rowan (1977; 1978) who define loose coupling as a situation in which 'structure is disconnected from technical (work) activity and activity disconnected from its effects' (Meyer and Rowan, 1978: 79). The thrust of the argument advanced by Meyer and Rowan (1977; 1978) is that educational organisations are institutionalised and ritualised and that they depend on the acceptance of an elaborate mythology concerning their organisational functioning rather than on the actual work output in relation to their educational goals. The structural pattern of order in areas outside the instructional core of schools leads society to believe that similar efficiency and effectiveness exist in the actual teaching-learning sphere of activity and in the general implementation process.

The view advanced by Weick (1976) and Meyer and Rowan (1977; 1978) that loose coupling is responsible for the weak link between intended policy goals and actual policy outcomes is given added support by Lipsky (1981) who refers to 'street-level bureaucrats' who exercise great discretion in the way policies are actually interpreted and implemented in the lower levels of service bureaucracies. These 'street-level bureaucracies' require their workers to make decisions about other people. The nature of the work at the actual delivery level 'calls for human judgement that cannot be programmed' and because they function at the actual point of face-to-face contact with the public, 'street-level bureaucrats must irreducibly be accountable to the client and for appropriate response to the client's situation and circumstances' (Lipsky, 1981: 342-343). As a result, Lipsky (1981: 342) maintains:

Bureaucratic accountability is virtually impossible to achieve among lower level workers who exercise high degrees of discretion, at least where qualitative aspects of the work are involved.

The reason for this lies in the fact that the qualitative aspects of the work often arise from direct interaction with the public and may entail working outside the strict confines of bureaucratic policies and procedures. Moreover, in education the loose connectedness of the system reduces greatly the bureaucratic span of control and the possibility of close supervision of policy actors at all levels of the system.
Examples of street-level bureaucrats, as defined by Lipsky (1981) are principals, teachers, circuit inspectors, or anyone who represents state or government authority in a face-to-face interaction with members of the public. The basic problem in controlling these officials emerges from differences in perception of reality. While policymakers' view of reality may be partial because of distance from the delivery point and influenced by rational, organisation principles, that of the 'street-level bureaucrat' may be influenced by the practical, day-to-day experience of working with the target population. Therefore, as Lipsky (1981) argues, the problem of exercising bureaucratic control over 'street-level bureaucrats' depends to some extent, on the legitimacy of the policy directives. If the technical-rationality of senior officials strikes lower level bureaucrats as being inconsistent with the needs of the delivery point, they are likely to exercise their own discretion on how to implement the policy. This paradigm thus requires an epistemology that is a synthesis of logical positivist, constructivist, critical theory, and chaos elements (see section 6.3.2.7).

1.4 VALUE OF STUDY

A month after the installation of the new government of national unity, the possibility of 'chaos' in education was still prevalent. The following points emerged in an article in The Daily News (June 9, 1994, p.2):

- Education in KwaZulu-Natal was threatened with 'chaos' as SADTU members vowed to oppose the provincial government's decision to move the education headquarters to Ulundi.

- There was continuing disruption of education in several areas of KwaZulu-Natal a month after the new government had been installed.

- Teachers were threatened with violence in schools in some areas.

- Some schools still had severe staff shortages.

Two months later there was still no visible movement towards a unitary system of education (The Daily News, August, 8, 1994, p.6). The absence of visible progress was also acknowledged by Dr B Nzimande, chairman of the parliamentary select committee on education, at a seminar at Natal University, Durban on 31 August 1994. He also acknowledged that the education crisis in black schools was still a grim reality, that the pre-election education departments were still in control of a fragmented education system, and that there was still no unitary system of education in the country (Nzimande, 1994). In essence, like a Rubik's cube, the
colours and combination of colours had changed, but the pre-election structure of education and the shape of education problems and crises were still the same. Transition to a legitimised South Africa had not produced any visible change in education. It just marked a new point in the transition process.

In this climate of continuing change and reconstruction, it is absolutely necessary to avoid the dangers of ad hoc, expedient approaches to policymaking and policy implementation. With a better grasp of the processes at work in policy implementation, particularly in a turbulent environment, educational administrators at all levels would more successfully guide the downward processes of winning subordinate compliance with policy and upward processes of meaningful involvement of subordinates in policymaking.

Furthermore, in a period of transition, educational administrators need to be fully conscious of their managerial role as they have to steer the education enterprise forward in a climate of uncertainty. Because of the process of rapid socio-political changes, the potential inter-relationships among the various system and environmental variables soon exceed the threshold where full analysis is possible. The result is ambiguity and uncertainty. Yet educational administrators are faced with pressures to act decisively and lead purposefully. Under conditions such as these, educational administrators need to know how to cope with the uncertainties of transition.

Also relevant here is the fact that the education policies that are formulated during a period of transition are designed to produce change in schools so that their functioning is congruent with the socio-political changes in the larger environment. In such conditions, as Smith (1973: 202) points out, policies are a 'tension-generating' force in that they demand from policy implementers 'deliberate action ... to establish new transaction patterns or institutions or to change established patterns within old institutions.' If schools reject educational change through open or covert resistance to almost all key policies, if they fail to implement them, then they may become forces of stagnation, if not retrogression. Therefore a significant value of the study lies in the fact that the examination of the policy implementation process in the period 2 February 1990 to 31 March 1994 can contribute to an understanding of the problems and challenges facing educational administrators in the post-election phase of transition. While the study focusses on the Indian education system during the pre-election phase of transition, and though it examines a system which will have probably ceased to exist by 1996, it may, nevertheless, yield generalisable data about the operation of specific variables and suggest ways these could be manipulated during policymaking and policy implementation.

This study has practical significance for yet other reasons. We are
currently in the second phase of transition in education, one that hopefully will lead to the establishment of a more functional, unitary system of education. By increasing policymakers' knowledge and understanding of an education system in transition, the nature and interaction of the elements of which it is composed, the characteristics and potentialities of the human components faced with change, the study may clarify and increase the policy options available to policymakers themselves.

Finally, this study seeks to contribute to a theoretical understanding of the way an education system is likely to respond to fundamental societal changes and societal transitions. Such an understanding can contribute both to the management of educational change generally and to education policy implementation in a society in transition specifically.

1.5 Conclusion

In this chapter the researcher has outlined the problem, presented the background to the problem and set out in some detail the research purposes and parameters. Essentially the purpose is to examine the education policy implementation process in a society in transition, focussing on the Indian education system as an exemplar of a system in transition. The practical value of the study for educational administrators lies in the possibility that it will yield more effective policymaking and policy implementation procedures for a system in transition, and, perhaps even procedures with general validity.

In Chapter 2, the key concepts of the study - policy, policymaking, policy implementation, system, transition and change - shall be discussed in some detail against the background of relevant literature before grounding them in operational definitions.

In Chapter 3, attention shall be devoted to the research methodology and design of the study. This chapter shall also present information on data gathering instruments, data analysis procedures, and the sample for this study.

In Chapter 4, the researcher will present a brief history of the policy changes and crises in the Indian education system with special emphasis on the period 2 February 1990 to 31 March 1994. The purpose here is to present the transition process as it affected the Indian education system and its schools. More specifically, attention shall be directed at the fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence of the system and the general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages that accompanied education policy implementation. In the process, the
validity of the hypothesis advanced in this study shall be examined.

In Chapter 5, the researcher shall present a comprehensive description of findings of the study emanating from questionnaires returned by 532 respondents ranging from Level 1 educators to superintendents of education and from structured interviews administered to a sample of 57 educators, again ranging from Level 1 educators to superintendents of education. Attention shall be directed at presenting the system impacts of education policy implementation in a society in transition and demonstrating the validity of the hypothesis advanced in this study.

In Chapter 6, the researcher shall discuss the findings presented in Chapters 4 and 5 and evaluate the hypothesis presented in section 1.2.2 against the background of relevant literature. He shall also develop a theoretical model to explain the education policy implementation process in a society in transition and present the theoretical bases of the model. Finally, in Chapter 7, the researcher shall summarise the conclusions reached and present a set of recommendations based on the findings and conclusions of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

CLARIFICATION OF KEY CONCEPTS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The terms 'policy,' 'policy implementation,' 'system,' 'education system,' 'transition' and 'change' have surfaced regularly in the discussion of the problem, the background to the problem, and the research purposes of the study. Definition of these terms was deferred to this chapter to enable an extended discussion of the key concepts against a background of relevant literature. In the course of this discussion the concepts shall also be grounded in operational definitions.

2.2 KEY CONCEPTS

2.2.1 Policy

2.2.1.1 General definitions

There are many definitions of policy. As Cunningham (1963: 229) observed: 'Policy is rather like an elephant - you recognise it when you see it but cannot define it easily.' The term, nevertheless, has several related shades of meaning. Merritt and Coombs (1977: 259) maintain that:

... it may best be defined as an authoritative prescription for behavior or, alternatively, as a decision rule for people occupying certain positions in the system. This definition distinguishes between a policy and either a goal or behavior. It is the authoritative prescription itself, whether embodied in law, administrative directives, or informal messages circulating within the education system, that counts.

Mazzoni (1985: 67) follows a similar line of thought but differs from Merritt and Coombs (1977) in stressing the goal orientation of policies. Thus he defines a policy as 'an authoritative decision that establishes the goals and behaviors' of organisation members. In other words, a
policy is directed towards the routinisation of specific behaviours that would facilitate the achievement of particular goals and values.

Peter W House (1982, cited by Tanner, 1991: 93) suggests that the purpose of public policy is to make 'corrections in the ship of state' and to change it as the 'weather' requires. This view of policy clearly draws attention to the fact that it has the function of ensuring orderly functioning of the system. Therefore when internal and external changes threaten this stability, policies have to be changed or revised. Prunty (1984: 24-25) belongs to a similar school of thought as he maintains 'that policy is about change' and they 'are made in order to improve some existing condition or prevent some potential problem.'

Kogan (1975: 55) draws attention to another facet of policies. He maintains that policies involve 'authoritative allocation of values'. Therefore they are operational statements of values and 'statements of prescriptive intent.' Focussing on education, Cistone (1977: 90) also touches upon the fact that policies are prescriptions for behaviour when he writes:

Educational policy is a form of public policy that affects a substantive area in public jurisdiction. Educational policy has both an instrumental and an expressive function. It defines organizational goals, and it provides standards and prescribes criteria by which the educational enterprise is evaluated. Concomitantly it expresses a conception of a desirable future for both individuals and society, and allocates human and material resources in pursuit of that future.

The notion of prescription also draws attention to the fact that policies are closely linked to power and control. Prunty (1985: 136) draws attention to this in his examination of the concept:

The authoritative allocation of values draws our attention to the centrality of power and control in the concept of policy.

Education policies, as authoritative and prescriptive statements, are binding on all in the education system until they are challenged, resisted, or rejected - resulting, in time, in their revision or replacement. Also using this idea as his point of departure, Ball (1990: 3) maintains that education policies cannot be separated from 'interests, from conflict, from domination or from justice.' In an article that concentrates on an examination of the term 'policy', Ball (1993: 13) also comments on the power aspect of policies as follows:

Policies typically posit a restructuring, redistribution and disruption of power relations, so that different people can and cannot do different things.

He also argues that the operation of this power aspect of policies reveals itself in the actual process of policy implementation. Ultimately, from this perspective, policy outcomes are the product of
conflict, struggle, and domination.

2.2.1.2 Operational definition

Despite the shades of difference in the definitions presented and differences in the particular aspects of policies highlighted, collectively they suggest that the following are the core elements of an education policy:

- It is an authoritative prescription for behaviour within the education system.
- It is a goal and value-oriented prescription.
- It sometimes is a response to internal and external changes that threaten the stability of the system.
- It often defines the steps and standards for implementation and criteria for evaluation.
- It is closely linked to power and control.
- The relationship between policy intentions and policy outcomes is often nonlinear and uncertain because of the multiple factors that operate during policy implementation.

Therefore in this study an education policy is defined as an authoritative prescription that has the dual objective of controlling the behaviour of organisation members and affected groups to secure preferred goals and values, and when necessary, addressing external and internal changes that threaten the stability of the education system. Education policies may be issued in the form of legislation, circulars, or policy documents.

2.2.2 Policymaking

2.2.2.1 Technicist vs. democratic policymaking

Once issues and problems have been identified the actual task of policy formulation in education may be technicist or democratic. Badat (1991: 23-26), for example, maintains that the pre-election South African
government approach to education policy was 'marked by technicism.' He categorises both the De Lange investigation and the Education Renewal Strategy as being technicist. 'In both these policy-making exercises, state officials, academics and researchers became the arbiters of the needs of the mass of the people.' The technicist approach also tends to be undemocratic and authoritarian. Badat (1991: 25) concludes that this approach to policymaking is likely to generate problems and resistance during policy implementation. A democratic approach, in contrast, allows policymaking participation of all those who are directly affected by the policy. Figure 2.1 presents a diagrammatic representation of the policymaking process in South Africa during the period under consideration.

2.2.2.2 Policymaking as a political process

Marshall et al. (1986: 348) view policymaking as a political process in which various stakeholders interact to influence policy decisions that are favourable to their interests. Figure 2.2 presents their representation of the policymaking process. Prunty (1984: 1) also asserts:

Educational policymaking is an exercise of power and control directed towards the attainment or preservation of some preferred arrangement of schools and society. Whether a particular policy has to do with the nature of school curriculum, pedagogy, the role of the community in school decision-making, disciplinary procedures, or the content and criteria of HSC examinations, some desired state of affairs is envisaged, and the requisite resources and authority are garnered in the service of this ideal.

Because of its political nature, policymaking thus always involves exercise of power and influence to secure preferred positions through the policymaking process (see sections 1.3.2.2.2, 2.2.3.2.2, 6.3.2.2, and 6.3.2.4).

2.2.2.3 Policymaking under adversity

Dror (1986: 23-35), who developed the concept of 'policymaking under adversity,' describes the 'generalized features of main policy adversities' as the 'rapid shifts and jumps in policy issues'; 'the erosion of the political base of policymaking'; and the 'absence of reliable policy compasses.' That the concept of 'policymaking under adversity' and that of 'policymaking and policy implementation in a society in transition' have much in common becomes evident in Dror's discussion of each of the main 'policy adversities.' Of 'shifts and
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jumps in policy issues,' Dror (1986: 23) says the following:

Shifts and time-compressed turns in the nature of issues make traditional policy paradigms, policy assumptions, policy habits, policy "grammars," and grand policies increasingly doubtful. Recent, present and foreseeable shifts and jumps in policy issues include transformations in expectations, aspirations, and beliefs, inflections of the internal dynamics of policies, which make their linear continuation with only incremental changes impossible or counterproductive ...

Dror (1986: 23-35) presents several examples of this predicament:

- Periods of extended stagnation and high unemployment in countries that had experienced long periods of economic prosperity produce a sharp, unanticipated break with the past, producing 'policy adversities.'

- In many Third World countries 'abysses' between resources and operations, cultural-social turmoil, and the absence of any viable 'state traditions' may inhibit effective policymaking.

- Of particular relevance to this study is the example of 'changes in the very fundamentals of society' where changes move toward a total reversal of conditions as experienced in the recent past.

In situations such as these 'relatively easy policymaking modes, such as segmented, incrementalism and disjointed mutual adjustment' become more and more ineffective.

The second major 'policy adversity' experienced by some countries in the latter half of the twentieth century, according to Dror (1986: 26), was the erosion of their political base. Here the essential 'political foundations of effective policymaking contract, with no substitution in sight,' producing conditions variously described in political science literature as 'ungovernability', 'overload', 'limits on capacity to govern', 'alienation', 'legitimation crisis' and 'governance in crisis'. Some specific examples of this situation are (Dror, 1986: 27-33):

- The elimination of the transcendental justification for the system of government results in its no longer possessing legitimacy and moral force.

- Reduced force monopoly at the disposal of the government, diminished trust in the government's ability to govern the country, and the fragmentation of political resources in the country all lead to conditions such as lack of consensus, single-interest groups, multiple groupings of political activists, growing voter volatility, resurgence of ethnic politics, growing tendency towards accusative politics, and a general condition of high political volatility with
decreasing popular support for the government.

Under conditions such as these, which probably bear fairly close resemblance to conditions in South Africa, especially after 2 February 1990, a general undermining of the essential basis for traditional policymaking and policy implementation can be expected.

On the issue of an 'absence of reliable policy compasses', Dror (1986: 33-35), notes that situations are so radically different from anything in the past that policymakers are no longer able to make decisions with reasonable certainty about their effectiveness. Generally, adequate response to 'policy adversities' is weakened by the general absence of 'good policy ideas.' In situations such as these, policymaking becomes partly a 'blind gambling activity' because there is no sense of confidence that the policy will successfully address the problem which it seeks to address (Dror, 1986: 98). Heese's (1989: 13-14) comments on the impact of an open-ended, unpredictable environment on the whole task of educational management are also relevant here. He points to the fact that the formulation of unambiguous, measurable goals is no longer easily attainable in an education system because of a wide range of factors, including the following:

- the number and disparate interests of the various interest groups involved in the formulation of goals,
- the uncertainty of educational outcomes,
- the complexity of valid and effective evaluation procedures, and
- the teaching profession's need to protect itself in such an uncertain environment.

The problem, as Heese (1989: 14) points out, is made 'immeasurably more difficult' when the system itself is in a process of change and 'many of the aspects of the target society are unknown.'

2.2.2.4 Operational definition

In this study the researcher shall accept the definition of educational policymaking offered by Salter and Tapper (1981: 88, 92) as the operational definition. They define it as:

... the process whereby the various pressures for educational change are translated into formal governmental expression ... the forum in which those pressures for change are politically negotiated is ... the educational state apparatus ... [which] although it cannot ignore the social and political pressure to which it is invariably subject ... can nonetheless interpret these pressures in ways which suit its own bureaucratic ambitions.
Some propositions which flow from this definition and which are relevant to the study of education policy implementation in a system in transition are:

- Education policies emerge from some mismatch between existing policies and the substantive changes within the education system and within the larger environment.
- The changes generate pressure for educational change through revision or change of relevant policies.
- Education policies are an outcome of a conversion process in which the competing values and views of the various stakeholders seek decision benefits.
- The policymaking process is political in the sense that competing groups seek to realise decision benefits from the process.
- Education department officials who have legal authority to make authoritative prescriptions are central actors in the policymaking process.
- Education department officials who have policymaking authority will seek to influence policymaking to suit the department's bureaucratic ambitions.

2.2.3 Policy implementation

2.2.3.1 Evolution of the concept

This concept shall be examined in some detail as it is central to this study. Policy implementation first began to receive formal attention in the late 1960's. Since then the concept has undergone several changes in content and theoretical composition. Concentrating mainly on research in the United States of America (USA), one can identify three periods in the evolution of the concept.

2.2.3.1.1 First period of policy implementation research

Policy implementation first began to receive attention in the 1960's when policy researchers in the United States of America began to examine local
response to major federal policies and the success of programs flowing from these policies. As Odden (1991: 1) reports, 'the finding were sobering'. The first period of research - extending from the 1960's to the early 1970's - showed that the 'expectations and hopes of state and federal program designers were dashed on the shoals of local resistance and ineptness' (Odden, 1991: 5).

2.2.3.1.2 Second period of policy implementation research

The second period of policy implementation research - extending from the late 1970's to mid 1980's - concentrated attention on the actual dynamics of the policy implementation problems identified by earlier researchers and on the survival of the programs after the initial start-up years. Mainly, these studies showed (Odden, 1991: 7-8):

... that higher level government programs eventually get implemented locally, that the initial conflict gets worked out over time, and that the opportunity for bargaining ultimately produces a workable program for both parties. Another conclusion is that state and federal initiatives do impact local practice: there may be questions about the impact, but impact occurs.

2.2.3.1.3 Third period of policy implementation research

In the third period - beginning in the mid-1980's and continuing into the present - researchers began to focus attention on the policy outcomes and their congruence with original policy goals. Odden (1991: 8-12) identifies several theoretical and conceptual directions in this body of literature. Some of these are presented below as propositional statements which underly the present research:

- Micro-implementation issues are critically important for effective policy implementation.

- 'Backward mapping' that entails design of policies and policy implementation based on knowledge of the micro-context and its various human and material needs contributes to policy success.

- New implementation techniques must be developed for the 1990's as education policies now often entail restructuring of schools and fundamental redesign of the system.

- Policy changes relating to teacher or parental empowerment are difficult as they challenge fundamental notions of who controls or should control schools.
The present period of policy implementation literature is thus grappling with the whole issue of how to achieve a higher level of policy success. It distinguishes between compliance with policies and making policies work in delivering the desired and intended policy outcomes.

2.2.3.2 Theoretical developments

The thirty years or so of policy research summarised above also embodies changes and developments in the theoretical underpinnings of policy implementation literature.

2.2.3.2.1 Rational model

Drawing mainly on Nakamura and Smallwood (1980), Bain (1984: 49) summarises the classical or rational model as resting on the following 'major preconceptions':

(i) Policy-making and policy implementation are bounded, separate and sequential.

(ii) These boundaries exist because -

(a) there is a clear division of labour between policy makers and policy implementers; the former sets goals, the latter carry out these goals;

(b) policy makers are capable of stating policies definitively because they can agree on a priority among different goals;

(c) policy implementers possess the technical capability, the obedience and the will to carry out these policies.

(iii) The process of implementation unfolds in a chronological fashion in which policy-making precedes policy implementation.

(iv) Decisions of implementers are non-political and technical in nature ...

(v) The delusion is that the legislature must have primacy in the whole process of policy formulation and that the bureaucracy should be an instrument rather than a brain.

The limitations of the rational model were underscored by Wise (1979). He argued that the rational model in the policy process had actually evolved into a hyperrational system (Wise, 1979, cited by Moore, 1986: 22-23):

... rationalization occurs when the relationship between means and ends is known,
when ends are attainable given the means, or when the means are reasonable given the ends. When the relationship between means and ends is not known and bureaucratic rationalization persists ... we are witnessing the phenomenon of hyperrationalization - that is, an effort to rationalize beyond the bounds of knowledge ... because the policymaker is far removed from the classroom, he is forced to make numerous assumptions about how a whole succession of organisations and sub-organisations will respond to the policy. At each level through which policy must pass on its way to implementation, bureaucratic politics and incentives can and will affect how and if the policy will be implemented.

A fundamental flaw in the rational model is the assumption that policy implementation will follow in a natural, pre-planned manner to the realisation of policy goals, as envisaged in the course of policy formulation (see section 6.2.6.3).

2.2.3.2.2 Political model

The first major theoretical model of policy implementation that revealed a distinct shift from the rational model was that of Van Meter and Van Horn (1975). Their basic model - depicted in Figure 2.3 - posits six clusters of variables which 'shape the linkage between policy and performance' (Van Meter and Van Horn, 1975: 462).

As Nakamura and Smallwood (1980: 14) point out, the importance of Van Meter and Van Horn's contribution to the study of policy implementation lay in the fact that their analysis highlighted 'the personal and psychological complexities that influence the actors in the implementation arena.'

Another significant contribution to the literature on policy implementation and another shift away from the classical-rational model was Milbrey McLaughlin's (1976: 340-341) conclusion based on the RAND Corporation study of federal programs involving educational change:

Contrary to the assumptions underlying many change strategies and federal change policies, we found that implementation did not merely involve the direct and straightforward application of an educational technology or plan. Implementation was a dynamic organizational process that was shaped over time by interactions between project goals and methods and the institutional setting.

As such, it was neither automatic nor certain. Three different interactions characterized this highly variable process.

One, mutual adaptation, described successfully implemented projects. It involved modification of both the project design and changes in the institutional setting and individual participants during the course of implementation.

Another implementation process, cooptation, signified adaptation of the project design, but no change on the part of participants of the institutional setting. When
implementation of this nature occurred, project strategies were simply modified to conform in a pro forma fashion to the traditional practices the innovation was expected to replace - either because of resistance to change or inadequate help for implementers.

The third implementation process, nonimplementation, described the experience of projects that either broke down during the course of implementation or were simply ignored by project participants.

**Figure 2.3 Van Meter and Van Horn's model of the policy implementation process**

McLaughlin's (1976) analysis clearly established that policy implementers play a critical role in the policy process and the realisation or non-realisation of policy goals.

Also showing the influence of people in the organisation on the policy implementation process, Bardach (1977) developed the metaphor of 'games' to describe implementation. Bardach (1977: 55-56) writes:

The idea of 'games' ... directs us to look at the players, what they regard as the stakes, their strategies and tactics, their resources for playing, the rules of play (which stipulate the conditions for winning), the rules of 'fair' play (which stipulate the boundaries beyond which lie fraud or illegitimacy), the nature of the communications (or lack of them) among the players, and the degree of uncertainty surrounding the possible outcomes. The game metaphor also directs our attention to who is not willing to play and for what reasons, and to who insists on changes in some of the game's
parameters as a condition for playing.

Bardach (1977) describes four types of implementation games which he sees as driving impulses in the activities of policy implementers - diversion of resources, deflection of policy goals, resistance to administrative control, and the dissipation of energies.

In another step in the process, drawing on the work of writers such as Van Meter and Van Horn (1975), Weick (1976), McLaughlin (1976), and Bardach (1977), Berman (1978) differentiated between macro- and micro-implementation in an effort to synthesise the growing body of literature on policy implementation. Berman (1978: 164) points outs:

The study of social policy implementation is so difficult because social services are delivered by local organizations (schools, hospitals, health care centres, police departments, welfare agencies, and the like) that are relatively independent of federal or state control and, worse yet, have their own implementation problems. Implementing national policy thus consists of not one but two classes of problems. The federal government must execute its policy so as to influence local delivery organizations to behave in desired ways; we call this the macro-implementation problem. In response to federal actions, the local organizations have to devise and carry out their own internal policies; we call this the micro-implementation problem... Essential differences between the processes of micro-implementation and macro-implementation arise from their distinct institutional settings. Whereas the institutional setting for micro-implementation is a local delivery organization, the institutional setting for macro-implementation is an entire policy sector, spanning federal to local levels.

The political model of policy implementation was further developed by the theoretical contribution of Rein and Rabinovitz (1978). They maintain that the policy implementation process is shaped by 'three potentially conflicting imperatives.' These are (Rein and Rabinovitz, 1978, cited by Nakamura and Smallwood, 1980: 17-18):

- the legal imperative that requires policy implementers to do what is legally required and to comply with policy directives;

- the rational-bureaucratic imperative that focuses on what is morally correct, feasible, and defensible from the bureaucratic perspective; and

- the consensual imperative that concentrates on having to do what is necessary to win acceptance of the policy from the various stakeholders.

A fourth imperative, not mentioned by Rein and Rabinovitz, but of particular significance to education systems relates to the need for constant monitoring of the system to ensure positive alignment with the larger society. This often creates the demand for policy research. Policy implementation is thus not a 'one-dimensional transition from
legislation, to guidelines, and then to auditing and evaluation' but a 'circular or looping' process with all four imperatives operating simultaneously and, at times, in a conflicting manner.

What all these theoretical explorations of the policy implementation process clearly establish is that policy success depends on the positive synchronisation of a variety of factors. One of the most comprehensive modeling of these factors is that of Sabatier and Mazmanian (1979), who attempt to integrate several previous conceptualisations of the process into a systems framework that embraces the various political, legal, social, and economic variables exposed by earlier researchers. They postulate that there are four variables that most affect the first three to five years of a program's/policy's implementation. These are (summarised by Kirst and Jung, 1980: 42):

- The 'strength' of the statutes and ensuing regulations, including both how precisely and consistently the objectives are specified and ranked, and how clearly authority is delegated to organizational subunits;
- The presence of a 'fixer', i.e., a key legislator or administrator ideologically attuned to program requirements who controls resources important to crucial actors and who has the status, desire, and staff to monitor closely the implementation process;
- The resources of various constituency groups - the salience of an issue, the solidarity, the access to policy channels and information, and availability of side payments for representatives from implementing agencies and intended target group recipients;
- The commitment and leadership of agency officials, including the direction and ranking of statutory objectives in officials' preference ordering, and the skills in realizing these preferences.

Sabatier and Mazmanian (1979: 21-22), however, also state that these variables are essentially 'elusive concepts' because of the complexity of their operation. Finally, Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) draw the various strands of policy implementation literature into a detailed exposition of the 'politics' of the process. They note that the process is 'characterized by a high degree of diversity, fluidity, a complexity in terms of actors, arenas, bureaucratic imperatives, linkages and compliance mechanisms.' The political nature of the task is suggested by the fact that 'bargaining and other forms of negotiation have taken on growing importance in the implementation process' (Nakamura and Smallwood, 1980: 65).

2.2.3.2.3 Integrationist model

With these views about the political nature of the policy implementation
process, there evolved a convergence of the interests and perceptions of policymakers and policy implementers. Bain (1984: 49) summarises the 'major preconceptions' of this growing merger of opinions about policy implementation as follows:

(i) The fine distinction between policymaking and policy implementation often disappears entirely, for example, legislation may have ambiguities or even contradictions and public officials must, in the process of interpreting, clarifying and programming the legislative intent, make some explicit choices about policy content ...

(ii) Implementation is just as important as the decision itself ... since during the implementation stage contending views of various actors, including public officials, are worked out. Subjects of dispute which could have been postponed during the initial stages of policy making must now be resolved ...

(iii) Increasing emphasis on the qualities of implementers as key actors in the policy process eg. the psychological and human factors that can influence the implementer's behaviour ..., a reciprocal process of mutual adaptation between policy makers and policy implementers ..., the roles that implementers can play to impede, frustrate and subvert policies ..., and the intrigue that can surround attempts to implement specific policies ...

(iv) The Integrationist model is also referred to as the bottoms-up approach of policy implementation - an approach in which what is actually done is accorded prominence, i.e. how and why individuals act the way they do. Policy may be one of a variety of factors which may influence group and individual behaviour in implementation, but it cannot be assumed this will be so.

Bain (1984: 50) also points out that in the integrationist model, policymaking and policy implementation are 'inextricably linked.'

2.2.3.3 Policy implementation variables

Policy theorists and researchers have also directed much attention to the identification of variables that interact during the policy implementation process to affect policy outcomes. The reason for this lies in the fact that the process is so complex and yet so fundamental to the functioning of government and its public service delivery systems. Bardach (1977: 2) states the problem, with some exasperation, as follows:

It is hard enough to design public policies and programs that look good on paper. It is harder still to formulate them in words and slogans that resonate pleasingly in the ears of political leaders and the constituencies to which they are responsive. And it is excruciatingly hard to implement them in a way that pleases anyone at all, including the supposed beneficiaries or clients.

The complexity of the task flows from the fact that a multiplicity of variables function in the process. From a survey of the literature,
Moore (1986: 40) identifies the following as variables that weave into the policy implementation process:

1. the policy itself (clarity, vague or specific language; potential goal conflict; goal saliency);
2. level of available resources (personnel; time; materials; finances; capacity);
3. inter-organizational communication (awareness of the policy; degree of complexity of the process);
4. inter-organizational enforcement and follow-up (possibilities and limitations of external control);
5. disposition of implementors (support of constituency groups; presence of incentives/disincentives; degree of consensus);
6. economic, political and social conditions within the implementors' jurisdiction (environmental stability).

Of particular importance in this study is the last mentioned variable with its emphasis on the level of environmental stability. It has dual significance. First, because of the dynamic nature of the environment, even at the best of times, it is difficult for policymakers to anticipate the future during the policymaking process. Therefore, as Rein and Rabinovitz (1978, cited by Nakamura and Smallwood, 1980: 17-18), point out, the policy implementation phase has to circle back to the policymaking phase to adjust the policy as the implementation process unfolds. Second, during a period of rapid changes and social transition, the environment is characterised by great turbulence and thus exhibits greater instability and unpredictability during both the policymaking and the policy implementation phases. The cycle of policy implementation problems and policy adjustments thus becomes more rapid and thus more unsettling to officials at the service delivery point.

2.2.3.4 The problem of policy implementation

As research on policy implementation proceeded and as new models and theoretical refinements occurred, the problem of implementation continued to be unresolved. Commenting on the problem, McLaughlin (1987: 172) writes:

"Rational man" was one of the first casualties once analysts turned their attention to issues of policy implementation. Implementors, we discovered, did not always do as told (as proponents of scientific management would have it) nor did they always act to maximize policy objectives (as many economists would have it). Instead those responsible for implementation at various levels of the policy system responded in what often seemed quite idiosyncratic, frustratingly unpredictable, if not downright resistant ways. The result was not only program outcomes that fell short of expectations but
also enormous variability in what constituted a "program" in communities across the nation.

The problem, however, was not unique to the USA. As other countries began to undertake major political, social, and educational revision and restructuring of their systems, they also experienced implementation problems.

In their discussion of the implementation of the National Curriculum policy in schools in England and Wales, Ball and Bowe (1992: 99-100), for example, also point to implementation problems:

\[\text{Our suggestion at this stage is that, even with a highly detailed piece of legislation on the statute books, educational policy will still be generated and implemented both within and around the educational system in ways that have intended and unintended consequences for both education and its surrounding social milieu. As a result the Act, and its attendant texts, are in one respect an expression of sets of political intentions and a political resource for continuing national debates, and in another a micro-political resource for teachers, LEAs and parents to interpret, re-interpret and apply to their particular social contexts.}\]

Ball and Bowe (1992: 100) also draw attention to the process of policy recontextualisation that goes on in schools and to the 'impact of matters of contingency - staff absence or shortages, individual personalities or capacities, the geographical location and catchment area, etc.' Therefore these writers maintain that clear distinctions must be made between the following:

- **Intended policies** which 'focus on the variety of "official" competing ideologies that seek to affect policy ... and the continual struggle for power they reflect and contain.'

- **Actual policy** which centres on the world of legislation, circulars and policy documents - the policy texts - that set out to lay down the ground rules for policy-in-use.

- **Policy-in-use** which refers to the 'the institutional practices and discourses that emerge out of the responses of practitioners to both the intended and official policies.'

A fourth category that could be added to the above three is 'rejected policy' which would refer to policies which educators refuse to implement because of some fundamental value and goal conflict between policymakers and policy implementers.

The clash of values and ideologies and the multiplicity of actors and groups involved in policy implementation have led writers such as Clune (1983: 53) to support the view that the process has a 'political' dimension in the sense that it is a 'process of struggle, conflict, and
compromise among contending interest groups.' This is also evident in Ball and Bowe's (1992: 100) discussion of the 'clashes and mismatches at work' in school settings and the impact of the 'peculiarities and particularities' which are responsible for 'policy-in-use.'

Dror (1986: 195), focussing on the effects of 'policy adversities' on policy implementation, offers the following generalisations:

- Implementation is affected by 'power concentration and political skills of the actors.'

- Under 'turbulent conditions as characterizing adversity,' implementation is subject to rapid shifts and changes in environmental factors.

- Under conditions of turbulence and adversity, implementation 'must also be looked at within a fuzzy gambling perspective, with ignorance and various forms of uncertainty surrounding implementation possibilities.'

- Political cultures prevalent among the various groups differ in terms of what can be done.

- Under conditions of turbulence and adversity 'jumps between optimistic and pessimistic moods conditioning policymaking' may also occur and impact on the actual policy outcomes.

Dror (1986: 193), adopting a wide, international sweep in his research, concludes that 'policy spoilage,' policy distortions during implementation, and the dangers of 'nonimplementation', and of inappropriate implementation are the major problems currently facing those involved in the policy process. In education, this fuzziness and uncertainty of outcome can be expected to be greatly magnified because of the loosely coupled nature of the system. Pressures of a turbulent environment should therefore magnify the dangers of 'policy spoilage' even further because of their weakening impact on the interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages in the education system.

2.2.3.5 Operational definition

For the purposes of this study the term 'policy implementation' is taken to refer to the dynamic organisational processes that are set in motion by the formulation and formal announcement of a policy by the Department.

The implementation processes may or may not produce the intended
alterations in the organisation and sometimes may also produce reactions and outcomes that were not anticipated. This definition takes cognizance of the diverse groups and individual actors at the macro- and micro-levels whose complex motivations and interactions merge with a network of social, cultural, and micropolitical factors to influence what actually happens as a policy moves towards policy outcomes.

2.2.4 System

2.2.4.1 Open systems theory

All systems display the following properties (Lipham and Hoeh, 1974 31):

1. All systems exist in space-time.
2. All systems tend toward a state of randomness and disorder, the ultimate of which is [maximum] entropy, or inertia.
3. All systems have boundaries, which are more or less arbitrary demarcations of that included within and that excluded from the system.
4. All systems have environment, which is everything external to (without the boundary of) the system.
5. All systems have factors that affect the structure and function of the system. Factors within the system are variables; factors in the system's environment are parameters.
6. All but the largest systems have suprasystems.
7. All but the smallest systems have subsystems.

A significant component in these properties is that, unlike a closed system, an open system is in continual, dynamic interaction with its environment.

Of particular relevance to this study are the management implications of these and other related open systems properties. Kast and Rosenzweig (1976), for example, see all organisations as containing five distinct but interrelated subsystems:

- Goal and values subsystem
- Management subsystem
- Technical subsystem
- Structural subsystem
- Psychosocial subsystem.
Each of these subsystems is itself an open system that interacts with the other subsystems and the larger environment. Each of the five subsystems also performs a distinct and critical function for the organisation as a whole. The *goals and values subsystem* provides the rationale for the organisation and shapes its course and direction. The *management subsystem* brings the other four subsystems into functional alignment and manages and directs their functioning for the attainment of organisational goals. This subsystem also sees to it that the boundaries of the organisation are maintained or managed in a way that preserves and protects the interests of the systems. Snyder and Anderson (1986: 50-51) see this role of the management subsystem as being critical in that management 'diagnoses the situation and adjusts the organization' for stable goal orientation, orderly change, adaptability to new conditions and innovativeness when conditions warrant it. The *technical subsystem* embraces the knowledge and skills essential for the achievement of organisational goals. The *structural subsystem* concentrates on the tasks, the technology and the roles of organisation members and seeks to bring these into an effective design. Finally, all organisations are ultimately composed of people who bring to the system different skills, different values, and different perspectives on the world of work. This channels into the *psychosocial subsystem* which is concerned with the individual and group interactions within the organisation.

During a period of transition the functioning of these subsystems in an integrated, effective manner will in all probability be threatened. The dynamic equilibrium of the organisation may be affected as it seeks to adjust to the rapid changes in the environment. Structural changes may occur through morphogenic processes as the system seeks to adjust to rapid changes in the environment (see section 6.3.2.2).

2.2.4.2 Environment

The environment is a critical component of an open system in that there is a continuous exchange of energy, matter, and information between it and the system. As a result, changes in the environment inevitably create changes in the system's functioning. Hedberg (1981: 9) describes this linked interaction as follows:

> Profound changes in the relationships between organizations and their environment may involve total restructurings of the rules by which responses are assembled, and total restructuring are often strongly resisted. Organizations' environmental maps tend to be rigid ... because socially constructed reality and logical congruence in human brains stabilize established perceptions and beliefs and ward off ambiguous cues until there is enough counter evidence to justify radical reorganizations.

That organisations are increasingly faced with a turbulent environment
was noted by Emery and Trist (1965) almost thirty years ago. In their influential article, they maintain (Emery and Trist, 1965: 21):

A main problem in the study of organizational change is that the environmental contexts in which organizations exist are themselves changing, at an increasing rate, and towards increasing complexity.

Turbulent environments have several significant effects on systems located in them. The 'area of relevant uncertainty' in relation to the system's functioning is greatly increased; the consequences of their actions become 'increasingly unpredictable, amplified beyond all expectation;' and at other times 'attenuated by emergent field forces' (Emery and Trist, 1965: 26). In this situation, energies of the management subsystem become deflected to the task of elimination or significant reduction of ambiguity and uncertainty by 'buffering the technical core' and designing systems that can scan the environment for effective processing of needed information (Cameron et al., 1987: 223).

Research on the impact of environmental turbulence and the uncertainty which it generates among organisation members by collapsing established world views has been widely undertaken. Reviewing this body of literature, Cameron et al. (1987: 226) report that common reactions to environmental turbulence are feelings of crisis, stress, anxiety, rigidity of response, standardisation, and routinisation. Concurrently, conflict, secrecy, and scapegoating of leaders increases and a participative, open style of management decreases. In the process, the system's internal management becomes crisis-oriented and reactive (see sections 6.2.6, 6.2.7, 6.3.2.1, and 6.3.2.2).

2.2.4.3 The state education system

Margaret Archer (1979: 54) defines a state education system as:

... a nationwide and differentiated collection of institutions devoted to formal education, whose overall control and supervision is at least partly governmental, and whose component parts and processes are related to one another.

In elaborating on this definition, she adds (Archer, 1981: 261) that 'both the political and the systemic aspects must be present together before education can be considered to constitute a state system.' The specific form and character of each state education system, however, as Dekker and Van Schalkwyk (1983: 4-15) note, are the products of demographic and geographical factors, historical background, the sociocultural situation, the political system, the economic system, and religious attitudes.
In his description of the education system, Stone (1991: 2-3) defines it as a structure that:

- operates within a given context and has to take into consideration existing parameters
- accepts the preparation of people for the society they live in as one of its main functions
- has an internal authority structure which can be said to be weakly coupled
- is an interwoven structure in which many interest groups are closely associated to ensure that the system produces education of a type which also serves their specific needs
- has goals which are often ambiguously articulated since they have to accommodate sometimes conflicting interests of the various stakeholders
- must be accepted as legitimate by its clients to the extent that they are willing to use the services it provides.

Focussing more closely on the structure of education systems, Heese (1992: 102-104) states that education systems may be thought of as bureaucracies, collegiums of academics, or weakly connected structures. Viewed as bureaucracies, as Heese points out, education systems display characteristics such as a clearly defined hierarchy, division of labour on a functional basis, a clear set of functional rules governing interaction and standardised work procedures. Viewed as a collegium of academics, the education system highlights issues such as the professional autonomy of teachers. Finally, viewed as a weakly coupled structure, the education system reveals characteristics such as weak linkages between its subsystems that makes efforts by the managerial subsystem to control the functioning of the other subsystems a difficult and complex task. These three views of the education system actually throw into relief specific interpersonal, cultural, and structural features of the education system in action (see section 1.3.2.1).

2.2.4.4 Structural nature of the education system

As Van Schalkwyk (1982: 79-80) points out, the education system is more than the school. Various social structures such as the state, the family, the church and other religious bodies, commerce and industry, the organised teaching profession, and parent organisations are interwoven with the specifically educational institutions to form the education system with the purpose of educative teaching. The educational system thus consists of:

- Pedagogically qualified structures of which the school is the
principal component.

- Socially concerned structures of which the state, the family, the church and other religious bodies, commerce and industry, and the organised teaching profession are the principal components.

- Nodal structures that organise the mutual interests of relevant intersecting social structures, which may be grouped in terms of linkages between the school and the state, the school and the parent community, the school and industry, the school and tertiary education, the school and the teaching corps, and the school and the life-world.

As Van Schalkwyk (1982: 145) points out, the interrelatedness of the education system is actualised through educational administration that links the law and its execution. It is this that makes effective policy implementation a critical aspect of education administration because, without it, the goal of sound educative teaching cannot be realised.

2.2.4.5 An education system in transition

The movement from crisis to change to crisis and yet further change that occurred in the Indian education system corresponds in many ways with Margaret Archer's (1979; 1981) theory of change and transition in education systems. She writes (1981: 280):

The system in operation today was structured yesterday; the patterns of governance and accountability now observed were shaped by past struggles for control and shape future processes of change; the educational interests which are currently defended were distributed earlier in time. In other words some of the causes of continuation are inscribed in the origins of educational systems, whose structure created and perpetuates vested interests in its maintenance.

I picture this development of systems over time as a series of cycles. In each cycle the initial structure conditions educational interaction; interaction which is also affected by independent influences, eventually brings about a change in the structure. Thus successive cycles of structural conditioning -> interaction -> structural elaboration continue to unite 'historical' origins with current operations.

These cycles move through chronological time. In the earliest ones the influence of the structure of the educational system as it first emerged is preponderant: in later ones this attenuates, for it is the changed structure of system, as elaborated by successive bouts of interaction, which then conditions subsequent educational interaction. How many cycles are delineated in this way depends mainly on the problem in hand.

She stresses the significance of time in this process of structural conditioning -> interaction -> structural elaboration of the education
system but rejects the notion that her theory is only applicable to macro-processes that have a large time scale and historical sweep. She maintains (Archer, 1981: 281):

A temporal dimension is essential and implicit in the smallest scale investigation which focuses upon a single point in time. An understanding of the linkage between systemic origins and contemporary operations is necessary to a full explanation of the latter: an appreciation that these ongoing operations are already contributing to structural elaboration is essential to a full understanding of systemic change. In other words the dynamics of morphogenesis are at work at any given point in time and therefore educational operations can never be reduced to their momentary mode of existence...

Taking these points together we can begin to visualize the interplay between origins and operations as well as between micro- and macro-levels. We can start to conceptualize the effects of (macro) origins, i.e. the structure of system shaped in the past, on present (micro) operations. These can be seen as series of negative-feedback loops which work to maintain the original systemic structure but which weaken over time. Simultaneously the effects of current (micro) operations in modifying the (macro) characteristics of the system can be conceptualized as a series of positive feedback loops which amplify deviations from the original structure and strengthen over time. Both sets of loops are found in the present, but the causes of negative feedback lie in the past and the consequences of positive feedback lie in the future.

The process Margaret Archer identifies as the dynamics of transitions in education systems has also been noted by political scientists examining the process of regime changes and transitions from one form of government to another. Zartman (1991: 18-19), for example, writing about regime changes, identifies a similar process of conflict → resolution → conflict → resolution as the system changes with each crisis, undergoing in this process regime transition to a new form of government. The significance of morphogenic processes in the structural alterations that occur in an education system are re-emphasised in Chapter 6 (see section 6.3.2.2).

2.2.4.6 Education system and education policy

The location of the education system in a turbulent environment that is itself the product of socio-political changes of massive, nationwide consequence has enormous significance for the capability of the education system to function effectively. Under pressure from a turbulent environment, education system events that are likely to occur, in varying degrees, are polarisation of values and beliefs among system members, surfacing of self-interest, alterations in power relations, general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages among system components, and increase in policy conflicts and failures, system disequilibrium, and pressure for change.

Moreover, in periods of transition, system actors are more likely to form coalitions in support of particular policy approaches to resolve
perceived problems in the system or to obtain maximum gain from the new policy. They interact with policymakers, using a variety of strategies and power resources. Policymakers, in turn, seek to accommodate these pressures while seeking to gain advantage in the policy for the education department's position on the policy problem. During the implementation phase, on the basis of the perceived effectiveness of the policy, the various coalitions in the system with an interest in it may revise their beliefs and/or alter their strategy to gain their specific objectives. This may involve pressure on policymakers to revise the policy or to replace it with a completely new policy (see Figure 2.4). If these efforts fail, a group may even go outside the education system to elicit the support of external groups in seeking radical change within the education system. As a result, the pace of changes in the larger system and the environment 'constitute one of the principal dynamic elements affecting policy change' (Sabatier, 1988: 134, 136). Writers who adopt a critical theory perspective to education therefore argue that 'policy is about change' (Prunty, 1984: 24; original emphasis).

2.2.4.7 Operational definition

A system in this study shall be defined as a set of interrelated elements merging to form a whole in structure and operation, and functioning in constant interaction with the environment. Moreover, applied to the education system, this definition shall be taken to display several properties. Drawing on the views of the various writers cited above, the more significant of these properties may be listed as follows:

- The education system has both political and systemic components.

- The education system has several subsystems of which the most significant are the goal and policy subsystem, the administration and control subsystem, the structural subsystem, the delivery subsystem, the sociocultural subsystem, the ancillary support services subsystem, the budget and finance subsystem, and the community subsystem.

- The education system operates within a given context which is itself the product of demographic and geographical factors, historical background, the socio-cultural situation, the political system, the economic system, and religious attitudes.

- The education system operates within an environment with which it is in a state of continual, dynamic interaction. Separating it from the environment, the education system has clearly defined boundaries.
Figure 2.4 General model of education policy change process in an education system in transition

ENVIRONMENT
1. Changes in socio-political conditions
2. Changes in socio-cultural values
3. Crises and changes in larger education system
4. Changes in causal texture of environment
5. Policy decisions and impact from other subsystems
6. Pressure for change from external groups

SYSTEM EVENTS
1. Polarisation of values among system members
2. Operation of self-interest
3. Alterations in power relations
4. Weakening of interpersonal, cultural and structural linkages
5. System disequilibrium as a result of education bureaucracy/school/teacher organisation/conflicts/crisis

POLICYMAKING SUBSYSTEM
An arena where upper management may begin to lose dominance in policymaking and policy control

Coalition A
1. Values, attitudes, and interpretive schemes of system actors
2. Constraints and power resources of system actors
3. Policy opportunities of system actors

Policymakers
- Beliefs
- Values
- Power resources
- Interpretive schemes
- Strategy/ies to affect process

Coalition B
- Beliefs
- Values
- Power resources
- Interpretive schemes
- Strategy/ies to affect process

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION SUBSYSTEM
A arena where lower level participants may begin to gain dominance
• The environment of an education system exercises a great influence on its operations, especially when it is in a state of turbulence, and may generate structural changes through the dynamics of morphogenesis.

• The education system is driven by goals, of which one of the basic is the preparation of youth for the society in which we live.

• The goals of an education system are often ambiguously defined to enable their swift adaptation to fit the needs and interests of various stakeholders.

• Important participants in education function at various levels of the system. At the macro-level, there is the ruling political party, the minister of education, executive level officials of the education bureaucracy, and middle-level and junior officials in the education bureaucracy who have the task of managing and controlling the policy implementation process. At the micro-level of the school, there are educators ranging from the principal to a beginning teacher, pupils, and parents. At the broad community level there are other participants with a deep interest in education, of whom the more important are parent organisations, religious organisations, cultural bodies, and employers in commerce and industry. Linking these groups and participants at various levels are bodies such as the education department, organised teacher bodies, professional organisations, parent-teacher governing bodies, and national and provincial bodies representing interests of tertiary education and industry.

• Over a period of time the system develops a culture which acts as the intersubjective reality for all those who function in it. In a period of societal transition this reality may fragment with the emergence of different value systems and different priorities among policy actors.

• When the larger society is in transition, the education system is likely to be confronted with regular crises to which it has to respond adaptively to ensure the continued delivery of education services. These adjustments, over a period of time, may produce structural changes.

• The policymaking subsystem of the education system has to respond with appropriate policies if it is to be successful in effective boundary maintenance and effective response to the processes of change generated by the causal texture of the environment.

• The internal authority structure of the education system can be defined as a structure weakly coupled with many of the other structures of the system. In a period of environmental turbulence
the coupling mechanisms may become greatly weakened.

- The education system must be accepted as legitimate by its clients before it can be expected to function effectively and be in a state of positive equilibrium with its environment. Lack of legitimacy contributes to policy resistance, fragmentation of system coherence through emergent conflict and tensions, general weakening of systemic linkages, and increased loosely coupled functioning.

2.2.5 Transition

2.2.5.1 Political transition

2.2.5.1.1 South African experience

With the unbanning of political organisations such as the ANC and the South African Communist Party on 2 February 1990, the country made a significant break with the past. Within two years of this historic event South Africa witnessed 'talks about talks, pacts such as the Pretoria and the D F Malan Minutes, Peace Accords and the scrapping of some Apartheid legislation' (New Nation, February 28 to March 5, 1992, p.22). The issue of whether the country was finally in the process of transition evoked two clear responses. New Nation (February 28 to March 5, 1992, p.22) summarised these responses as follows:

Many people are asking the question: are we finally on the doorstep of majority rule and democracy? Within the ranks of some theoreticians in the mass movement this question is posed in the form: can the present period be described as transitional? Some people argue that a transition is only when an interim government or similar structure is in place. Given that the present white minority regime is still in control of power, from the law-making process to the army and the police, these people argue that South Africa is not in a transitional situation. Others, however, argue that South Africa is in transition because the release of political prisoners and the unbanning of organisations signalled the transition. These reforms of the post-February 2 period, they argue, must therefore fundamentally affect policy and strategy.

Despite the variations in views about the present South African situation, one thing is common: things are changing. How much is changing, how, and why may be debated, but the change is clearly taking place.

The flow of events from 2 February 1990 onwards was rapid and irreversible. Thus by December 1993, the Transitional Executive Council was ushered in and the path to the elections of April 1994 was clearly sign-posted. After the elections and the installation of the new
government of national unity, planning 'to oversee the transition from separate, racially based education departments to a single education system' was commenced (The Daily News, May 19, 1994, p.7).

2.2.5.1.2 International experience

That the transition process was not unique to South is noted by Stone (1991: 22):

South Africa is not unique in this respect. The USSR for example, is currently in a period of radical political, economic and social change (Gorbachev, 1991). The Soviet experience is only one instance of a phenomenon which has, in some measure or other, affected every single state of what used to be the East Bloc. In South America a number of states have in the recent past moved from military rule and interventionist economic policies to forms of democracy and market economies.

Even more stable societies may be perceived as experiencing transition. Britain, during the Thatcher years, certainly experienced fundamental changes in its basic political paradigm, economic ground rules and social structures. A victory for private enterprise, the privatisation of state enterprises and social changes including fundamental changes to educational structures would seem to support this interpretation. The fusion of West and East Germany, likewise, has introduced a period of transition for the Germans.

Generally, as La Belle and Ward (1990: 99) point out in a review of radical political and social transformations ranging from Marxist revolution to an Islamic restoration, transitions are characterised 'by conflict, internally-driven change and a generally high degree of support and involvement by the population.' Only those who are threatened with loss of political power and wealth show resistance to the change. La Belle and Ward (1990: 100) also identify some patterns in these political transitions:

- The immediate transition period following independence varies as to degree of intra-movement struggle. In Algeria, for example, the post-struggle period saw the continued influence of the colonial bureaucracy.

- In countries like China and Cuba, in contrast, a well-disciplined revolutionary vanguard and its army immediately took over all facets of administration of a new government.

- In other countries such as Iran and Ethiopia, the transition to a new form of government was more complex than a negotiated settlement or a military victory. In Ethiopia, for example, after a military dethronement of the emperor, a provisional military government was set up, then this government slowly moved to the left, losing much
public support.

- In all cases, reform of the education system was high on the transition agenda with access typically expanded, curriculum revised to reflect a new ideology, and training of new personnel accelerated to administer the new education system.

2.2.5.2 Transition to democracy

The South African example of transition is one of regime change and transition to democracy. The literature on the subject suggests that there are three models that have been developed as theoretical constructs to explain the process.

2.2.5.2.1 Structural model

As the name suggests, structuralist approaches to political regime change examine the structural components of society for explanations of transitions to democracy. Leubbert (1991: 306), for example, concludes his study of regime change between World War I and World War II with the view that 'leadership and meaningful choice played no role in the outcomes.' In his discussion of the works of Leubbert (1991) and Rueschemeyer et al. (1992), Kitschelt (1992: 1029-1030) identifies the following as elements of the structural model:

- Class interest and class alliances play a critical role in transition to democracy.

- The true source of democratic transitions is working class mobilisation functioning in combination with middle-class support.

- If the state elite comes mainly from a dominant class and if it controls large segments of the country's economic resources and functioning, the democratic transition is not easy to attain.

- Transnational power structures have highly contingent effects on regime changes.

- Only where political parties become institutionalised as lasting competitive organisational alternatives is there some assurance of the survival of newly created democracies.
2.2.5.2.2 Process model

Unlike the structural model which concentrates on the structural and institutional aspects of society, process-oriented approaches emphasise the outcome of choices within the context of conflict and negotiations. Reviewing the works of Brooker (1990) and Di Palma (1990), Kitschelt (1992: 1031-33) summarises the elements of the process model as follows:

- Not structural conditions but human actions are responsible for regime changes and democratic consolidations.

- At the centre of the process are 'negotiated agreements' between the challengers of the old order and the incumbent elites that gradually 'move common perceptions of self-interest toward accepting democracy as the best possible regime form under given conditions.'

- Authoritarian elites must be convinced that they will not be disadvantaged with the transition to democracy; they must be assured of 'coexistence' and political fair play.

- Tactically, 'a speedy timetable for the electoral reform and balanced concessions among all participating forces pave the road to democracy' and 'facilitate the transition process.'

2.2.5.2.3 Dynamic model

The third model, following Rustow (1970), may be called a dynamic model in that it combines both structural and process elements. This model will be discussed in some detail as it corresponds in many ways to the policy implementation model that shall be used in this study in that it examines the actions of significant role players and the constraining influence of structural and cultural factors.

Rustow's version of the dynamic model consists of four sets of variables and the interaction among them. First, for transition to democracy there has to be a 'background condition' of a sense of 'national unity.' The second set of variables relate to the preparatory phase. Against the background sense of national unity, 'the dynamic process of democratization itself is set off by a prolonged and inconclusive political struggle' in which 'the protagonists must represent well entrenched forces (typically social classes), and the issue must have profound meaning for them' (Rustow, 1970: 352). The third component of the transition process is the decision phase. Since precise terms must be negotiated and 'heavy risks with regard to the future taken,'
national leaders of the various political groups in the country play a 'disproportionate role' in the final decision. The decision phase may be considered 'an act of deliberate, explicit consensus' to restore peace and order in the country, involving some compromise, some ambiguity and some buried differences that are likely, at a later point, to become areas for further debate (Rustow, 1970: 355-357). The final phase is the habituation phase during which politicians and the public at large learn from practice and experience the rules, practices, and beliefs on which democracies are founded.

Zartman's (1991: 19) examination of regime change also reveals a dynamic view of the process. He summarises the process as follows:

Regimes are continually under challenges and are reaffirmed when they successfully overcome those challenges and reassert their structures and habits. But at times the challenges accumulate and begin to represent growing structural shifts, new issues, or an exhaustion of old answers. Forces favored by the existent regime exert their usual efforts to repel the challenges, with less and less success. An interregnum appears, in which new alternatives are proposed, debated, tried, discarded and defended. During this process, structural relations continue to shift, until gradually the basis of a new regime is formed. Negotiation is necessary to create the replacement regime and have it accepted since there is no authority or decision rule in international relations to formalize a new order.

The emergence of a new government, however, does not signal the end of the transition process. As Higley and Burton (1989: 29) point out:

Stable democracies do not emerge simply by writing constitutions, holding elections, expanding human rights, accelerating economic growth, or exterminating leftist insurgencies. The vital step is the consensual unification of disunified elites.

In a similar vein, Hermet (1991: 255-256) writes:

Transition is understood as a process in time rather than in terms of what it actually designates, which is rather vague. It corresponds to the extremely variable period of time that elapses between the fall of a regime and the moment when the wheels of power come under the complete control of the regime replacing it - in the event, the democratic regime. It normally comes to an end when that democracy has endowed itself with legitimate institutions and a constitution, and especially when the democratic leaders have had their supremacy recognized by the army or by the nomenklatura, thereby making it possible for there to be peaceful changeovers of power, at least in principle. This diagnosis of the satisfactory completion of the process in fact serves to define it...

There is in the process of transition an inherent risk of a reversion to dictatorship in the event of failure, or of democratization being halted in an unfinished state... Secondly, a transition is generally regarded as a hybrid state in which the former authoritarian rulers or the new democratic leaders share power, either through conflict or by agreement.
2.2.5.3 Transition in education

Political transitions, no matter what form they take, produce a programme of transformation for the education system. La Belle and Ward's (1990: 104) comment on this link is interesting:

All educational reform is intertwined with political decision-making. In the United States, for example, it has been governors and state legislatures that have fostered much of the reform of the 1980's. But this kind of political change pales in the presence of the radical transformations discussed here. What they have in common, of course, are the ways in which education is used by those whose decisions prevail and by those who would challenge the status quo. Ginsburg et al point out that one such use of educational reform activities is as "placebos" - symbolic moves which obscure the true ills of society (1989, p.4). In the cases studied, new governments may be resorting to such placebos in two separate areas. First, the effort to highlight educational reform may simply be a way to direct a population's attention away from economic and social issues toward education as the principal path of mobility in most societies. Secondly, these educational reform announcements may be placebos in that they highlight governmental initiatives like literacy campaigns or new applications of technology as a means to signal modern innovative approaches to traditional practices.

What is relevant here is that the implementation of these policies during the second phase of transition, when independence has been achieved, is generally far from smooth: the full realisation of policies is obstructed by a range of implementation problems.

In South Africa also there are two phases in the education transition process. The first phase occurred in the years preceding the democratic elections of April 1994 and the second phase is in its early stages with fundamental policy debates still in progress. This study focusses on the first phase and its impact on policy implementation in the Indian education system and hopes to contribute to refinement of policy implementation strategies in the second phase.

2.2.5.4 Operational definition

In this study, the concept shall be defined as:

- a process in time that begins with steps to effect the end of one system or mode of government and comes to an end when a new system of government is in place and functional

- a process in which the intervening period is characterised by growing structural shifts, new issues, and a general rejection of the policies of the past
• a process in which the intervening period between the weakening of the old and the establishment of the new is marked by negotiations, stalled discussions, policy debates, value conflict, and power struggles

• a process during which the environment of an education system becomes turbulent and its causal texture dense

• a process, when completed successfully, produces a paradigm shift reflected in practices, value systems, and general socio-political interaction.

While it is true that the transition process is still continuing, in this study a narrow definition of the term will be accepted. Therefore, insofar as it relates to the Indian education system, the process will be taken to have commenced on 2 February 1990 and ended with the formal installation of the new Government of National Unity in May 1994.

2.2.6 Change

2.2.6.1 The concept

The rate of social, economic, and technological change outside the education system and the uncertainty this creates about the future combine to produce conditions that make the education system adjust and alter many of its structural features and functional priorities (Archer, 1979; 1981). This is a natural systemic response since change begins with the perception or experience of environmental threat, loss or disequilibrium. This, in turn, may lead to new curricula, new materials, new technologies, new teaching methods, and new forms of teacher appraisal, new forms of educational decision making, and new forms of school organisation being proposed and implemented. Change thus involves the modification or replacement of some existing practice or technology which no longer satisfies the changing needs of the system. As Fullan (1982: 13) comments, 'We can take it as a granted that there will always be pressures for educational change in pluralistic and/or externally influenced societies.'

There are different types of changes. Kleiner and Corrigan (1989: 26-27), for example, categorise changes as developmental, transitional, and transformational. A developmental change is 'an improvement on the old way of doing things' and is generally minor in scope. Such changes can be easily implemented and do not result in strong resistance. Transitional change, in contrast, is larger in scope: it 'requires
rearranging or dismantling old operating methods.' The desired outcome is clearly perceived and the change occurs within a clearly defined time frame. Examples in education are the implementation of new teacher evaluation procedures and new pupil control policy. The third type of change is transformational, which is 'the most profound and traumatic, and the least understood.' Unlike transitional change, transformational change is 'revolutionary' and is implemented 'rapidly in bursts.' Transformational change generally involves some or all of the following:

- Reformed mission and core values
- Altered power and status
- Re-organisation
- Revised interaction patterns
- New executives.

Because they often require 'considerable attitudinal and behavioural change' and often involve alterations in power relations, such changes are 'normally resisted fiercely' (Cloete, 1991: 28).

Change, as a rule, is met with resistance. The reason, as Fullan (1982: 6) points out, is 'that real change, whether desired or not, whether imposed or voluntarily pursued, represents a serious personal and collective experience characterized by ambivalence and uncertainty.' Hoyle (1970: 2), in fact, asserts that a basic problem in educational change is that of 'tissue rejection' where an innovation, although it is formally 'adopted' by a school, does not become an institutionalised aspect of its functioning. Merging the views of Fullan (1982), Hoyle (1970) and Kleiner and Corrigan (1989), it can be inferred that implementation problems are likely to become progressively more complex as one moves from a developmental to a transformational change.

2.2.6.2 Operational definition

In this study the term 'change' is taken to refer to any alteration of state. It has to be distinguished from the term 'transition' in that the latter refers to a process in time, to a movement from point A to point B.

Individual policy changes are elements in the transition process in that they represent the adjustments and adaptations of the system as it moves from point A to point B. Moreover, in this study, the term transition also refers to the processes of regime change in the larger system and the resonance this creates in the education system.
2.3 CONCLUSION

This chapter has addressed itself to two purposes simultaneously. First, it has clarified the key concepts and grounded them in operational definitions. Second, it has presented a theoretical background to these concepts, placing them in larger theoretical frameworks. The terms selected for discussion are those required for detailed discussion of the topic. They are:

- Policy
- Policymaking
- Policy implementation
- System
- State education system
- Transition
- Change

Because of their centrality to the study, some concepts were discussed in greater detail than others.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Though this study advances the view that exclusive reliance on a logical positivist epistemology is inappropriate in the study of policy implementation, it, at the same time, rejects the view that social reality is constructed individually and therefore there is no reality beyond this individual creation. Social life would be impossible if this were true. Individual freedom in the construction of social reality is undeniable but individual freedom is also constrained by the norms, values, and expectations of the group. Shared meanings and an intersubjective reality, indeed, act as forces that prevent the anarchy of independent realities and the absence of denotative meanings.

In their guidelines to policy research, Warwick and Pettigrew (1983: 362) address this problem by suggesting:

Multiple rather than single research methods should be employed in complex areas of policy or where public debate about the research findings is likely to occur. If the resources are not available for multiple research methods, such critical work should not be attempted.

The use of multiple research strategies is also advocated by Denzin (1978) and Rist (1982) who suggest that the validity of social research data can be increased through a process of 'triangulation' which entails the use of multiple research strategies to collect multiple sets of data on the same phenomenon (see section 1.3.2.1).

3.2 MULTIVARIATE SYSTEMS APPROACH

This study will analyse the impact of a variety of factors on the policy implementation process and view the process itself, as indicated above (see section 1.3.2), from a variety of theoretical perspectives. A systems approach, the researcher believes, is best suited for this purpose. Cloete (1991: 25), indeed, maintains this approach is
particularly suited for 'understanding the dynamics of the policy process.'

3.2.1 Systems approach

Hoyle (1986: 7-10) argues that the systems approach 'underpins most organisations theory.' Specific theories that display a systems identity, Hoyle (1986: 7-10) elaborates, can be divided into three categories - theories displaying a 'strong' systems approach, theories displaying a 'loose' systems approach, and theories displaying a conflict orientation.

The 'strong' systems approach is characterised by the central position given to concepts such as mission statement and goals, role functions and consensus. The rational perspective is a good example of the 'strong' systems view of organisations. In contrast, the 'loose' system approach is characterised by the view that the relationship between the various subsystems of the organisation is not always close, predictable, and unvarying. The loose coupling model is a perfect example of a 'loose' systems approach to organisations. But unlike the 'strong' and 'loose' forms of systems approach, theories with a conflict systems approach stress that the components which they see as comprising the system are in a state of constant tension and conflict. Critical theory approach to organisations is an example of a systems theory with conflict bias.

Hoyle's (1986) expansion of the system concept thus provides an extremely productive research framework for it allows the use of a range of theoretical perspectives. This study shall therefore use this elaborated systems framework to define the linkages and interactions among the multiple actors and multiple variables involved in the policy implementation process in Indian schools (see sections 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.2, and 6.3.2.4).

3.2.1.1 Multiple actors

Policy research, as Johnston and Proulx (1987: 195-196) note, 'points to the necessity of gaining insights into policy implementation from the multiple perspectives of different levels of actors in the process.' Analysing the values, beliefs, and feelings of the various actors not only permits the researcher to discover organisational and group forces but also the ways in which these facilitate or hamper the policy implementation process.
The various groups of policy actors at various levels in the education system, however, can be reduced to two groups - macro-level policymakers and implementers and micro-level policy implementers. From the standpoint of macro-level actors, as Sabatier and Mazmanian (1983: 50) point out:

... implementation involves the efforts of hierarchically superior officials or institutions to obtain compliance from peripheral institutions and officials in order to provide a service or directly change behavior.

In contrast, from the standpoint of micro-level actors at the periphery of the system:

... implementation focuses on the manner in which the local implementing officials and institutions respond to the perturbations caused in their environment by the efforts of outside officials to achieve central policy.

Consequently, actors belonging to these two levels develop their distinct perceptions of the policy implementation process - their own 'subjective understandings of the environment in which they operate' (Young, 1977: 2).

Therefore, as Berman (1978: 164) points out, implementing policy 'consists of not one but two classes of problems.' The first is the macro-implementation problem which centres on how the department of education executes its policies so as to influence schools to act in desired ways. The second is the micro-level problem which focusses on how schools respond to these policies. During a period of societal transition these two groups may develop different value systems, different perceptions of reality, and different priorities.

3.2.1.2 Multiple variables

By approaching policy implementation from different theoretical perspectives and from the viewpoint of different groups of actors at the macro- and micro-levels of the system, different combinations of variables are thrown into sharp relief. When policy implementation is viewed from the rational perspective, for example, structural variables associated with concepts such as hierarchical authority, formal control, and top-down decision making acquire prominence. Similarly, when the process is examined from the viewpoint of different groups of policy actors in the system, yet other variables gain primary significance: this time the policy actors themselves - senior management officials at Departmental level, superintendents of education, management staff in schools, pupils and their parents, and the organised teacher body
function as variables. Factors such as perceived self-interest and the power relationships within and among these groups acquire crucial importance in the policy implementation process. Though the power relationships cannot be measured, we may, as Crozier (1972: 242) points out, 'get an indirect but fairly clear picture,' if we 'analyse attitudes, feelings and behaviour of members of various groups comprising the organization.' In this study, these variables are clustered as follows:

3.2.1.2.1 Department level variables

Department level variables are variables such as organisational structure, organisational culture, coordination, communication, and control processes, superintendents' participation in policymaking and their level of commitment to Departmental policies, and the micropolitical aspects of Departmental functioning. The interaction among these and related variables shapes the structural, social, cultural, and political characteristics of the system and affects the policymaking and policy implementation processes at the Departmental and school levels.

3.2.1.2.2 School-level variables

School-level variables are variables such as the structural characteristics of schools, school culture, the leadership style of the principal, teacher morale, teachers' professional orientation, teacher involvement in decision making, teacher unionisation and militancy, teachers' level of commitment to school goals, and teachers' political orientation. The structural, social, cultural, and political characteristics of schools interact to influence policy outcomes in schools and exert pressure on macro-level processes.

3.2.1.2.3 The policy

The policy itself, as Beyer et al. (1983: 231) point out, is an important variable in policy implementation. Facets of the policy that can influence the policy implementation process are the content of policies, their scope, complexity, departure from past practice, and their proximity to the core areas of schools' operation. In other words, the policies themselves, as defined by the Department and as perceived by all
those involved in the process, are expected to act as variables in policy implementation.

3.2.1.2.4 Environmental variables

In this study environmental variables are expected to have a critical significance. Transition forces were operative at three significant levels of the environment, throwing it into a state of turbulence and thus probably intensifying its causal texture. At the macro-system level the whole society was in the process of regime change and transition to democracy. The historic announcement of 2 February 1990 clearly signalled that the lifespan of the apartheid system of government was limited. From an education system point of view, destabilising aspects of the post-2 February 1990 years, however, were the escalation of political violence, the politicisation of teacher organisations, and the participation of pupils and teachers in rolling mass action and political protests. As a result, macro-system environmental forces penetrated the education system and affected policymaking and policy implementation processes.

The national education system also acted as an environment to the Indian education system. It, too, was in a state of transition, affected by macro-system transition processes. Crises in education were frequent and increasingly disruptive, aggravated by the new education phenomena of the 1990's - chalkdowns, sit-ins, teacher strikes, and teacher and student participation in various forms of political protest action. These environmental forces, also impacted on the Indian education system, affecting policymaking and policy implementation in direct and indirect ways.

Finally, the immediate environment of the Indian education system was also in a state of turbulence as a result of political changes in the larger system. Attacks on the legitimacy of the House of Delegates, its politicians, and its structures were more regular as the political transition processes unfolded (see section 4.2). Indeed, attacks on the Minister of Education and Culture for policy crises in the Indian education system were common in the Indian press (see section 4.3.2).

3.2.2 Reasons for a multivariate systems approach

Without a comprehensive systems approach, any study of the policy implementation process will, as Berman (1978: 158-159) rightly maintains,
deal 'with only part of the complex chain from policy input to outcomes, and not necessarily the most important part of that chain.' Emery and Trist (1965: 21) similarly support the use of a systems approach when the primary research task is to understand the causal texture of complex processes and phenomena:

In a general way it may be said that to think in terms of systems seems the most appropriate conceptual response so far available when the phenomena under study - at any level and in any domain - display the character of being organized, and when understanding the nature of the interdependencies constitutes the research task.

Dror (1986: 8) takes the argument in favour of a systems approach in policy sciences a step further. He maintains that the researcher should, within a systems framework, seek to uncover the longitudinal dynamics of the policy process as 'a system of processes.'

In the sphere of education policy research, views such as those of Berman (1978), Emery and Trist (1965), and Dror (1986) have wide acceptance. Wirt and Kirst (1972, cited by Bacharach, 1981: 13-16) advance the major reasons for this. A systems approach, they maintain:

- delineates clearly how schools respond to environmental forces
- affords the researcher opportunities to examine both structural and process aspects of the relationship between the school and its environment
- allows the researcher to examine the wider socio-political implications of educational policy and, conversely, to analyse the impact of wider social systems and their influence on schools
- permits empirical examination of the openness of schools as systems
- provides a scope that is sufficiently broad to incorporate all the subsystems that comprise the whole education system.

Briefly then, a multivariate systems framework is extremely useful because of the scope it offers the researcher. It is also extremely useful, as noted earlier, in its flexibility in permitting a variety of methodological and theoretical approaches to reside within its conceptual confines.

3.3 RESEARCH MODEL

The research model for this study contains four sets of variables from
the education system and the system environment (see Figure 3.1). As mentioned above, these are:

- Departmental or macro-system variables
- policy variables
- school-level or micro-system variables
- environmental variables.

These variables interact during the policymaking and policy implementation processes to produce the policy outcomes. Figure 3.1 presents these variables in greater detail, indicating also the larger environments which progressively pressed in upon the policy process in the Indian education system. At this point, however, the model merely identifies the variables and indicates some of their possible interrelationships. It does not explain the policymaking and policy implementation dynamics in an education system in a society in transition. More specifically, it does not explain:

- how alterations may occur in value systems and power relations among system participants because of transition processes
- how the interactions among the key policy actors may be affected by the turbulent environment
- how the functioning of the system may be affected by possible changes in the interactions among policy actors
- how policymaking and policy implementation processes may be affected by the turbulent environment and how they, in turn, may contribute to interpersonal, cultural, and structural changes in the system.

In Chapter 6, drawing upon the empirical data that shall be presented in Chapters 4 and 5, the researcher shall re-conceptualise the research model to develop a theoretical model to explain the dynamics of policymaking and policy implementation in an education system situated in a society in transition.

3.4 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design for this study utilises three separate data collection strategies - questionnaire, structured interview, and historical report.
Figure 3.1 Research model in context
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3.4.1 The sample

3.4.1.1 Sample for the questionnaire

The sampling frame for administering the questionnaire for this study consisted of 61 Indian primary schools and 26 secondary schools in the Chatsworth and Durban area. From it a simple random sample of 45 schools was selected as shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 The sampling frame and random selection of schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>PRIMARY SCHOOLS</th>
<th>SECONDARY SCHOOLS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durban Central</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatsworth</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample %</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>51.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Administration: House of Delegates, Education Statistics Section

To arrive at this sample, a list of all schools in the Durban and Chatsworth areas was obtained from the Education Statistics Section of the DEC. Next, in selecting the size of the sample, the aim was to be as representative of the universum as possible. It was therefore decided to work with a sample of approximately 50% of all schools in the area. Because of the fact that the ratio between primary and secondary schools was roughly 2:1, it was decided to select schools to reflect this breakdown. Therefore 30 primary schools and 15 secondary schools were randomly selected to yield a sample of 51.72% of all schools in the Durban Central and Chatsworth areas. Placed against the total number of Indian schools in the Greater Durban area, and in the Republic as a whole, as shown in Table 3.2, the sample for this study has a fairly reliable level of representativeness in terms of percentages they represent of the universum. (See Appendix 1 for the list of schools that participated in the study).

Next, in each of the randomly selected schools, a breakdown of the staff was obtained from staff returns and educators were randomly selected as follows:

- Because of their relatively small numbers, all principals, acting
Table 3.2 Sample percentages in broader contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRIMARY SCHOOL</th>
<th>SECONDARY SCHOOL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Durban</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample %</td>
<td>21,73</td>
<td>23,44</td>
<td>22,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.S.A.</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample %</td>
<td>9,62</td>
<td>10,34</td>
<td>9,85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the school had 4 or more heads of department, two-thirds of them were selected by a simple random process. If, on the other hand, the school had fewer than 4 heads of department, all of them were included in the sample.

If the school had 16 or more Level 1 educators, one-third of them were selected by a simple random process. If on the other hand, the school had 15 or fewer Level 1 educators, half of the group was included in the sample. (Note: In this study, this group shall be referred to as 'teachers').

Table 3.3 presents a breakdown of the school-based sub-samples that resulted from this process.

In addition to school-based educators, superintendents of education, both those responsible for circuit management duties and those responsible for subject advisory duties, were included in the sample for this study. In arriving at the sampling frame of superintendents of education, the researcher limited himself to those located at the Durban offices of the Education Inspectorate of the DEC. He began by creating two sampling frames, one of the superintendents of education (management) and the other of the superintendents of education (academic). The first contained 7 elements and the second 33 elements. As this produced a total number of 40 elements, it was decided to include all in the sample. Table 3.4 summarises the details relating to these two sub-samples.

Demographic data relating to the questionnaire sample are presented in the tables included in Appendix 2. The tables presented there supply details relating to the sex distribution of the various groups of respondents, their age categories, their years of teaching experience, their years of experience at the present post level, their academic...
Table 3.3 School-based educator sub-samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>PRIMARY SCHOOLS: N = 30</th>
<th>SECONDARY SCHOOLS: N = 15</th>
<th>TOTAL: N = 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>USABLE RETURNS</td>
<td>RETURN %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Department</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91,04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>94,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>93,73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Superintendents of education sub-samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendent of Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>USABLE RETURNS</th>
<th>RETURN %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Education (Management)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Education (Academic)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67,50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
qualifications, their professional qualifications, and their location in the system.

3.4.1.2 Sample for the structured interview

A basic objective of the structured interview was to explore the thinking behind the responses to the questionnaire and to add texture to the historical data. Therefore a much smaller sample was selected to focus on certain factors in greater depth. Again schools served as the initial sampling unit. From the list of 15 secondary schools in the questionnaire sample, 7 were selected by a simple random process to give a sub-sample of 46.67 percent. From the list of 30 primary schools in the questionnaire sample, 10 were selected by a simple random process to give a sub-sample of 33.33 percent.

The selection of actual interviewees in these 17 schools was effected on the basis of the returned questionnaire (see Table 3.3) sub-samples:

- From the 17 schools, 10 principals were randomly selected, giving a sub-sample of 22.22 percent in relation to the returned questionnaire sub-sample of 45 principals.
- From the 17 schools, 4 deputy principals were randomly selected, giving a sub-sample of 36.37 percent in relation to the returned questionnaire sub-sample of 11 deputy principals.
- From the 17 schools, 16 heads of department were randomly selected, one from each of 16 schools in the sample, giving a sub-sample of 12.50 percent in relation to the questionnaire sub-sample of 128 heads of department.
- From the 17 schools, 17 teachers were randomly selected, one from each of the 17 schools in the sample, giving a sub-sample of 5.30 percent in relation to the questionnaire sub-sample of 321 teachers.

Principals of the 17 schools that participated in this phase of the research assisted in the actual identification of educators to be interviewed in terms of the predetermined sample.

The interview sample of superintendents of education was relatively larger in that 10 were selected, yielding a sample that was 37.04 percent of the returned questionnaire sample of 27. (See Table 3.5 for a summary of the structured interview sample).

The demographic data pertaining to the structured interview sample are
presented in Appendix 2.

Table 3.5 Summary of structured interview sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLE</th>
<th>INTERVIEW SAMPLE</th>
<th>SAMPLE PERCENTAGE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Department</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37,04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>532</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In relation to the returned questionnaire sub-samples. Also note that percentages are lower for those sub-samples where the questionnaire sub-samples were relatively large.

3.4.2 Data collection

Data for this study were gathered by both informal as well as formal data collection processes.

3.4.2.1 Informal processes

3.4.2.1.1 Loosely structured participant observation

Participant observation is a method of social investigation that permits the researcher to work with members of the population of interest in their natural settings (Frankenberg, 1982: 50-52; Gans, 1982: 53-61). He observes their functioning, discusses their day-to-day experiences and seeks to gain understanding of their actions, values, and beliefs. As a Superintendent of Education (Management) from January 1990 to March 1993, the researcher was responsible for circuit inspection and management duties relating to Indian schools in the Durban region. As such, he had opportunities to note policymaking at Departmental level as well as policy implementation at both the macro- and the micro-levels.
He had regular meetings with principals, school management staff, teachers, and members of parent-teacher associations of schools in his circuit to discuss education policies, policy implementation problems, and general school-community matters.

Simultaneously, he had access to senior Departmental officials to discuss management problems in the field. From March 1993, the researcher was first seconded and then promoted to the position of Chief Superintendent of Education (Academic) which required him to oversee the work of a team of superintendents of education (academic) who are primarily concerned with subject advisory duties. This new position enabled the researcher to participate in and observe macro-level policymaking and policy implementation by senior Departmental officials. It also facilitated observation of the Department's reactions to policy crises and its efforts to manage the education system while it was in a phase of transition towards a unitary system of education.

3.4.2.1.2 In-depht interviews

In-depth interviews were conducted in the early stages of the research with senior officials of the Department, principals, deputy principals, heads of department, and teachers to establish general reactions towards the Department and its policymaking and policy implementation practices. Discussion also centred on topics such as the various crises in education, changes at the macro-level, the nature of the coupled functioning of schools, and environmental pressures on the Indian education system. Although the information gathered during this phase was general and impressionistic, it provided the researcher with concepts and themes for the formal investigation process.

3.4.2.2 Formal processes

3.4.2.2.1 Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed to establish the views of various groups of educators and Departmental officials involved in the policy implementation process at the macro- and micro-levels. It (see Appendix 3) consisted of a covering letter and four parts, some with several sub-sections. A brief description of each of these parts and their sub-sections is provided below:
Part 1

This section was designed to obtain demographic details for purposes of statistical cross-tabulation.

Part 2

This section, which consisted of three sub-sections, was designed to elicit respondents' views about education policies of the Department. The first sub-section sought to establish the level of agreement with policies covering thirteen different areas of school functioning. The second sub-section sought to establish the degree of change from past practices evident in recent policy directives in each of these thirteen areas. The third sub-section focussed attention on the Department and its officials and sought to establish the level of control they exerted on schools and educators during the policy implementation process in each of the thirteen policy areas listed.

Part 3

Also consisting of several sub-sections, this part of the questionnaire was designed to determine respondents' views about the various actors and forces in the policy implementation process. In the first sub-section the focus was on the policy implementation role of the Department and its superintendents of education. The second sub-section concentrated respondents' attention on schools and school-based educators. It elicited respondents views about various facets of school functioning on the assumption that interaction among educators at schools contributes to the policy implementation process. The third sub-section was more sharply focussed on teachers, pupils, parents, and external forces: respondents were required to give their views on the influence these forces exerted on the policy implementation process at their schools.

Part 4

While Parts 1 to 3 were completed by all respondents, Part 4 was restricted to acting principals, principals, and superintendents of education as it aimed at establishing the views of senior management personnel on management-related issues. The first sub-section sought to establish the view of management personnel about policymaking practices of the Department and its general 'organisational health.' The second sub-section looked closely at the impact of the organised teacher body on the policy implementation process, and the third section directed attention at the role of the principal in the policy implementation process.
3.4.2.2.2 Structured interview

The primary objective in using the structured interview was to supplement the areas focussed on in the questionnaire and the historical report with qualitative data on specific policy issues and policy problems in the Indian education system. The structured interview used in this study consisted of five parts (see Appendix 4). A brief description of each of these parts is provided below:

Part 1

This section was designed to obtain basic demographic data relating to sex, position, and total years of teaching/management experience.

Part 2

This section focussed attention on the Department and policy areas relating to the Department's use of the education budget, the role of superintendents of education, school staffing policy, and the evaluation of educators for promotion.

Part 3

This section directed attention to the school and factors operating in the school context. Interviewees were asked to comment on factors such as the role of the principal in policy implementation, the impact of teacher unions, and the involvement of pupils in decision making.

Part 4

This section required the respondent to look at environmental forces such as parents, the community, and cultural factors.

Part 5

This section touched on general issues such as interviewees' level of job satisfaction, their views about the impact of change, the problems facing Indian schools, and the factors responsible for the success or failure of policies.

All the questions consisted of two components: the first required interviewees to give a fixed or scaled response and the second required them to enter into an open-ended discussion of the content of the question and their response.
3.4.3 Procedures for data collection

Data collection was conducted over five months in 1992 and 1993. Questionnaires were administered at the end of 1992 and beginning of 1993. The structured interview was conducted mainly in February and March 1993. (See Appendix 5 for letters of authorisation to conduct the research in the Indian education system). The actual procedures used are presented below:

3.4.3.1 Questionnaire

The researcher personally distributed the questionnaires and covering letters to the principals of the 45 schools included in the sample. (See Appendix 5 for permission from the DEC to conduct the research in its schools). In-depth interviews and discussion with these principals and members of their staff during 1991 and 1992 had already familiarised them with the researcher's study goals and his interest in the policy implementation process at macro- and micro-levels.

The sample requirements for each school were discussed with the principal and he/she undertook to distribute the questionnaires accordingly. Moreover, the principal undertook to collect the completed questionnaires (which were in sealed envelopes), to place these in a large envelope provided for this purpose, and to mail them to the researcher. The researcher personally distributed the questionnaire to all superintendents of education in the sample.

By the due date, the end of the school term in December 1992 for school-based educators (and the end of December 1992 for superintendents of education), 35 schools had sent in their responses. Telephonic reminders to the remaining 10 schools early in 1993 resulted in their submitting their responses by the end of January, 1993. These had been completed by the due date but the principals concerned were reluctant to mail them during the school holidays for fear of their 'going astray' in the Department.

Of the 40 superintendents of education, 22 submitted their questionnaires by the due date. Reminders resulted in the submission of another 5 questionnaires. A significant problem here was the fact that some superintendents of education failed to send in their questionnaires by the end of January, 1993, which was used as the final date of extension, because they were either on study leave, on vacation leave, or an extended field trip away from the office.
3.4.3.2 Structured interview

Once the returns from questionnaires had been finalised by the end of January 1993, the researcher completed an initial analysis of Part 1 of the questionnaire to identify basic demographic data pertaining to the position and location of the respondents. Once this had been effected, the researcher was able to establish a sample frame for the structured interview, as outlined above. The sample, it has to be stressed, was influenced by two factors: the availability of time and the need for representativeness.

Once this initial preparatory work had been completed, the researcher again turned to principals - this time of each of the 17 schools in the sample for the structured interview - to assist in the random selection of interviewees in terms of the sample norms outlined above. Those who volunteered to participate in the study were given assurances of complete confidentiality and promised non-identification of their schools. This was done to elicit frank and free expression of views and, at the same time, to prevent any transference of interviewees' comments and views to their schools or other members of staff at their schools. In the few instances where educators who had been identified by the principal declined to participate in the study despite assurances of confidentiality, a suitable replacement was found at the school.

Interviews of school-based educators were generally conducted at their schools or at the regional teachers' centre. A small number of participants came to the researcher's office at the Durban headquarters of the DEC. Insofar as superintendents of education are concerned, all the interviews were conducted either at his office or that of the participant. Each interview lasted for approximately an hour.

After the initial stages of the interview where the objectives of the study were briefly outlined and matters of general interest were discussed to establish rapport with the interviewee, the demographic section of the structured interview schedule was completed. Next, for each of the items in the other parts of the interview schedule, the respondent was asked to make a choice or to give a scaled response to the first component of the item. Then he was encouraged to expand on his response in an open-ended manner. This was recorded by the researcher on the interview schedule. As far as possible, the researcher used the words of the interviewee to capture the mood that prevailed during the interview. The accuracy of this summary was established by reading the comments out to the respondent as a way of summarizing the discussion before moving on to the next item. In Chapter 5, some of these comments have been cited to illustrate specific points of view.
3.4.4 Historical data

Because of the fact that policy implementation in a system in transition is a process ongoing in time, the researcher was of the opinion that the questionnaire and the structured interview had to be supplemented by another source of data, one which would present an ongoing, longitudinal account of the actual process of change and transition in the Indian education system. The researcher therefore decided to present a brief history of the education policy implementation process in the DEC during the period of transition.

For this purpose, the researcher used newspaper accounts as his primary source of information. Newspaper reports were, in some cases, the only source of information because of the recency of events. There is, of course, the danger that newspapers may be sensationalist in their reporting of events and selective in their presentation of information. To guard against this danger the researcher:

- accessed as many newspapers as possible that focus attention on events in the Indian community
- drew on other sources of documentary evidence such as minutes of meetings, Departmental reports and circulars, and journal articles wherever possible
- presented the completed history to senior Departmental officials, superintendents of education, and educators for their views on the accuracy of details incorporated in the historical report.

3.4.5 Data analysis

Data analysis was effected in three separate ways, each dictated by the nature of the research strategy used to collect the data.

3.4.5.1 Questionnaire data

All the data from questionnaires were subjected to statistical analysis with the use of a computer program. The computer program used was SPSS/PC + for the IBM PC/XT/AT (SPSS Inc, Norusis, 1986). The specific subprograms used were FREQUENCIES and CROSSTABS. The FREQUENCIES subprogram provided basic descriptive statistics such as frequencies,
means and standard deviations for each item on the questionnaire, after responses had been coded in. The CROSSTABS subprogram provided additional measures such as chi-squares.

### 3.4.5.2 Structured interview data

The first component of each item on the structured interview required a scaled, questionnaire-type response. These were also processed with the use of the SPSS/PC + computer program. Again the specific subprograms used were FREQUENCIES and CROSSTABS. The second component of each item required an open-ended response. The open-ended responses were studied carefully to establish themes and enable categorisation.

### 3.4.5.3 Historical data

After the historical report had been completed it was circulated among chief superintendents of education, superintendents of education, and three school-based educators to correct any misrepresentation of the policy events, any misinterpretation of details, and to develop consensus on the accuracy of the depiction. Along with this process, these officials were asked to note patterns and themes. This approach, being akin to that of Geller and Johnston (1990), also enabled a chaos perspective to be brought to bear on the data to discover patterns and note connections among seemingly insignificant events in the policy implementation process. This approach contributed to the development of the theoretical model developed in Chapter 6 (see section 6.3).

### 3.4.5.4 Triangulation

The data collected by these three different research strategies were then brought together in the discussion of findings. The questionnaire data, for example, was used to supplement and give quantitative significance to the patterns and themes uncovered in the data emanating from the structured interview and the historical report.

The utilisation of alternate methods of data collection is consistent with the triangulation criteria presented by Denzin (1978). It increased the validity and stability of the data base used in the study. This strategy of multiple data collection procedures is also supported by Harman (1978, cited by Sloan, 1982: 1) who maintains that the 'use of a
multiplicity of approaches is desirable in order to cope with the complexity and diversity in policy processes.' Murphy (1980, cited by Moore, 1986: 47) also emphasises the need for multiple data collection strategies in policy research. He says that 'used together these ... methods allow you to figure out systematically what's really going on ... and why.'

3.5 LIMITATION

In this study, the Indian education system is treated as an exemplar of an education system in transition. The data on education policy implementation in a society in transition were drawn from this education system. Therefore it cannot be assertively stated that the ideas and conclusions presented here are representative of policy implementation in all education systems in transition.

This study, nevertheless, is grounded in the assumption that in-depth understanding of macro- and micro-level interactions that shaped policy implementation in the Indian education system could contribute to basic knowledge about the process in general. To strengthen this expanded relevance of the study, the researcher has drawn on the general literature on policy implementation and the management of change during the discussion of findings. As a result, the conclusions of this study are stated as a set of propositions in the final chapter.

3.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented the concepts underlying the research methodology of this study. Basically, it uses an expanded systems framework to anchor a multivariate, multitheoretical approach to the policy implementation process. This permits the collection of wide-ranging data that can be explored from several theoretical perspectives and from the viewpoint of macro- and micro-level policy actors.

The research model for this study also stresses the significance of environmental variables, macro-system variables, policy variables, and micro-system variables in the policy implementation process. The variables cover areas ranging from the structural characteristics of the macro-system and schools to variables pertaining to organisational culture facets.

The data collection instruments, data collection, and data analysis procedures were also presented. The sampling procedures and demographic
data pertaining to the various groups of educators who constituted the sample were outlined in some depth.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE INDIAN EDUCATION SYSTEM

(1990 - 1994)

4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.1 Background

During the period of transition under consideration (1990 to 1994), the Indian education system in South Africa was a sub-structure of the tricameral, apartheid-based system of government. In the case of the Indian education system, this meant that government control was exercised by the House of Delegates. The legitimacy of the system, however, came under regular attack, especially from 1990 onwards. Teachers, for example, regularly called for the dissolution of the tricameral system of government and the establishment of a unitary, democratic system of government and a unitary, non-racial system of education (Tasa News, January/February 1990, p.6).

4.1.2 Outline of chapter

This chapter shall present a compressed historical report of the Indian education system, concentrating on the impact of transition processes in the larger society on education policy implementation. Concurrently, attention shall centre on the impact of the turbulent environment in producing a fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence in interpersonal relations among policy actors through emergent conflicts and tensions, the heightening of value conflicts and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes, the influence of perceived self-interest of individuals and sub-groups in the system, the alterations in power relations and structural aspects of the system, and the general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages in the Indian education system. In describing these impacts, the researcher shall illustrate the changes with examples of specific education crises and
policy failures. It, however, needs to be noted that each of these crises and policy failures contains in them the complex interplay of interpersonal, cultural, and structural elements. Moreover, the various policy actors, their value systems and their pursuit of specific individual and group goals interacted in a multilayered manner as several crises and policy events occurred simultaneously, sequentially, and interactively. Often minor events in one policy sphere produced unanticipated, cascading consequences in other policy spheres and other policy arenas as the system adapted to its rapidly changing environment. However, the crises and policy examples used in the discussion shall be presented with attention centring merely on those aspects necessary to illustrate the changes that occurred in the system. Finally, though the examples have been presented in a sequential manner, it has to be noted that the interactions among the various system phenomena were neither linear nor uni-directional in their causality. Thus, in the discussion of interpersonal interactions, the influence of both cultural and structural elements have also been noted. The same process has been adopted in the presentation of cultural and structural impacts of transition processes in the larger society.

4.2 POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN A SYSTEM IN TRANSITION

From the beginning of 1990, the pace of change was greatly accelerated in the Indian education system. Thus in his presidential address at the 1990 annual general meeting of the Association of Professional Officers of Education of South Africa (APROESA), Rameshur (1990) said:

... this year has been one of major changes in our education system. Educational reform and policy shifts have been effected in areas such as teacher evaluation, promotion procedures, merit awards and book purchases. Indeed, as a Department we have been swept at headlong pace from one policy crisis to another, from one educational reform to another. These changes generally failed to restore equilibrium and a climate conducive to effective education.

Again in his presidential address at the 1991 annual general meeting of the staff association of superintendents of education, school psychologists, and education planners, Rameshur (1991) said:

... we are now in the early 1990s, clearly at a watershed, a critical moment in the history of public education in this country. Educational management approaches which were accepted unquestioningly a few years ago are now openly rejected by educators. Supporters of People's Education Movement now forcefully demand that education incorporate democratic principles and that it allow full decision-making participation of parents, teachers and pupils.

By the end of 1991 the strains of the transition process were being
strongly experienced by the Department both in its policymaking as well as policy implementation functions. In 1992 the pressures of change and transition were experienced by the Indian education bureaucracy more extensively: policy crises and education department confrontation with educators and parents on education policy issues and the management of schools were even more regular and more protracted. Touching upon this rapidity of change and general turbulence in the education and socio-political environments of the Indian system, Dr S P Naicker (1992) described the policymaking and policy implementation impacts as being 'traumatic.'

This, by no means, implies that there were no policy implementation problems in the pre-1990 years. Far from it. There were, indeed, several policy problems in the pre-transition years but these centred mainly on Department-organised teacher body interactions relating to teacher promotions, merit awards, book buying policy, staffing issues, and, from 1984, allegations of political interference in the administration of education. The difference lies in the fact that none of these policy disputes and management problems resulted in education crises and systemwide alterations in the interpersonal, cultural, and structural features of the system. Moreover, education crises and policy failures were not aired in the press with same regularity and with the same detail as in the post-2 February 1990 period (Samuels, 1985a: 7-9; Samuels, 1985b: 9-10; Samuels, 1987: 7-11; Samuels, 1988a: 7-14; Samuels, 1988b: 7-10; Samuels, 1989a: 7-11; Samuels, 1989b: 6-9; Samuels, 1992: 25-33; Naicker, 1992: 34-38).

4.3 EDUCATION SYSTEM IMPACTS

Transition processes in the larger society affected the policy implementation process by transforming the pre-transition regularities of the system. Changes occurred in the interpersonal relations among key policy actors in the system and in the cultural and value aspects of the system, leading to value conflicts, widespread rejection of the legitimacy of the system, the emergence of competing interpretive schemes, and power struggles. At the same time, through the operation of chaos, structuration, conflict, and morphogenic processes, alterations in the interpersonal and cultural aspects of the system led to alterations in structural features of the system, especially at points in the system where strains and stresses of change were most severely experienced. In the sections that follow, examples of these education system impacts will be described in greater detail.
4.3.1 Changes in interpersonal relations among policy actors

Policy implementation success is largely dependent on coordinated interaction among a multiplicity of policy actors located at various levels and in various arenas of the system. From 1990 the stable interaction among these system participants underwent several changes that had the effect of undermining the pre-transition, established pattern of interaction among policy actors. A few of the more important changes in the interpersonal relations shall be presented below. However, it has to be noted that in many of the examples several policy actors are involved. But, for purposes of illustration, only the interaction of relevant policy actors shall be highlighted and relevant processes brought to the fore.

4.3.1.1 Minister-education department interaction

Soon after he assumed office as Minister of Education and Culture in the House of Delegates in 1990, Dr K Rajoo was criticised for 'political interference' in the administration of education. One of those who did so was the executive head of the Indian education department. This conflict finally ended in the latter taking 'early' retirement in July 1990. In the memorandum that accompanied Mr Singh's request for 'early' retirement, he alleged 'continual interference' in the running of the Indian education department. Denying these charges, Dr Rajoo stated that since his appointment to the education portfolio, he had received no advice nor any suggestions from Mr Singh about ways in which to sustain or raise the Indian education system's level of effectiveness. He went on to say (Sunday Times Extra, July 15, 1990, p.3):

I took it on my own to change the school calendar and reduce the age limits of pupils for admission. Mr Singh has come with no new ideas.

In his memorandum, Mr A K Singh claimed that (Sunday Times Extra, July 15, 1990, p.3; Sunday Tribune Herald, July 15, 1990, p.1):

- He had been frustrated to the point of having to request for early retirement.
- Dr Rajoo had interfered in the appointment and transfer of educators and had attempted to influence the appointment of his brother to the Phoenix Technical Secondary School.
- Dr Rajoo had arranged the transfer of a school principal and had the
vacancy filled without going through the proper procedures.

- Dr Rajoo had asked him to delay an investigation demanded by teachers who had questioned the filling of the vacancy without having had it advertised in the proper manner.

- Dr Rajoo had two people appointed as his personal assistants without consulting him on the matter.

- Dr Rajoo had demanded that two superintendents of education be withdrawn from all supervisory duties.

- Dr Rajoo had told him to have a principal who had admitted a large number of black pupils 'watched' as he was a 'UDF man'.

- Dr Rajoo had been 'rude and threatening' in a telephone call to him when he had refused to order pupils who were on an excursion to return home forthwith.

Dr Rajoo rejected the claims made by Mr A K Singh, the Chief Executive Director. In his rebuttal, Dr K Rajoo stated (Sunday Times Extra, July 15, 1990, p.3; Sunday Tribune Herald, July 15, 1990, p.1):

- Mr Singh had refused to comply with his orders because of 'personal differences' he had with several staff members.

- The claim about his brother was 'ridiculous' as he was a teacher in Canada.

- The school principal who had been transferred was the most suitable candidate and that the vacancy had been filled by an educator best qualified for the post.

- He was not aware of any requests by teachers for an inquiry into the transfer.

- He was not required to consult the Chief Executive Director when it came to the appointment of his personal staff.

- He had not asked any principal to be 'watched'.

- Mr Singh had been 'cheeky and rude' to him and had refused to comply with his telephonic requests.

These claims and counter-claims between the political head and the administrative head of Indian education caused shock waves in the system 'at a time when teachers' morale [was] at an all-time low' (Sunday Tribune Herald, July 15, 1990, p.1).
The conflict illustrates the emergence of value conflicts and competing interpretive schemes about education and the role of executive level officials in the education bureaucracy. The conflict also marked the emergence of active political involvement of politicians in education administration and changing power relations at the apex of the system. There is also the suggestion that perceived self-interest influenced policymaking and policy implementations decisions at the highest level. Commenting on the conflict, in which the political and the executive heads of the education system were 'at each other's throats', an editorial in a Sunday newspaper saw this breakdown in constructive interaction among the most senior policy actors as a major blot on the proud history of Indian education (Sunday Tribune Herald, July 15, 1990, p.4).

Worthy of note here is that allegations of political interference in the functioning of the Department by Minister Rajoo were also made by the Teachers' Association of South Africa (TASA) (see section 4.3.1.2). Finally, as a result of wide ranging allegations against the DEC and its Minister, in May 1992, a commission of inquiry was announced to investigate these charges. One of the terms of reference required the commission to investigate the 'allegations of improper political interference concerning the administration and management of Education and Culture and specifically in the promotion of teachers, and their placement in institutions.' Another term of reference required the commission to 'investigate and report on any other matter involving the Ministry and the Department of Education and Culture brought to the attention of the Committee' (HOD, 1992: 2). The commission's report, released towards the end of 1992, said of Dr Rajoo's functioning that there was 'an undue intrusion by him in the administration of the DEC' (HOD; 1992: 23). It added:

Although in broad terms the powers of the Minister under the Indians Education Act is to provide education, he has not adequately appreciated the fact that there is a clear demarcation between his powers and responsibilities as the political head accountable to Parliament, and the powers and responsibilities of the professional administrative head of the DEC whose duty is to control and administer education by virtue of his expert knowledge of education matters as provided for in Section 2 of the Act.

While the Commission felt that Dr Rajoo's execution of his duties could not be categorised as 'political interference', it, nevertheless, viewed his actions as being beyond the scope of normal ministerial conduct.

Soon after Minister D Govender assumed control in 1993, conflict and tension also emerged between her and the Chief Executive Director, Mr M Pillay. The background to this rift was the education department's participation from 1992 in a privately sponsored initiative to plan for an integrated provincial education system. The outcome of this strategic planning endeavour, which had begun during the period prior to Minister


While we cautiously welcome the news, we must point out that unless Sadtu and other organisations are involved, we will have to oppose the move as part of our campaign against the unilateral restructuring and rationalisation of education ... We strongly recommend that Sadtu and others are involved in the process because no permanent solution to our education crisis can be found without us.

Commenting on the general damage done to the plan itself by Mrs Govender's premature release of details in a political arena, an editorial in the The Daily News (February 26, 1993, p.20) stated that she had 'virtually guaranteed a blizzard of political acrimony in an area where it is least wanted' and called her act a 'sad blunder.'

Explaining her action, Mrs Govender stated that she had not been fully and correctly briefed about the status of the document by her senior officials. She stated (Sunday Tribune, Herald, February 28, 1993, p.3):

All members rely on their professional staff for help with information about their portfolios. I had no idea the proposals were a result of a think-tank and had not been finalised - it was a mistake.

Mrs Govender was convinced that she had been deliberately misinformed to undermine her status in the education department. Her suspicion seems to have been based on the fact that her appointment as Minister of Education and Culture a fortnight earlier had generally evoked controversy and dissatisfaction in the House of Delegates (The Daily News, February 11, 1993, p.1). The belief that she was not being kept fully informed about policy developments re-emerged during the May 1993 chalkdown when she was exposed to attack by teachers (see section 4.3.1.2.3). Her general lack of confidence in the upper management of the Indian education department was more directly stated in a speech to mark the formal closure of the House of Delegates (see section 1.2.1).

4.3.1.2 Minister-organised teacher body interaction

From 1990, the relationship between the political head of the Indian education system and the organised teacher body representing educators in Indian schools became progressively acrimonious. In 1990, for
example, TASA criticised Dr Rajoo for political interference and for unilateral initiation of major policy shifts (Post Natal, March 21-24, 1990, p.1). Touching on this issue in his presidential report at the 1990 annual conference of TASA, Mr P Naicker (1990a: 8) reported:

The Association had objected strongly to the presentation of Long Service Awards to educators by the Minister of Education and Culture and the Chairman of Ministers' Council of the HOD, which it considered a further example of political interference in education. The Association commended those educators who did not attend the presentation ceremonies and who subsequently had their awards delivered to them by Superintendents of Education...

The Association had protested strongly against the Minister of Education and Culture's spate of public pronouncements in respect of: Caning Ban, Establishment of Teacher Welfare Body, After-Hour Tuition to Black pupils, Five-Year Wait for Transfers, School Fund, After-Hour Tuition by Teachers.

The Association had considered the above-mentioned pronouncements as direct political interference in the control and administration of education and further, that it was part of a larger crisis in apartheid education. It had called on all participants within the Tricameral System of Government to resign forthwith, with a view to resolving the crisis in education and formulating a new educational policy based on a single, unitary, non-racial system of education.

Dr Rajoo rejected this type of criticism of his leadership, maintaining that since he had 'assumed control as Minister of Education and Culture in the House of Delegates in October 1989', he had 'zealously worked, towards excellence in education' (Rajoo, 1990: 7). Thus while the organised teacher body viewed his actions as political interference, the Minister himself saw his actions as the pursuit of 'excellence in education.'

Policy spheres where this value conflict often surfaced related to the promotion of educators, the handling of the education budget, and processes of consultation and negotiation. In these areas, the specific policy episodes and conflicts illustrate the fragmentation of relations between the Minister and the organised teacher body, the polarisation of values and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes, the operation of perceived self-interest, and changing power relations and structural adjustments as evident in the examples presented below.

4.3.1.2.1 Ministerial involvement in promotion of educators

From 1990, the Department's policies relating to the promotion of educators was a source of ongoing conflict with the organised teacher body and its members. In 1990 the Department entered into lengthy negotiations with TASA to develop a system more acceptable to educators.
The finalised system consisted of two parts: a preliminary evaluation by the principal to separate promotable from non-promotable applicants and a final evaluation of those rated by principals as 'promotable' by a panel of superintendents of education. To reduce subjectivity on the part of superintendents of education, the final evaluation of each level of applicants was on a structured interview with the same set of questions being posed to all applicants at a specific post level.

Despite the fact that a TASA observer was present at all interviews to ensure 'objectivity' and adherence to negotiated procedures, the system produced great dissatisfaction. First, educators complained that many principals had rated all applicants as 'promotable', regardless of their actual ability. This, it would seem, was done to avoid conflict with staff members: the 'winnowing process' was left to the Department and its panel of interviewers ('Teacher', 1990: 17). Second, and far more serious, was the criticism by political leader Mr A Rajbansi. He attacked the Department for adopting a system which he believed to be heavily flawed. Labelling it a 'farce' and an 'exercise in futility', he called for the immediate scrapping of the system and a re-evaluation of all applicants. Support was given to this attack on the system by the fact that the newspaper went on to reveal some of the questions that were actually being posed as part of the structured interview (Sunday Tribune Herald, October 21, 1990, p.1).

The Department went ahead despite the fact that teachers were actually rehearsing answers to the questions being used during the structured interview. Supporting the continuation of the exercise, Minister of Education and Culture Dr K Rajoo warned teachers who believed 'they will appear smart by learning model answers' that they 'will easily get caught' (Sunday Tribune Herald, October 21, 1990, p.1). The Minister, nevertheless, placed the blame for the interview-based system on TASA. He said that TASA had urged the adoption of the current system of teacher evaluation. He added (Sunday Tribune Herald, October 21, 1990, p.1):

But as far as we are concerned, it is not the best system. We only accepted the system because there was an urgency and we thought we'd try it out.

What the 1990 promotion policy illustrates is the desire of the teacher body to minimise the evaluative, judgmental role of Departmental officials. It also reflects the conflict avoidance strategy of principals in giving all applicants on their staff 'promotable' ratings. Third, it illustrates also the Department's adoption of a policy which it recognised to be inferior merely because of administrative convenience.

As a result of the criticism of the system, it was scrapped in 1991. The Department devised a completely new system of evaluation. This time it altered its teacher consultation strategy.
Minute BO of 1991 (DEC, 1991e) to all schools. The basic objectives of this circular were to present educators with the proposed new system of evaluation and to elicit suggestions from each school for changes and improvements that could be effected to it. TASA, however, objected to this direct interaction. It feared that principals and superintendents of education may distort teachers' inputs and that the entire process may not be effected 'democratically' (TASA News, June 1991, p.3). As a result, the Department was forced to negotiate the revision of the 1990 policy with the teacher body. In short, it was forced into recognising the consultative status of the teacher body and, in the process, accepting a diminution of its own power in the policymaking sphere.

Negotiations between the Department and TASA were concluded late in August 1991 and E.C. Circular Minute CQ of 1991 (DEC, 1991f) was issued to all schools. The introductory paragraph sought to avert possible teacher opposition by underscoring its negotiated basis:

The Department of Education and Culture has considered the recommendation from schools as well as from the Teachers Association of South Africa. The final evaluation and promotion documents, attached hereto, have been negotiated with TASA.

Another circular, E.C. Management Circular No. 35 (DEC, 1991g), was sent to rectors of colleges of education and all principals. This circular urged principals to exercise care and objectivity in completing their evaluation as a pattern of general over-assessment had been noted during the moderation of principals' scores in the previous few years.

Despite these efforts, once the system was implemented, criticisms began to flow in. In a letter to the editor, a correspondent (Naidoo, 1991: 14) asserted that the primary objective of superintendents of education during the moderation phase was 'to convince the principal why the scores should be lowered' and claimed that there was great uncertainty among applicants. The Parliamentary Officer attached to the Minister's office responded to this letter (Maharaj, 1991: 14). He pointed out that the procedure was the result of detailed consultation with teachers and TASA. He also drew attention to Management Circular No. 35 (DEC, 1991g) which advised principals to be objective in their ratings: he cited an excerpt from this circular to the effect that it 'is not the responsibility of the head of the institution to promote an individual by overrating him or to disadvantage him by underrating him.' The Parliamentary Officer went on to explain the moderation procedures and to deny that there was any reason for 'uncertainty' among applicants (Maharaj, 1991: 14).

However, when the announcement of promotions was delayed, there was great uncertainty and anxiety among educators. Suspicion that political interference and improper manipulation of evaluations were responsible for the delay rapidly spread in the field. Finally, when the press sought reasons for the delay, Minister of Education and Culture Dr Rajoo
All applications are being scrutinised with a fine comb for a second time after we discovered some of the applicants had been guilty of child abuse resulting from interference with pupils, and certain misdemeanours, including misuse of school funds... These applicants have no chance of being promoted... We have adopted a tough stand on promotions and are taking into account a teacher's character, morality, ability, academic qualifications, and other related attributes.

Dr Rajoo added that the Department was using certain guidelines to scrutinise all applicants, that these actions constituted a 'security check' to ensure that only educators with professional and moral integrity were promoted. Candidates with any form of misconduct, even those whose absenteeism rate was high, were to be excluded (Post Natal, November 27-30, 1991, p.1).

Dr Rajoo's explanation for the delay produced immediate and widespread anger among teachers. In a half-page advertisement, TASA (1991c: 27) labelled the promotion a 'fiasco' and voiced its outrage as follows:

In its handling of the latest round of promotions the Education Department in the House of Delegates has shown that it continues to indulge in that insidious game of Double-talk with the teaching fraternity. While on the one hand it confesses to TASA about the sins of the past and commits itself to erasing that shameful memory, its actions however amount to nothing more than undignified retreat into the ways of old... The Department ought to know that its actions have cast a dark cloud over all applicants - successful and unsuccessful. The Department must come clean and make a complete disclosure now!

The advertisement also cited reasons for TASA's condemnation of the latest development. First, incensed by Dr Rajoo's statement in Post Natal, November 27-30, 1991, it accused the Minister of being 'guilty of an attack that has the effect of tainting the entire profession,' of being intimidatory in suggesting that 'those who do not toe the official line have no chance of being promoted', and of planting in the public mind the thought that those who did not get promoted had 'something amiss' with them. Second, the teacher association accused the Department of 'bad faith negotiations' because it had been accepted that TASA 'would monitor the process at every level.' As such, it viewed the Departmental Promotions Placement Committee on which it had a 'watchdog' role as the final stage in the promotions process. It was therefore 'appalled to learn that the final determination' was done at a higher level, 'free from outside scrutiny', and 'with the meddlesome figure of Rajoo hovering near.' Third, it questioned, in the advertisement, the legitimacy and objectivity of the screening process and the 'definition of misconduct or misdemeanour' that had been applied and voiced its suspicion that known teacher activists would be excluded from promotion. Finally, the teacher organisation voiced its rejection of 'political interference' in education and its outrage at the fact that once 'again RAJOO seems to be
calling the shots with his faithful Departmental functionaries conspicuous by their silence.'

The source of the policy crisis in this instance was not the quality of the policy but the implementation process itself, which had become an arena for the contestation of values and power resources. This example also illustrates the normal role of perceived self-interest of both educators and the Department and the structural accommodation in decision-making processes to avert ongoing conflict.

4.3.1.2.2 Handling of the education budget: 1990/1991

In his 1990/1991 budget speech, Dr Rajoo (HOD, 1990: 1-2) stated that the 1990/1991 education budget had a shortfall of R73 096 000. Despite assurances that 'basic educational needs will be met', as the year unfolded there was increasing criticism of the various cutbacks effected by the Department. Dr Rajoo's response was that protesting educators and organisations should address their complaints to the Minister of National Education. He stated that the available education budget was exhausted by carrying staff above the nationally specified norms. Referring to the staffing of Indian schools beyond the norms prescribed by the funding formula, he said that he was trying by 'prudent rearrangement of priorities, especially in areas where it will least hurt education provisioning' to save the jobs of some 2 742 teachers who were in excess of the funding formula (Sunday Tribune Herald, November 18, 1990, p.4). Contesting this claim, Mr P C Samuels accused the Minister of causing uncertainty, anxiety and unhappiness among teachers by his suggestion that staff rationalisation was imminent (Sunday Tribune Herald, December 16, 1990, p.3).

These disputes were a prelude to the complete disruption of Indian education at the beginning of 1991 when teachers staged sit-ins and chalkdowns demanding the immediate withdrawal of E.C. Circular No. 2 of 1991 (DEC, 1991a), which stipulated new, more stringent staffing norms for Indian schools as a result of budget cutbacks (Sunday Tribune Herald, February 3, 1991, p.3) (see section 4.3.1.4.1).

4.3.1.2.3 Consultation and negotiation with the organised teacher body

While there are several examples which could be cited (see, for example, section 4.3.1.2.1), the chalkdown crisis of May 1993 best illustrates the
conflict between the Minister (now Mrs D Govender) and the organised teacher body on processes of consultation and negotiation relating to policy formulation and policy implementation in the Indian education system.

The chalkdown strike in Indian schools in May 1993 resulted from the Department's decision to go ahead with the granting of 'merit' and 'department specific' awards despite reservations of SADTU. A total of 778 teachers received the awards for 'exceptional ability' and 'meritorious service' (The Leader, May 7, 1993, p.1). SADTU reacted strongly. Spokesman for the teacher body, Mr H E S Samuel said (Sunday Times Extra, May 9, 1993, p.12):

They negotiate but they do so in bad faith. They ultimately decide to do their own thing.

Although the chalkdown began to show signs of being a protracted struggle between the teacher organisation and the Department, Minister of Education and Culture Mrs D Govender refused to meet with SADTU as she maintained that the matter was 'fait accompli'. Despite SADTU's requests for urgent talks to resolve the crisis, she felt that there was 'nothing to discuss' as the cheques had already been given to teachers who had been granted the awards. Moreover, she said that she had met with her senior staff and supported their actions. Therefore meeting with SADTU to discuss the issue would be tantamount to a rejection of her department's actions (The Leader, May 7, 1993, p.1).

At meetings of parent and community organisations arranged to discuss the crisis, there was widespread support for the actions of the striking teachers and a demand for the resignation of all those responsible for the decision to implement the policy relating to merit and department specific awards (The Leader, May 7, 1993, p.2). In a similarly militant vein, Mr M Ally, Southern Natal regional spokesman for SADTU, said that the Department had 'messed-up' the merit issue and now had to 'pay for it' (The Leader, May 7, 1993, p.2).

Solution to the crisis did not seem imminent as SADTU also refused to discuss the problem with Departmental officials, including Mr M Pillay, the Deputy Director-General of education. The reason for this position was that the teacher body was opposed to the fact that he was also adjudicating in the matter as the Acting Director-General of Administration: House of Delegates (HOD) after the appointment of Dr B Ranchod to the position of Chairman of the Ministers Council (Sunday Times Extra, May 9, 1993, p.12). As a result of this attitude, SADTU finally had a meeting with HOD's Chairman of the Ministers' Council, Dr B Ranchod and Minister of Education and Culture Mrs D Govender on 7 May 1993. After 'four hours of nail-biting negotiations' agreement was reached on several pivotal issues. In a document signed by Mrs Govender
and SADTU general secretary Mr R van den Heever, it was agreed to call on teachers who had received the awards to return the cheques to the Department. Mrs Govender also made a commitment to a process of reversal of the awards, pending further consultations with the Ministers' Council and the Minister of National Education, Mr P Marais. She also undertook to report back at a second meeting with SADTU on 12 May 1993. This second meeting, however, ended in serious deadlock. While the negotiations were in progress at Truro House, SADTU members held a placard demonstration outside and threatened to stage a sit-in if the meeting was still deadlocked by the end of the day (The Leader, May 14, 1993, p.1). Eleven top-ranking officials from SADTU were, in fact, arrested at Truro House and charged with trespassing when they attempted to stage a sit-in in protest at the Minister's refusal to concede to the demands of the teacher union (The Daily News, May 13, 1993, p.4).

Meanwhile, the crisis in Indian education over the merit issue continued unresolved. On 16 May 1993, Mr M Pillay, the Deputy Director-General of education, placed a half-page advertisement in newspapers, seeking to present a 'factual' account of the issues involved as there was 'much confusion about the causes of the present chalkdown' (Pillay, 1993: 6). A day later, a second half-page advertisement appeared in the newspapers, this time inserted by Minister of Education and Culture Mrs D Govender. She gave as her reason for the advertisement the wish 'to correct the wrong impression that the South African Democratic Teachers' Union is deliberately creating among our hardworking and dedicated corps of teachers' (Govender, 1993: 6). These efforts at presenting the 'facts' and appealing for an end to the chalkdown, however, were not successful. By now the merit issue was part of a larger national education crisis. Thus the 'chalkdown chaos' continued 'as the country slid deeper into crisis over education' (The Natal Mercury, May 18, 1993, p.1).

On the Indian political front, the chalkdown crisis had further ramifications. Minister D Govender was severely criticised in Parliament and labelled as 'incompetent.' With several members calling for her resignation as Minister of Education and Culture, the Democratic Party leader in the HOD, Mr M Rajab accused her of displaying indifference and indecision in her handling of the crisis (The Natal Mercury, May 18, 1993, p.1). Because of this weakened credibility in her ability to resolve the crisis and because of the teacher union's refusal to negotiate with her, Dr Ranchod temporarily assumed control over education and dealt with the crisis personally (Post Natal, May 26-29, 1993, p.3).

Mrs Govender herself attributed her inability to deal with the crisis effectively and expeditiously largely to inadequate information. She stated that senior officials in the education administration (who owed their appointment to the former Minister and the former ruling party in the House of Delegates - the Solidarity Party) were preventing her from knowing exactly what was happening in her department (Sunday Tribune
The crisis in Indian education was resolved by Dr Ranchod's announcement on 21 May 1993 of the withdrawal of all merit and 'specific' awards made to teachers (Sunday Times Extra, May 23, 1993, p.1). This 'withdrawal', however, was really a 'conscience appeal' to teachers who had received the merit award payments to return the money to the Department (Post Natal, May 26-29, 1993, p.1).

Besides the heightening of value conflicts and inversion of power relations, this policy crisis also illustrates the typical operation of perceived self-interest among policy actors. Despite the fact that the organised teacher body had made manifest its opposition to the policy, when educators were invited to apply for the award in 1993, 2 793 applications were received, a number which constituted approximately 20,00 percent of the total educator corps of the Indian education system. Of this number, 1 099 (68,00 percent) were SADTU members (Sunday Tribune Herald, May 16, 1993, p.6). The 'factual' presentation of details by the Deputy Director General in a newspaper advertisement also revealed that of the 778 merit recipients, 523 were SADTU members: of the 78 awardees of the Department specific award, 53 were SADTU members (Pillay, 1993: 6). Thus while collectively teachers' supported the abolishment of the 'merit' award system, individual members had deviated from this collective position by applying for the award for monetary and career benefits it brought recipients. Faced by this widespread violation of its position by its own members, the organised teacher body was reluctant to act against its members who had placed personal self-interest above that of the group. Instead, it directed its anger against the Department and sought to re-establish its position by organising strike action against the Department. Now all teachers, even those who had applied for the award, heeded the union, possibly for fear of militant reprisal from other union members if they again rebelled against the organised teacher body. The union also called upon the Department to withdraw the awards and to use 'administrative' measures such as having the money 'docked' from recipient's salaries. The Department, however, refused to do this as it was not legally feasible (Post Natal, May 26-29, 1993, p.1).

Only three teachers heeded the 'conscience' call, again illustrating the importance of perceived self-interest in policy implementation. On the other hand, teachers were widely supportive of the organised teacher body's call to teachers to defy the authority of superintendents of education, possibly because of perceived advantages in that it increased teachers' professional autonomy and freed them from external supervisory control (see section 4.3.1.4.2). Moreover, this call of the organised teacher body did not have attached to it the possibility of material loss to individual members.
4.3.1.3 Upper management—superintendents of education interaction

From the beginning of 1990 many Indian teachers openly defied the authority of superintendents of education. The organised teacher body (TASA) adopted a resolution urging all teachers to refuse any access to superintendents of education. This resolution was widely heeded by teachers (see section 4.3.1.4.2). Superintendents of education tended to blame upper management for their isolation from teachers. Moreover, sensitive to the political and social changes in the larger society, superintendents of education sought to assert their professional and ideological independence in their relationship with upper management. Two organisational crises that illustrate this change in interpersonal relations at Departmental level are outlined below.

4.3.1.3.1 'Pens-down' protest by superintendents of education

An education crisis that had its origins in the chalkdown crisis of May 1993 was the 'pens-down' protest action by superintendents of education employed by the Department of Education and Culture: House of Delegates at its headquarters in Durban.

During a newspaper interview on the evaluation process leading to the identification of educators who were deserving of merit and 'Department specific' awards, a chief director of education in the education department was reported as having said that superintendents of education and principals were expected to inform teachers about the particular reasons for their not being recommended for the awards. She was also reported as having maintained that it was not the fault of the Department if its officials had failed to inform teachers of their worth (Sunday Times Extra, May 9, 1993, p.12).

The section of the published interview which actually sparked off the 'pens-down' crisis was the alleged statement that the merit crisis could have been averted if the prescribed procedures had been followed by principals and superintendents. This statement, objecting superintendents of education maintained, not only suggested neglect on their part but implied that they had effected their role in a manner that cast doubt upon their fairness and objectivity. In protest against this suggestion of negligence and impropriety, the superintendents of education embarked on a 'pens-down' protest campaign (Post Natal, May 12-15, 1993, p.3). Mr V Moodley, president of the Public Service
Union, of which the superintendents of education were members, said (Post Natal, May 12-15, 1993, p.3):

- Superintendents were bound to be viewed negatively by educators as a result of the press article.

- The top hierarchy of the Department was making superintendents the scapegoats for the merit policy failure.

- The negative remarks about superintendents of education had to be withdrawn and their role in the merit evaluation/moderation process and the actual granting of merit awards clarified.

In another newspaper statement, Mr V Moodley said that superintendents of education would not visit schools until a meeting was held with the head of the Department to resolve the problem (The Leader, May 14, 1993, p.1).

The protest action only came to an end when the Deputy Director-General of the HOD, Mr M Pillay, addressed the full staff and stated that the original newspaper article had not reported the chief director's statements correctly. He appealed for a return to normal functioning (Professional Staff, DEC, 1993). Also clarifying the role of superintendents of education in the 'merit' exercise in a newspaper article, Mr Pillay stated that they were not required to inform candidates of their 'success or otherwise'. Their sole responsibility was to moderate the evaluation scores submitted by principals on the basis of a sample selected by senior officials (Sunday Times Extra, May 16, 1993, p.1).

4.3.1.3.2 'Sit-in' by superintendents of education and teachers

At a workshop on 2 March 1994 at Truro House, the headquarters of the HOD, representatives of the SADTU and members of APROESA, the staff association of superintendents of education, education planners and school psychologists attached to the Indian education department, met to discuss differences of opinion between teachers and superintendents of education on issues such as:

- teacher evaluation
- monitoring of education standards
- accountability in education
- staff development of educators.
The more fundamental goal of this exercise, according to the organisers, was 'bridge-building' as the two organisations were gearing for transition to a new South Africa and a unitary system of education (The Daily News, March 3, 1994, p.2).

Midway through the exercise, however, SADTU representatives referred to E.C. Circular No. 7 of 1994 (DEC, 1994a) which they maintained was contrary to the general mood of professionalism and collegiality prevailing at the workshop. The circular referred to had as its objective the monitoring of educational performance of educators: it noted that an educator 'may be granted a salary increment of one notch within the limits of the applicable salary scale provided that his/her service during the said period has been satisfactory in respect of industry, discipline, punctuality, efficiency and conduct.' The circular required principals of schools and rectors of colleges of education to complete a certificate in respect of educators at their institutions. It aimed at the implementation of Regulation 13 of Government Notice R1288, dated 26 August 1966.

SADTU officials were strongly opposed to the circular, interpreting it as a coercive method of effecting teacher evaluations and the supervision of classroom practice (The Daily News, March 3, 1994, p.2). Superintendents of education present at the workshop disclaimed any knowledge of the background to the circular, its objective, or the process by which it had been finalised. As a result, both the teachers and the superintendents of education called upon the Executive Director to address them on the rationale for the circular and to discuss its implementation consequences. The Executive Director, however, was unwilling to do so. Both the teachers and superintendents then staged a sit-in in 'protest against the implementation of a 28-year old regulation they considered archaic' (The Daily News, March 3, 1994, p.2). They only agreed to end the sit-in after they were assured that their grievances would be investigated.

The outcome was an immediate suspension of the policy. The Department issued E.C. Circular Minute BE of 1994 (DEC, 1994b) which advised principals not to implement the provisions of E C Circular No. 7 of 1994 until further notice. Joint pressure from the organised teacher body and superintendents of education had forced the Executive Director and upper management to retract from their policy position. Again what becomes apparent is that resistance stemmed more from perceived self-interest rather than from any substantive opposition to the quality of the policy or its relevance: teachers were unwilling to subject themselves to formal evaluation and superintendents of education were unwilling to expose themselves to teacher anger and teacher sanctions.
4.3.1.4 Department-organised teacher body interaction

By 1990, as noted above, teachers and the organised teacher body had begun to adopt a militant stance in their interaction with the education department, more active in their expression of policy resistance, and more demanding of a voice in the policymaking process (see section 4.3.1.2). Two detailed examples of these changes in interpersonal interaction and their impact on the policymaking and policy implementation processes are presented below.

4.3.1.4.1 Rejection of E.C. Circular No. 2 of 1991

To address the budget deficit of R73-million, the Department adopted a more stringent staffing policy at the beginning of 1991 (see section 4.3.1.2.2). E.C. Circular No. 2 of 1991 (DEC, 1991a) which set out the class size norms which principals had to apply in arriving at their staffing requirements for 1991, began with the following sentence:

In view of the financial constraints that the Department of Education and Culture in the Administration: House of Delegates is experiencing, it has become necessary to examine ways and means of rationalising the staffing position in our schools/colleges for 1991.

Open rejection of the policy occurred as teachers refused to accept the teaching allocations prepared in terms of E.C. Circular No. 2 of 1991. By the beginning of February 1991, estimates provided by TASA indicated that about 5,000 teachers were involved in chalkdown protest - 'the largest number of teachers yet to launch joint action to express their grievances' (Sunday Tribune Herald, February 3, 1991, p.3). Protesting teachers were joined by parents, pupils, and education leaders who expressed concern at the growing crisis in Indian education. Dr Rajoo's threat that disciplinary action would be taken against teachers involved in organising the chalkdown was ignored (Sunday Tribune Herald, February 3, 1991, p.3).

President of TASA, Mr P Naicker (1991: 8), reported that 'TASA was left with no option but to resort to mass action' when two meetings with the Department failed to result in a withdrawal of the new staffing policy. In his report at the 1991 annual conference of the teacher body, Mr P Kotiah (1991: 53), the secretary general, described the first meeting which occurred within days of the opening of schools in 1991 as follows:

The Acting Chief Executive Director refused to withdraw the Circular despite TASA's
insistence that it would settle for nothing short of complete withdrawal of Circular 2 and a return to the position as obtained in 1990 and before.

The meeting ended in deadlock with TASA warning that mass protest meetings which were being planned throughout the country would go ahead.

The reasons for the 'chalkdown' gradually spread beyond the issue of increased pupil/teacher ratio and the teacher anxiety about redundancy. This was evident, for example, in the decisions emanating from a meeting of 'concerned organisations' held on Saturday, 9 February 1991, at the Durban Teachers' Centre where a committee - Education Crisis Coordinating Committee - was formed to resolve the crisis in Indian schools. The organisations present at the meeting (Education Crisis Coordinating Committee, 1991) unanimously agreed to call for:

- The instituting of a single education department.
- The restoration of the R73-million cut-back.
- The scrapping of the HOD.
- The resignation of the Chief Executive Director.

Faced by this mounting criticism of its administration of education and its legitimacy, the Department altered its initial position and accepted the teacher organisation's demands. TASA immediately issued a letter to all its members describing this victory as 'House of Delegates buckles under the concerted pressure from teachers, parents, pupils, and community support groups.' Asking members to report any deviations from the agreement that had been reached with the Department, it went on to state that 'Circular 2 is effectively neutralised'. Moreover, it asked all members (TASA, 1991a) to retain their militant posture as:

- Our gains, significant as they are, should give no cause for complacency.
- Cutbacks are still very much with us - there is need to regroup and intensify the struggle in other forms.
- Education in this country is still submerged in a seething crisis after decades of devastation unleashed by Verwoerdian apartheid education policies.
- One education department for the country is now within grasp.
- We must act and plan for this reality.

During the staffing crisis the Department was contacted by a large number of parents seeking clarity about the issues in the dispute and complaining about the effect of the 'sit-in' on their children. As a result the Acting Chief Executive Director, Mr M Pillay, decided to address a letter to all parents (Pillay, 1991). This letter, dated 5 February 1991, refuted the correctness of TASA's claims relating to:

- compressed and overcrowded classrooms;
- increased teaching hours;
- large scale redundancies; and
- the haunting spectre of retrenchments.
Also sent, accompanying the letter, was a pamphlet that presented the 'FACTS' in relation to the implementation effects of 'Circular 2 of 1991'.

TASA perceived both the letter and the pamphlet as being an effort 'to drive a wedge between parents and teachers by portraying the actions of the latter group as being irresponsible and unwarranted ... and attempting to undermine the legitimate struggle of the community' (TASA News, February 1991, p.1). As a result, TASA's National Council, which met on 9 February 1991 to discuss the offer to end the crisis, also resolved unanimously to call for the immediate removal from office of the Acting Chief Executive Director, Mr M Pillay.

Despite the agreement reached with TASA to 'defer' the implementation of E.C. Circular No. 2 of 1991 (DEC, 1991e) indefinitely, the protest campaign organised by the Education Crisis Co-ordinating Committee went ahead and 'close onto 15 000 people' participated in a protest march on 15 February 1991 'to the Durban City Hall to hand over memoranda to the Minister of National Education and Minister of Education and Culture (HOD), outlining the crisis in education and demanding redress' (Naicker, 1991: 8).

4.3.1.4.2 Resistance to superintendents of education

For purposes of providing a backdrop to the resistance to superintendents of education in Indian schools, the researcher shall note some of the significant developments in the period immediately preceding the 1990's.

At the 1984 annual conference of TASA, one of the resolutions adopted centred on the issue of teacher supervision. The resolution called for 'an investigation into the nature of supervision programmes in schools' (Jaggernath: 1985: 36). The Executive Director, in his response to this resolution, stated that supervision programmes were regularly monitored and added that with 'the re-structuring of the inspectorate, the whole question of supervision and other functions of these personnel would be reconsidered' (Jaggernath, 1985: 36). On its criticism of A-form inspections which focussed on the total functioning of the school, the Executive Director invited the teacher body to submit 'concrete proposals on how the effectiveness of a school and the work of the Principal may be evaluated' (Jaggernath, 1985: 37).

Therefore by 1985 there was a general expectation among educators in Indian schools that there would be some revision of the supervision and general evaluation role of subject advisers or superintendents of education (academic) as they later came to be called. This, however, did
not occur. As a result, at the 1985 Annual Conference of TASA, one of the resolutions adopted was (TASA, 1985: 44):

That whereas broad policies of education may be defined, it is neither possible nor desirable to prescribe in detail how schools should be administered, precisely how lessons should be prepared, taught, evaluated, recorded and supervised.

Consequently Subject Advisers ought to evaluate the quality of education against the wide framework of divergent but acceptable educational theories free of personal preferences which have limited benefits and possibly a deleterious effect on the enthusiasm and morale of the qualified and highly experienced teacher.

At this stage, the criticism of subject advisers (superintendents of education) was basically directed at a perceived prescriptiveness in their interaction with educators. They were seen as being unaccepting of teaching practices and theories 'divergent' from their own.

By 1988 the mood of resistance to superintendents of education (academic) had hardened into a defence of the professional rights of teachers - which superintendents of education were perceived as violating in the execution of their role functions. Thus one of the resolutions at the 1988 annual conference of TASA was (TASA, 1988: 27):

That Conference being aware of the normal procedures used by superintendents, and several members of management staff in schools to prescribe to teachers how they should teach, consequently calls upon these persons to recognise the rights of teachers to use teaching strategies that may be good, best suited to their styles, and more importantly, meaningful to the pupils they teach, notwithstanding the fact that these may be innovative in some or all respects.

Reacting to this resolution, the Chief Executive Director rejected the view that superintendents of education prescribed to teachers: he maintained that 'they advised teachers on techniques/practices employed nationally and overseas and acquainted them with new trends and accepted practices' (Kotiah, 1990: 49).

Another more pointed rejection of panel inspections which had continued despite the objections by teachers was expressed in another resolution at the 1988 annual conference of TASA (TASA, 1988: 31):

That this Conference re-iterates its rejection of the system of group visits by Superintendents of Education for the purpose of "assessing the state of the subject" at schools and consequently calls upon the Chief Executive Director to respect the professional integrity of the Principal of the school who is in the best position to comment on the 'state of subjects', and hence be consulted first.

This view that the principal could easily effect the functions that hitherto had been effected by the superintendent of education also became evident in TASA's efforts to remove the latter from any direct involvement in the evaluation of educators for promotion. In two of the
resolutions at the 1988 annual conference of TASA, the thrust towards giving the principal a more central role in the evaluation for promotion process was clearly and explicitly defined (TASA, 1988: 28):

That in the process of evaluation Conference urges the Chief Executive Director to cause the Superintendent of Education to substantiate his scores should there be a difference from that of the School Principal's score.

That Conference calls upon the Chief Executive Director to dispense with the Chief Superintendent's role in the moderation process, so that moderation may be obtained by consensus between the superintendent (moderator) and the school principal (evaluator).

In 1989 the efforts of the teachers' association to reduce the role of superintendents of education continued. At a meeting with the Ministers' Council of the HOD in May 1989, the association 'strongly put across' the point that the ranks of 'the superintendents be rationalised and role functions changed' (Samuels, 1989a: 8). This view was also evident in one of the 1989 TASA annual conference resolutions which read as follows (TASA, 1989a: 47):

That the role of Superintendents in the supervision of the work of teachers in advising them on methodology and on miscellaneous resources be reviewed by the Ministry of Education with a view to change in their appointments and role functions on the following basis:

(1) that since most superintendents are no longer classroom practitioners they are no longer relevant to teachers in the classroom, and that they therefore be replaced by teachers on secondment;

(2) that such seconded teachers act only as professional development personnel with no objectives set for summative evaluation per se but rather in a human resource development process to help teachers to know whether or not they have accomplished the objectives they had set for themselves with the proviso that the objectives are not in conflict with the principles of the teaching-learning situations in schools;

(3) that other seconded teachers undertake the summative evaluations of teachers;

(4) that teachers be seconded for a period not exceeding 3 years.

The response of the Department to this resolution was that superintendents of education from levels 4 to 7 were 'well equipped to act as advisers to classroom practitioners as they had proved themselves to be experts in the classroom' (Kotiah, 1990: 51).

What one notices here is the presentation by TASA of yet another reason why superintendents of education were not acceptable to many Indian teachers - they were said to be completely out of touch with the day-to-day realities of teaching. The superintendent of education, TASA seemed to assert, was transmitting outmoded ideas or ideas not subjected to the test of personal practice. Faced with the growing resistance to the
presence of superintendents of education in teachers' classrooms, at the
beginning of 1990 the Department terminated the system of 'panel
inspections'. It issued E.C. Circular Minute N of 1990 (DEC, 1990a),
requiring principals to forward written requests for the professional
assistance of Departmental officials. Superintendents of education
(academic) were still required to complete 'subject inspections' at
schools where needs had been identified on the basis of Senior
Certificate results - but not on a panel basis. Despite this change in
policy, by the beginning of 1990 educators had begun to adopt a
militantly active rejection of superintendents of education.

In May 1990, TASA embarked on its first open defiance of the Department's
authority (see section 4.3.3.2). At a mass protest meeting held on
18 May 1990, it decided to call on all its members to protest against the
'secret' evaluation method and resolved not to allow superintendents of
education into the classroom of teachers who were due for promotion,
routine evaluation for staff development purposes, and confirmation of
their probationary appointment to the permanent staff (Sunday Times

Reacting to this rejection of its officials and by extension its
authority, the Department issued E.C. Circular Minute CN of 1990 (DEC,
1990d). This briefly worded circular of one sentence reads as follows:

Please be informed that superintendents of education shall visit schools to perform
administrative and professional duties other than evaluation of CS educators for
purposes of promotion and merit achievement recognition awards.

TASA reacted to this circular with a swift rejection. In a newsletter
to its members, TASA informed them of the stance that they should adopt
towards superintendents of education (TASA, 1990a):

NO TO EVALUATIONS FOR PROMOTIONS!
NO TO EVALUATIONS FOR MERIT AWARDS!
NO TO SUBJECT INSPECTIONS!
NO TO SUPPORT PROGRAMMES!

Warning teachers that such behaviour exposed them to a charge of
misconduct, the Acting Chief Executive Director, Mr M Pillay issued E.C.
Circular Minute No. 15 of 1991 (DEC, 1991b), which, in general terms,
advised educators of their obligations in terms of their conditions of
service. One of the paragraphs in the circular stated:

I would be shirking my duties if I did not ensure adherence to the provisions of the
Indians Education Act, 1965 (Act 61 of 1965), as amended and the regulations
promulgated thereunder in the best interests of education. Consequently I have no
option but inter alia to ensure that CS Educators who do not comply with their conditions of service are acted against in accordance with the prescribed procedures in terms of the relevant provisions of the aforementioned Act.

Despite this threat of disciplinary action, teachers generally persisted in abiding by the TASA resolution and refusing to admit superintendents of education into their classrooms to appraise their work and to undertake general formative evaluation of their performance.

Therefore in August 1991 teachers reacted angrily to a statement by the Department on supervision of their work. The Department announced that the teacher body had agreed to reconsider its militant standpoint and to allow superintendents of education to evaluate the work of teachers and their pupils for routine formative evaluation purposes. TASA immediately and 'emphatically' denied that any such agreement existed (Sunday Times Extra, September 1, 1991, p.1).

The rejection of superintendents hardened during the SADTU campaign for formal recognition. At a joint mass meeting called by the Isipingo, Clairwood, Merebank, Chatsworth, Silverglen, Welbedacht, and Pinetown branches on 21 May 1992, the issue was expressed as follows (SADTU, Southern Durban Branches, 1992):

Superintendents of education have been instructed to visit schools under the pretext of support services. You are warned you could be the next victim.

The Department responded to this teacher drive to reduce yet further the role of the superintendent of education (academic) by issuing E.C. Circular No. 25 of 1992, (DEC, 1992b). The circular stressed the need for superintendents of education and teachers to work together. It referred to the fact that the monitoring and controlling functions of superintendents of education had been progressively reduced since 1990. It advised teachers that these officials would look into the instructional programmes of classroom practitioners, the performance of pupils in the various subjects/phases/standards, and the management of schools. Commenting on the underlying purpose of the circular, Minister of Education Dr K Rajoo said that superintendents of education were once again being sent to schools to monitor and maintain educational standards as complaints had been received from parents about a drop in standard in certain subjects (Sunday Times Extra, June 14, 1992, p.1).

Teachers, however, responded in a strongly negative manner to E.C. Circular No. 25 of 1992. At a mass meeting of teachers of the Pietermaritzburg North Branch of SADTU on 10 June 1992, for example, teachers 'voted overwhelmingly to reject the circular.' The main reasons for this were (SADTU News, Pietermaritzburg North Branch, 1992: 1):

1. No evaluation will be acceptable to teachers until a democratic system of
evaluation has been thoroughly negotiated with SADTU. This is in line with previous policy and the resolution adopted at the SADTU National Congress held in Johannesburg last October.

2. As long as SADTU is not officially recognised, teachers will view Circular 25 as an attempt to take advantage of the "vacuum" in which teachers lack the representation which is their right.

Other reasons for the rejection included doubts that there was any 'serious' drop in standards of education, anger at the suggestion in the circular that 'schools do not address shortcomings in a professional manner', and the 'authoritarian tone and language' of the circular.

To avert the likelihood of unpleasant confrontations between teachers and superintendents of education, SADTU asked the Department not to send its officials to Indian schools to evaluate the work of teachers and to inspect their educational output. Mr P Naicker, SADTU deputy president, stated that teachers 'resented' school visits by superintendents (Sunday Times Extra, June 14, 1992, p.1). In another newspaper report, he said (The Leader, June 26, 1992, p.1):

Teacher evaluation is a very sensitive issue. A resolution adopted at the first national congress of SADTU was forwarded to the department ... to suspend inspections until a democratic form of inspection and evaluation has been thoroughly negotiated and developed and until SADTU is recognised.

He also maintained that 'evaluation for accountability' was the responsibility of the school management acting in conjunction with the teaching staff (The Leader, June 26, 1992, p.1).

Many parents, however, were not supportive of the position adopted by teachers. Complaints continued to be made to the Department that there was a decline in education standards in Indian schools (Sunday Times Extra, June 14, 1992, p.1). One parent wrote to the press as follows ('Unhappy Mum', 1992: 8):

Why do teachers resent visits by superintendents? Are teachers afraid they may be caught unexpectedly for not maintaining a proper standard of education?... I can understand teachers not wanting superintendents to visit schools as I am sure they would not want their lax work to be detected.

Teachers, however, continued to adopt an attitude of resistance towards the implementation of E.C. Circular No. 25 of 1992 (DEC, 1992c).

Therefore a Departmental meeting was arranged with a delegation from SADTU to discuss the issue. At the report-back on the meeting with SADTU, superintendents of education were informed by their representatives (Superintendents of education, DEC, 1992):
SADTU officials had criticised the contents of E C Circular Minute 25 of 1992 and questioned the validity of the circular in the light of its generalisations.

The evaluation of actual teaching performance through classroom visits was a major obstacle to interaction between teachers and superintendents of education.

All decisions that may emanate from the current negotiations with the Department would be only 'interim' decisions as the matter of subject advisors and superintendents of education and their role in schools was a national issue and thus had to be debated and resolved at that level for permanent solution.

SADTU officials wanted a written proposal on how superintendents of education would effect their responsibilities.

Further negotiations on this issue, however, did not take place because of the strained relationship between the Department and SADTU arising from the chalkdown in August 1992. Other events that pushed this issue down the list of priorities were the need to negotiate an acceptable evaluation and promotion system for 1992, the various staffing problems at the beginning of 1993, and the emergence of 'site committees' in schools as union structures to oversee the functioning of their schools and to screen the visits of superintendents of education (academic).

In a paper on the role of site committees, executive member of SADTU, Mr H E S Samuel (1993) explained the origin of the 'site committee' body as follows:

With the establishment of SADTU in 1990, the Site Steward was identified as essential to the needs of the membership. The Union began to lean more on general labour practices at factory floor levels and the position of Site Committees was written into the Union's constitution. Since 1990, the need for proper representation and decision making at school level emerged as a real issue. In the main, the Union identified Site Committees as vital to its activities and personnel of the committee were essential to service the needs of the membership. The Site Committee saw the need to be involved in decision making around school administration ... to play key roles in conflict situations ... The Committee itself must work as a link between the membership and management. It also serves as a clearing house addressing the need for greater participatory management in school administration.

To resolve the staffing crisis at the beginning of 1993 the Department acknowledged the presence of site committees as grievance resolving and mediation structures between the staff and the principal in matters pertaining to staffing.

The site committee, however, soon took on the role of monitoring the exact purpose of superintendents of education who visited the school.
In many schools, the site committee chairperson insisted on being informed of the arrival and purpose of all superintendents of education (academic) who interacted with Level 1 and Level 2 educators. As a result, the Department issued E.C. Circular Minute EQ of 1993, (DEC, 1993e), withdrawing E.C. Circular Minute AM of 1993 (DEC, 1993a), the circular which gave limited recognition to site committees. Despite this effort by the Department to abolish their role in schools, site committees continued to operate in Indian schools, disregarding E.C. Circular Minute EQ of 1993.

By the beginning of 1994, upper management in the Department had reached the view that the reduction in the role functions of the superintendent of education could not continue. As a result, at the beginning of 1994, at the first policy-oriented meeting of the year with superintendents of education, the Chief Director of Education (Control) touched on the urgent need for superintendents of education (academic and management) to perform their full range of functions, including the monitoring and enhancement of education standards (Professional Staff, DEC, 1994). A major theme of the whole meeting, in fact, was that monitoring of education standards and visits to schools for the support and guidance of educators had to be given primary attention.

Superintendents of education endorsed the policy directions but strongly suggested that the issue be negotiated with SADTU and that a circular be sent to schools to clarify the position for 1994. They also requested additional time to examine the policy directions for 1994 insofar as they related to the whole issue of monitoring education standards.

Despite these suggestions and requests, the Deputy Director-General, issued E.C. Circular Minute No. 7 of 1994 (DEC, 1994a) soon after the meeting. Essentially, this circular drew on an old regulation, first promulgated in 1966 (Regulation 13 of Government Notice R1288, dated 26 August 1966) which stipulated that an educator may be granted a salary increment of one notch within the limits of the applicable salary scale provided that his/her service during the relevant incremental period was certified as being satisfactory. The circular requested principals and rectors of colleges of educators to complete certificates on all educators on the satisfactoriness of their performance. The implementation of this circular, however, was swiftly deferred as a result of protests from superintendents of education, teachers, and the teacher union (see section 4.3.1.3.2).

Superintendents of education had earlier sought direct interaction with the organised teacher body to resolve differences relating to their role in schools. On 20 November 1991, for example, the APROESA executive met the TASA executive to discuss teacher attitudes towards superintendents of education and ways to resolve the problem (Executives of APROESA and TASA, 1991). At this meeting TASA executives pointed out that teacher
attitudes towards the Inspectorate were influenced by the fact that superintendents of education had remained silent on many critical issues in a period of political change, that they were willing implementers of apartheid education policies. Teachers also perceived many superintendents as being bureaucratic and prescriptive in their interaction with them. TASA executives also maintained that members of the Inspectorate can play a key role in the emergence of the new South Africa by becoming members of SADTU and working for its professional and political goals. The meeting ended with both groups committing themselves to ongoing formal and informal exchange. It is this ongoing interaction that led to the 'bridge-building' exercise on 2 March 1994 which ended in a joint 'sit-in' in protest against E.C. Circular Minute No. 7 of 1994 (see section 4.3.1.3.2 above).

Nevertheless, the problem of teacher-superintendent relationships still remained unresolved at the end of 1994. It is one of the major policy issues for the Department of Education in the post-election phase of transition towards a fully functional, integrated, unitary system of education.

4.3.1.5 Department-parents interaction

By 1990 parents began to adopt a militant stance against the Department. Parents and parent bodies, for example, joined teachers in their protest campaign against the implementation of E.C. Circular No. 2 of 1991 (see section 4.3.1.4.1). The Natal School Grantees' Association (a body representing the grantees of state-aided Indian schools), in supporting teachers, said that the policy presented in the circular was 'a recipe for confrontation' (Sunday Times Extra, February 3, 1991, p.3). Parents and parent bodies also took part in the protest march against the implementation of this circular in February 1991 (Post Natal, February 13-16, 1991, p.1). Often the quality of the policy and its technical basis were of no relevance. The policy implementation process often acted as the arena for contestation of values and power resources.

During the cleaners' strike in the latter half of 1991, frustrated parents attacked the DEC for its inability to resolve the labour crisis expeditiously despite the fact that this was a labour dispute between the contracting company and its staff. They demanded that the Department accept full responsibility for resolving the problems which had led to the strike (Sunday Tribune Herald, October 6, 1991, p.1). Parents also adopted a militant posture against the Department on issues such as the staffing of schools. Parents at Orient-Islamic Secondary School, for example, released a press statement attacking Department for its failure to supply the school its full complement of teachers at the beginning of
1992 (*The Daily News*, February 12, 1992, p.8). At other schools where there were staff shortages, parents engaged in protest action such as 'sit-ins' when their demands were not timeously attended to (*The Daily News*, February 10, 1992, p.3).

The overall effect of this parent militancy against the Department and its management representative at schools - the principal - was that it could not turn to parents for assistance and support in crisis situations.

4.3.1.6 Department-principal-teacher-parent interaction

The resistance to superintendents of education in schools produced progressive devolution of powers to principals who were now required to be more centrally involved in supervision and staff development functions and in the evaluation of promotion applicants (see section 4.3.1.4.2). Persad (1990) described the impact of these policy changes on principals in the Indian education system as follows:

Principals ... caught in a position of having added responsibilities of being instructional leaders, found themselves removed forcibly from the safe and secure position of being regulated and controlled by officers from the Department. This created strains in relationships all round. The change, for example, created a situation where teachers called principals to account for their inability to be promoted or to receive merit awards. The tension in schools was made evident in the frequency of letters to the press denouncing principals.

With the increased militancy of teachers, principals were forced to adjust their relationship with staff members. One of the levers used by teachers in this process was the establishment of site committees at each school. Key functions of this committee were to transport 'factory floor' labour structures into schools, to act as a link between membership and management, and to address 'the need for greater participatory management in school administration' (Samuel, 1993). As a result, they acted as the militant voice of teachers at school level, insisting on full involvement in all decisions relating to education policy at school level. Principals who disregarded their demands often became the target of attack by teacher-parent coalitions (see section 4.3.1.7). Some examples of policy crises and conflicts that illustrate some of the alterations in the interpersonal relations among Departmental officials, principals, and teachers as a result of transition pressures are presented below.
4.3.1.6.1 Teacher resistance to official opening of schools

One of the more controversial policies of the Department in 1991 was that relating to the official opening of schools: it was decided that this should be done by senior politicians serving in the HOD. One of the first schools selected for such an opening ceremony was St. Michaels Primary School in the Greater Durban area, a school which had already been in existence for 11 years. Parents, teachers, and pupils of the school were strongly opposed to the idea and engaged in various forms of protest action. Finally, the principal, acting on a hoax call, suspended 15 members of his staff for boycotting the official opening. Reacting angrily to this disciplinary measure, parents removed more than 500 pupils from the school (Sunday Times Extra, September 22, 1991, p.1).

Subjected to pressure from both members of his staff as well as parents, the principal fell ill and had to be hospitalised for stress-related problems. Attacking the Department for his problems, he stated before being admitted to hospital (Sunday Times Extra, September 22, 1991, p.1):

The department's handling of the opening of the school and the way they used me has been humiliating. It has caused me to lose credibility in the community.

He said that he had made the Department aware that teachers and the community were against the official opening of the school by House of Delegates' Minister B Dookie. He had also advised Minister Dookie of teacher and community opposition to the official opening of the school by him but the Minister had insisted on going ahead with the programme. In a second statement to the press, the principal said (Sunday Times Extra, September 29, 1991, p.7):

The Department has treated me shabbily. They used me for the opening. They insisted that I had to do it. If I did not hold the function I could have been charged with insubordination.

The problems arising from the 'official opening' controversy did not end here. A teacher from another school who had participated in demonstrations at the official opening of St. Michaels Primary School was suspended for his role in the protest action. Staff at his own school and community organisations immediately objected to this action by the Department. As a result, it was forced to rescind the suspension (Sunday Times Extra, September 29, 1991, p.3; Sunday Times Extra, October 6, 1991, p.3). Moreover, the policy itself was not enforced at other official openings to avert other anti-House of Delegates protest actions (Post Natal, September 4-7, 1991, p.1)
4.3.1.6.2 Grandmore Primary School crisis

While most parents were supportive of teacher militancy against the Department, there were others bitter about their children's loss of teaching time (see section 4.3.1.8). A vivid example of the strained relationship that develops between parents and teachers when the former do not support the militant actions of the latter was provided by the unfolding events at Grandmore Primary School in May/June 1993 in the course of the general chalkdown strike of May, 1993 (see section 4.3.1.2.3). When teachers began their chalkdown at the school, which is located in Phoenix in the Greater Durban area, a large percentage of the parent population refused to support them. Angry parents became 'locked in a stand-off' with teachers and finally decided on 'taking over the institution' from teachers (The Daily News, May 17, 1993, p.1). Teachers at the school identified the principal as the cause of their problem with parents: they felt that in not supporting the chalkdown, he had incited the parents against them. As a result on the morning of 14 May 1993, the teachers of Grandmore Primary School staged a sit-in in the acting principal's office. In a statement to the press (Sunday Times Extra, July 25, 1993, p.3), describing the occupation of his office, the acting principal said that 24 teachers and 11 trainee teachers had participated in a sit-in in his office and had shouted 'Down with the Headmaster', 'Traitor' and 'Viva Sadtu'. He said that the teachers had pushed his desk aside, sat on his chair, used his telephone, and left behind scraps of food and cooldrink containers. In a memorandum submitted to the Department explaining the context of their strike action against the acting principal of the school, the teachers stated (Grandmore Primary School Site Committee, 1993):

At the onset of the chalkdown (06:05:93), the Acting Principal made no attempt to inform the parents of the occurrences at the school. All attempts to contact the parents and to explain the crisis in the school were made by Grandmore Site Committee. The Acting Principal mentioned that he did not want any letters to be sent to parents from his office. The Site Committee subsequently took the responsibility of inviting parents to a Mass meeting.

At the said meeting (07:05:93) the Acting Principal and his management were noticeable in their absence, despite urgent requests by two Site stewards, that as head of this institution, even if he does not support the chalkdown, his presence was vital. We as teachers, feel that the Acting Principal has neglected his duties and acted irresponsibly.

In interviews conducted by the researcher with several members of staff in September, 1993, it emerged that the general opinion among teachers was that they could no longer serve under an acting principal who, in their eyes, had deliberately exposed them to parent anger and criticism.

Meanwhile, parents, angry at their children's loss of instruction time, conducted a placard demonstration against the striking teachers and
their action committee presented a list of demands to the teachers' union and the education authorities (The Daily News, May 17, 1993, p.1). Interviews which the researcher had with three parents of the Parents' Crisis Committee of the school suggested that they saw themselves as defending the right of their children to receive education and saw the dispute between the teachers and the acting principal as another example of a dispute in which their children were being neglected.

After their placard demonstration, the parents adopted a more militant stance against the striking teachers: they barricaded the entrance to the school and refused teachers admission to the school unless they signed an undertaking to return to their classes and commence teaching. Refusing to submit to this demand, the teachers reported at a neighbouring school (Post Natal, May 26-29, 1993, p.1). The consequence was an extended chalkdown in 25 schools in Phoenix. Although the national strike planned for May 1993 had been averted by government concessions to the teacher union's demands, 25 schools in Phoenix continued their chalkdown in solidarity with the teachers at Grandmore Primary School, who stated that they would only return to the school if the acting principal was removed from his position (The Daily News, May 26, 1993, p.2). Chairman of the Phoenix North branch of SADTU, Mr P Moodley said (Post Natal, May 26-29, 1993, p.1) that the decision to impose a regional chalkdown had been taken when parents of pupils at Grandmore Primary had demanded that their teachers give a written undertaking to return to their classrooms and refrain from another chalkdown. He said:

The Phoenix North branch of Sadtu is demanding the removal of the principal of Grandmore School ... because, we believe, he is siding with some parents and this is affecting the running of the school ... We view this problem seriously ...

The strike at the school and 25 others in Phoenix was resolved on 26 May 1993 when the Department granted the acting principal extended special leave and seconded another principal to serve in his absence. The teachers immediately returned to their classes. The Department also undertook to hold an inquiry into the grievances of the teachers against the principal (Sunday Times Extra, May 30, 1993, p.3).

The problem, however, was not fully resolved by these actions and decisions. While still on leave, the acting principal said in a press statement that he was anxious to return to Grandmore Primary School. He added (Sunday Times Extra, July 25, 1993, p.3):

I want to go back to my pupils. The local community has placed great faith in me by insisting on my reinstatement ... If the department sends me to another school it will not be fair as I am not guilty of any misdemeanors. I believe my heads are satisfied I have been a good headmaster.

That parents fully supported him and wanted him back at their school was
evident all through the crisis. A community leader, Reverend K Naidoo said (Sunday Times Extra, July 25, 1993, p.3) that more than 400 parents had submitted a petition supporting the principal's return to the school. He also stated that he had had a meeting with Minister of Education and Culture Mrs D Govender and that she had informed him that the principal would return to the school as 'the department found [the principal] had handled the chalkdown very well.'

The teachers at the school, in contrast, were adamant that they would not accept him as their principal and that they would refuse to co-operate with him. Faced by these conflicting expectations, the Department's immediate concern was to avert the possibility of another extended chalkdown in Phoenix schools. Thus after the principal had been on special leave for four months, the Department decided to have him report to duty at another primary school. At the same time, the Department released a statement to the effect that it had conducted an inquiry into events at the school in May 1993 and had found the principal not guilty of any misdemeanor. A Department spokesman added that it had decided on its course of action in the interests of Grandmore Primary School, its parents, pupils, and staff. The principal said of his appointment to another school (Sunday Times Extra, September 19, 1993, p.1):

My spirit has been lifted again. I have got back my smile. I was depressed and under stress since being put on leave. It's difficult to say how I feel about the staff at Grandmore. But I thought it would not be beneficial to the pupils if I insisted on going back there. I was eagerly waiting to return to school. I had a chat with the staff at [the new school] and they were happy to have me.

The problem, however, was far from resolved. The teachers at Grandmore Primary School and the Phoenix North branch of SADTU demanded that the inquiry be re-opened as they were dissatisfied with the finding reached by the Department. A SADTU spokesman said that teachers were 'surprised' to learn through a newspaper report that the principal had been found not guilty. He said (Sunday Times Extra, September 26, 1993, p.1):

The matter is far from resolved. We have demanded for the appointment of a committee of three people made up of representatives from the education department, Sadtu and an independent person. We will set up a meeting shortly with the department to work out the committee's terms of reference.

Progress towards the constitution of this committee, however, was blocked by the teacher body's refusal to accept the terms of reference and the specific role of its representative. Nevertheless, a committee of three Departmental officials who were not involved in earlier inquiries was set up but its findings were also not accepted by the teacher body.
4.3.1.7 Principal–parents interaction

From 1990 parents began to adopt an active and militant stance against unpopular principals. In November 1990, for example, parents and community leaders staged a placard demonstration outside Impala Crescent Primary School and demanded the immediate removal of the principal, accusing him of several irregularities in the running of the school (*Sunday Times Extra*, December 2, 1990, p.1). Not satisfied with the response from the Department, parents continued their protest campaign on a sporadic basis. Finally, in November 1991, these parents conducted a placard demonstration against Minister of Education and Culture Dr K Rajoo. They said that he had failed to respond to their queries about the Department's progress with the promised inquiry into the irregularities at their school (*Post Natal*, November 6-9, 1991, p.3).

Parent demands for the removal of principals also occurred at other schools. At Marburg Primary School, for example, parent allegations of misconduct against the principal reached such a high level of bitterness at an education committee meeting at the school that angry parents threatened him with violence. The police, in fact, had to be called in to investigate a 'disturbance'. To avert further disruptions at the school, the Department suspended the principal while it undertook an inquiry into the alleged misconduct (*Post Natal*, September 4-7, 1991, p.1).

A similarly militant mood was evident in another case where parents demanded the removal of the principal for alleged insensitivity towards teachers in his management of the school. The Department's investigation revealed that the allegations against the principal were without any substance. Nevertheless, some parents were so opposed to the presence of the principal at the school that they entered the school premises and shouted 'Get out, get out', outside his office (*Sunday Times Extra*, March 7, 1993, p.1). Commenting on events at his school, this principal stated that parents had 'ganged up' with 'disgruntled' teachers in campaigning for his removal from the school. He attributed teachers' use of parents to get him removed to the fact that he was 'innovative' in his management style. Teachers, in contrast, maintained that they were unwilling to work with the principal because he had allegedly called a teacher a 'cripple' after she had begun arriving late at school following a spinal operation. The principal denied this allegation. He also stated (*Sunday Times Extra*, March 7, 1993, p.1):

> For the sake of the children's education, I quietly withdrew from a volatile situation. If the chaos and intimidation I witnessed at my school is going to be the new order, then I fear for the future of education in this country... It was a sad day for me and education in a country that is moving towards democracy. Some parents kept their children away from classes. They harassed and intimidated me outside my office
window. They were unruly and chanted for me to get out.

Some parents who had not participated in this militant action against the principal claimed that the protest had 'tainted' the image of other parents who were opposed to the 'undemocratic' action of certain members of the parent community (Sunday Times Extra, March 7, 1993, p.1). The overall effect, however, was that principals were generally unable to rely on parent assistance in resolving problems at their schools (see section 4.3.1.8).

4.3.1.8 Teacher-parent interaction

Like teachers and the teacher organisation, parents and parent bodies were generally united in their rejection of the tricameral system of government. Many of the policy crises of the transition period - such as those relating to the rejection of E.C. Circular No. 2 of 1991 and merit awards in May 1993 - revealed a close parent alliance with teachers and the teacher organisation (Naicker, 1991: 8). Parents used their political and community influence to exert pressure on the Department to yield to the demands of teachers. A basic motivation in this interaction seemed to be parents' desire to bring school disruptions to a swift end (The Natal Mercury, May 18, 1993, p.1).

Indian parents, nevertheless, were polarised into two distinct groups; the larger group supportive of the teachers' protest action and the smaller opposed to it. Many parents supportive of teachers staged public protests to express their anger at the education officials, the Minister, and the government for the continuing education crisis. Parents from a school in Clare Estate in Durban, for example, held a placard demonstration on 19 May 1993 in support of their teachers; they also called for the resignation of Education and Culture Minister Mrs D Govender. In contrast, parents at Grandmore Primary School in Phoenix refused teachers entry to the school unless they halted their chalkdown (The Daily News, May 19, 1993, p.1).

4.3.2 Changes in the cultural aspects of the education system

Concurrent with changes in interpersonal relations, fundamental changes had begun to emerge in the cultural aspects of the education system. Some manifestations of this process are presented below.
4.3.2.1 Professional and political activism among superintendents of education

The Executive Director and his upper management colleagues were generally authoritarian and supportive of existing hierarchical structures (see section 4.3.1.4). In contrast, superintendents of education had begun to be more supportive of values associated with transition to democracy and transparency in decision making (see section 4.3.1.3.2) and more insistent about participation in policymaking processes (see section 4.3.3.1). Moreover, as a result of political processes in the larger society, many educators had begun to define for themselves a more active role in the political and educational changes occurring in the larger society (see section 4.3.1.3). Superintendents of education and education planners in the Indian education system, for example, expressed a strong view that they should be actively involved in the process of transforming the education system of the country into a unitary structure (APROESA, 1990b). In contrast, upper management staff seemed to prefer a bureaucratic, status quo stance (see section 4.3.1.3).

4.3.2.2 Teacher militancy and political activism

A more obvious example of the change in value systems and interpretive schemes was the increasing militancy of teachers. From 1990, Indian teachers began to adopt a militant approach in their interaction with the Department. In May 1990, for example, teachers at Stanger M L Sultan Secondary School staged a 'sit-in' to protest against the way promotions and merit achievement awards were processed by the Department (Sunday Times Extra, May 20, 1990, p.1). More specifically, one of the resolutions adopted at the 1990 annual conference of TASA empowered the organisation 'to undertake as a matter of urgency an intensive programme of socio-political conscientisation among its membership' (TASA, 1990b: 20). This resolution, in turn, was a reflection of the general thinking among a large segment of Indian teachers from the mid-1980's onwards. The teacher organisation, for example, had campaigned against Indian participation in both the 1984 and 1989 'tricameral' elections (Jaggernath, 1985; TASA, 1989b: 28). There was also a general encouragement of political activism among teachers. For example, at a seminar organised by the Umgeni Branch of TASA in February 1990, the general consensus was that there could be no neutrality in education and that teachers had to choose between joining organisations involved in 'progressive' action or passively accepting the status quo and failing to contribute to the transition to democracy (Post Natal, February 7-10, 1990, p.3).

Early in 1991, following the position adopted in 1990, the first, system-
wide 'sit-in' protest action in Indian schools was launched in protest against the R73 million cutback in the education budget, increased teaching hours, overcrowding of classroom, and rationalisation of teachers (Post Natal, February 6 - 9, 1991, p.1). Commenting on the mood of militancy, Yoganathan (1991: 4) maintained that a 'new mood of defiance' was 'sweeping through House of Delegates-run schools as once-docile Indian teachers' joined teachers of other races 'in a fight to end apartheid education.' Describing this change in greater detail, she wrote (Yoganathan, 1991: 4):

The transformation taking place in the hearts and minds of Indian teachers who once worked without openly questioning the authority of their bosses, has been as dramatic as the changes sweeping the country. As key figures in the newly launched South African Democratic Teachers' Union - which will absorb Tasa members when the Indian teacher association is disbanded - Indian teachers have taken the front line in Sadtu's battle for one education system.

Participants in teachers' protests openly admit their actions will escalate if the government does not immediately knock the last nail into the coffin of separate education.

The mood of militancy and vociferous protests now enveloping HOD-controlled education is relatively new: until seven months ago it seemed Indian teachers would not react to the turmoil in African education and the politicisation of teachers of other races.

But in February this year, in the wake of increased support for the African National Congress and its demands, the worst nightmare of Indian education bosses and parents began: for the first time in the history of Indian education, thousands of teachers took to the streets, calling for the scrapping of the HOD and the establishment of a single education department.

TASA executive member, Mr H E S Samuel explained the emergence of teacher militancy in Indian schools as follows (Yoganathan, 1991: 4):

The Indian teacher is finally taking positive action to rid himself of the shackles of apartheid education ... In the past, Indian teachers were submissive and dominated by the education department despite widespread dissatisfaction with their position and the education system in general. Therefore, parents and the community at large cannot be blamed if they regard the sudden militancy of teachers as "irresponsible behaviour", and the current political situation in the country tends only to intensify their fears... The current mood of teachers must be seen as an indication that we are moving out of the education crisis and into a democratic system where all will enjoy equal opportunities.

As a result of this attitude, protest action by Indian teachers occurred intermittently at Indian schools throughout the period of transition focussed on in this study - 2 February 1990 to 31 March 1994.

Several examples of teacher militancy have already been presented in the examples of policy problems and failures outlined above (see section 4.3.1.2). Yet another example of teacher opposition to education
policies is the rejection of the Department model of parent-teacher associations (PTAs). Up to 1991, Indian parents had a voice in the running of their schools through elected school education committees. These bodies, however, had very limited powers. In 1991 the Department revised its policy to allow parents a greater range of powers. E.C. Circular Minute BI of 1991 (DEC, 1991d) requested principals to establish PTAs at their schools in terms of the gazetted amendments to the Indians Education Act of 1965. From the outset, TASA was opposed to the Department’s view of PTAs: it rejected the Department model and called for the establishment of PTAs and Parent Teacher Student Associations (PTSAs) on the basis of guidelines published by the NECC (Naicker, 1991: 7). Despite this opposition, the Department required all principals to form PTAs in terms of the guidelines released in E.C. Circular Minute BI of 1991 (Sunday Tribune Herald, November 3, 1991, p.4).

Controversy and debate on the policy occurred at the various parents meetings called by principals in terms of E.C. Circular Minute BI of 1991 (DEC, 1991b). Teacher opposition to the policy centred on two pivotal issues. First, the constitution of the PTA was strongly parent-oriented in that they formed the majority. Second, pupil representation was absent: the Department was totally opposed to formal pupil representation on the school's governing body. Despite this, a 'large section of the community' insisted on the inclusion of pupils on these bodies (Sunday Tribune Herald, November 3, 1991, p.4). As a result, several schools established unofficial PTSAs.

In another development, some teachers who had been willing to serve on interim parent teacher associations formed in compliance with Departmental regulations withdrew from such bodies to force their dissolution. The minutes of meeting of one such parent teacher association (Risecliff Parent Teacher Association, 1992) cites the teachers' reasons for withdrawal as follows:

a. The inability of the PTA to move towards the formation of the PTSA as promised by the previous principal ... at the first meeting held to elect the members of the PTA.

b. The inability of the PTA to have any real decision making power in matters affecting the school, the pupils and the staff.

The secretary of the PTA, a member of staff, also resigned from the PTA in accordance with the decision of the staff. As a result, the body had to cease functioning because it was no longer constituted in terms of the membership requirements stipulated by the Department.
4.3.2.3 Polarisation in the values of the Department and the organised teacher body

With the liberating effect of the announcements of 2 February 1990, the already strained relationship between the organised teaching profession and the Department became polarised into a state of opposed values and professional ideologies - one basically oriented towards system maintenance and the other towards system transformation. There were three basic reasons for this. First, the Indian teacher organisation was critical of what it perceived as being political interference in education - the direct involvement of the Minister of Education and Culture in the administrative functioning of the Department (Naicker, 1990a: 8). It also rejected the legitimacy of the education department and allied itself to extra-parliamentary groups (see sections 4.3.1.2 and 4.3.1.4).

Second, the teacher organisation insisted that all education policy which affected its members had to be negotiated with it both in terms of content and implementation procedures (see section 4.3.1.2.3). Failure to do so on the part of the Department resulted in immediate refusal to implement the policy, threats of 'sit-ins' and 'chalk-downs', and general non-compliance. As a result, the Department was unable to exercise its authority in areas such as formative evaluation of teachers, supervision of teachers' work, monitoring of education standards, evaluation for promotion purposes, and co-curricular programmes without first negotiating the policy fully with the teacher organisation and gaining its approval. In critical areas such as evaluation for promotion purposes, circular minutes to schools often began with the statement that they had been negotiated with the teacher organisation to forestall opposition (see section 4.3.1.2.1 and 4.3.1.2.3).

Third, the teacher organisation saw itself as a community organisation with a responsibility far beyond the professional needs of its members. It, for example, in 1992 instituted civil proceedings to stop the appointment of Dr G K Nair, the chief director responsible for professional planning in the Department, to the position of chief executive director of the Department. When legal representatives of the Department argued that the teacher body had no 'direct or sufficient interest in the outcome of the appointment of Dr Nair,' the presiding judge, Mr Justice Combrink accepted the argument advanced by the legal counsel for TASA that (Sunday Tribune Herald, November 3, 1991, p.1):

... teachers had a direct interest to see to it that the prime facie behaviour of Dr Nair should be taken into account especially after the James Commission of Inquiry had found him to be implicated in allegations of irregularities in the allocation of text books.
Similarly, it supported parent opposition to the transport subsidy cuts and the efforts of the Department to charge pupils a fixed fee per term for transporting them to school from outlying areas where there were no schools. Its role in this sphere was summarised by Mr P Naicker (1991: 8) as follows:

The threatened curtailment of transport subsidies to special schools and training centres resulted in a mass protest march to Truro House, organised by an action committee representing special schools and training centres. TASA was fully-supportive of this initiative and called on its membership to participate wherever possible ...

When the teacher organisation was of the view that the Department had acted outside the frame of negotiated agreements in areas such as teacher promotions, it did not hesitate taking the matter to court and publicising its position in newspaper advertisements (e.g. Post Natal, January 29 - February 1, 1992, p.12; TASA, 1992: 12).

4.3.3 Changes in the structural aspects of the education system

With each policy crisis, the Department was forced into a process of negotiations with the teacher organisation and parent bodies to restore stability in schools. Generally, in such negotiations the Department was in a weak bargaining position because of the widespread rejection of the tricameral system and the legitimacy of its structures. As a result, with each policy concession by the Department, there was a gradual shift in power and gradual structural accommodation. Each of the policy crises noted above produced changes in structural aspects of the system (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.3, and 4.3.1.4). Alterations in value systems and the general increase in power struggles produced adjustments in the structure of the education system because of the complex, multivariate nature of relationships among policy actors, their value systems, their power resources, and the turbulent environment (see sections 4.3.1.4 and 4.3.1.6). This pattern of change is also evident in the insistence of superintendents of education and the organised teacher body that they have a decision-making voice in the policy process.

4.3.3.1 Superintendent of education insistence on a decision-making voice

The demand of superintendents of education that they be consulted in policymaking is best illustrated in their response to the restructuring
of the Department in 1990/1991. The restructuring of the Department, which came to be referred to as a 'matrix system' of management was proposed by the Minister of Education and Culture Dr Rajoo, in October 1990 and accepted by the Management Committee of the education department (Management Committee, DEC, 1990).

At a meeting of APROESA in November 1990, a month after the executive decision to adopt the 'matrix system', the chairperson outlined in detail the staff association's efforts to elicit information from the Acting Chief Executive Director with regard to the restructuring of the Department. He reported that when some information had finally been released to the association, it had expressed its dissatisfaction to the Acting Chief Executive Director over the fact that APROESA had not been consulted on the restructuring. In the discussion that followed at the staff association meeting, some of the points raised by members were (APROESA, 1990a):

- The process of restructuring should be rejected.
- The decision to restructure was not based on democratic decision making.
- Being made accountable to several 'directorates' (as a result of 'matrix' structuring) could produce dilution of effort and a drop in quality of work and productivity.
- The objectives for the restructuring were not clearly defined.
- 'Bureaucratic' practices would increase and stifle creativity within the education department.
- The system had very real potential for conflict among members of the different "directorates" as each 'directorate' would pursue its own goals.
- APROESA should insist on being consulted on policy decisions that affected the membership as a whole.

The discussion of the pros and cons of the restructuring of the Department led to two resolutions being forwarded to the Chief Executive Director. The first resolution expressed a total rejection of 'the process of restructuring of the Department as presently undertaken as well as the design in its present form.' The second resolution, adopting a positive, proactive stance, maintained:

... any restructuring of the Department must be undertaken with due recognition given to the following guiding principles:
- Intensive research into the present structure and projected design;
- Extensive negotiations between and among all interested parties;
- The proposed model must be one that is exposed to full discussion before implementation.

At a meeting between the Executive Committee of the Department and the executive members of the staff association that followed, the second resolution was accepted and APROESA undertook to make recommendations for the final model. By the end of 1990, the staff association made its submission to the Acting Chief Executive Director in the form of a concise report, which began with these remarks (APROESA, 1990c: 1):

The Association readily accepts the fact that all organisations are regularly faced with the need to assess the effectiveness of their structures and, if necessary, to initiate some form of re-organising to meet new environmental challenges. The Association also completely accepts the fact that, undertaken successfully, the process of re-organising brings together the basic human and material resources in an orderly fashion and re-arranges people in a new pattern so that they can perform their tasks and responsibilities more effectively and efficiently.

The process of re-organising, however, is fraught with problems and pitfalls when it is undertaken without intensive examination of the interplay of elements in the changed environment, without careful analysis of the specific costs and benefits that may flow from each component in the change, without adequate concern for the great anxiety, stress and instability any new structure generates in the organisation's members and without full and frank negotiation with all the parties concerned. It is the general belief that these criteria for successful re-organising had not been adequately met that makes the Association less than optimistic about the intended change.

The association also found 'disturbing' the fact that:

... there seems to be no clear and comprehensive definition of the Department's overall goals or how existing goals have been affected by changes in the environment or the precise nature of the fit between organisational goals, the proposed structure and the changed environment.

The association also warned that with '18 functional units in the proposed structure', there was the real danger of goal diffuseness, organisational instability, coordination difficulties, job dissatisfaction and low staff morale, power struggles among the different 'functional units', and a work environment which was likely to be 'intensely stressful'.

Disregarding the submission made by APROESA, the Minister and the Acting Chief Executive Director finalised the restructuring of the Department to make its 'management structure ... more responsive to change' (Fiat Lux, 1991: 8). This reorganisation, which drew on matrix organisation principles, resulted in the creation of 15 'functional units', each directly accountable to the Executive Committee and the Acting Chief
Executive Director.

The restructured Department functioned for the whole of 1991. However, by the end of 1991, some of the possible dysfunctions of the restructuring noted in the submission made by APROESA at the end of 1990 began to surface. At the end of 1991 the association undertook a full evaluation of the 'matrix system'. The system, nevertheless, was allowed to function for the greater part of 1992. However, by the end of 1992 it was evident that the 'matrix system' had not been a successful effort at coping with the pressures of change. Therefore at the beginning of 1993, with Dr Rajoo's departure as Minister of Education and Culture, the Department reverted to its pre-transition organisational structure.

The conflict between superintendents and upper management over the restructuring of the Department revealed the increasing independence of superintendents of education and their willingness to oppose the hierarchical authority of the Minister and the Chief Executive Director. There is also a suggestion that their resistance to the policy was partly a product of their not being consulted and partly a result of the fact that it emanated from the Minister. Similarly, the Chief Executive Director seems to have supported the policy despite resistance from his junior staff because it emanated from the Minister. As a result, as soon as the Minister of Education and Culture lost his office in 1993 in a cabinet reshuffle, there was a reversion to the pre-transition head office structure. By now, however, superintendents of education had moved yet further apart from upper management in the education department (see section 4.3.1.3).

4.3.3.2 The organised teacher body insistence on a decision-making voice

As early as 1988, TASA expressed its dissatisfaction with an inadequate decision-making voice in all matters 'relating to important policies and procedures' (Samuels, 1988a: 8). As a result, the organisation decided to 'investigate the feasibility of union status' for itself and the need for mobilising teachers for purposes of 'concerned action', for holding 'mass teacher meetings' for launching a 'publicity campaign' to highlight deficiencies in education, and for mobilising 'the community in education matters.' As a result of the implementation of some of these strategies, the teacher organisation was often consulted by the Department but not accorded full decision-making status (see sections 4.3.1.2.1, 4.3.1.2.3, and 4.3.1.4.2).

However, by the beginning of 1990, the general dissatisfaction at inadequate consultation had become widespread. Finally, on 18 May 1990,
TASA embarked on its first campaign of defiance of the Department's authority (see section 4.3.1.4.2). At a mass meeting attended by more than 1600 members, the teacher association registered its opposition to the 'secret' evaluation method and resolved that it should call on all members to refuse any interaction with superintendents of education who visited their schools for the purpose of conducting evaluations for promotions, merit awards and confirmation of probationary appointment (Sunday Times Extra, May 20, 1990, p.1; Naicker, 1990: 9). TASA's National Council which met on 19 May 1990 further resolved to call membership to march to the offices of the Chief Executive Director to present the resolution (Naicker, 1990a: 9).

The Chief Executive Director's initial response to the decision taken at the mass meeting of 18 May 1990 - to bar superintendents of education from classrooms and to refuse co-operation with them - was a warning that such conduct would lead to immediate disciplinary action (Sunday Times Extra, May 27, 1990, p.1). The Department's spokesman said:

Unless there is a change in the entire education system, Tasa nor anybody for that matter can bar superintendents from the schools. A teacher is expected to accord the superintendent all the necessary assistance to enable him to arrive at an objective and accurate assessment.

Opposing this view, Mr P Naicker (Sunday Times Extra, May 27, 1990, p.1) said that he expected all members to adhere to the resolution of TASA to refuse superintendents of education admission to the classrooms for evaluation purposes. Moreover, abiding by the decision of the National Council meeting of 19 May 1990, 'a historic march' to the offices of the education department took place on 1 June 1990 with more than 5 000 protesting teachers participating (Naicker, 1990: 9).

Flowing from this mass action, at a meeting held on 6 June 1990, Mr A K Singh, the Chief Executive Director, (Sunday Times Extra, June 10, 1990, p.1) informed TASA's national executive committee that the Department was reviewing the current method of evaluation: he handed the TASA executive a copy of the Department's proposal for a revised system and stated that the final decision on the matter would only be taken when inputs had been received from the teacher association. TASA, however, rejected the proposed system in its entirety. On 16 August 1990 both parties met to negotiate a mutually acceptable interim evaluation system for 1990.

As a result, on 28 August 1990, the Department issued another circular - E.C. Circular Minute DA of 1990 (DEC, 1990e) - which spelt out the interim evaluation procedures that had been accepted by both sides. In its opening paragraph, this circular assured all applicants that the revised procedures to be used in 1990 had received the approval of TASA. It began as follows:
The Department of Education and Culture and the Teacher Association of South Africa (TASA) have jointly determined a set of interim procedures for the evaluation of applicants for the filling of promotion posts as advertised per Circular Minute BM of 1990.

This set the pattern for the negotiation of all further policy decisions that affected teachers: the teacher body was not prepared to accept a subordinate role. Open defiance by teachers led to the Department granting the organised teacher body power in consultation and negotiation of affected policies (see section 4.3.1.2.3).

4.3.4 Analysis

4.3.4.1 Support for the hypothesis

The historical data relating to the alterations in the interpersonal, cultural, and structural aspects of the system during the transition years suggest an underlying pattern of processes supportive of the hypothesis advanced in Chapter 1 (see section 1.2.2).

4.3.4.1.1 Fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence in interpersonal relations among policy actors

The historical data suggests that emergent conflicts among policy actors led to a general fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence in interpersonal relations. This may be discerned in:

- As the transition process gained momentum, emergent conflicts in the larger society were replicated on a micro-scale in the various arenas of the education system, producing fundamental alterations in the interaction among policy actors (see section 4.3.1). The fragmentation occurred in a rapid, cascading manner perhaps as a result of the relative smallness of the Indian education system and the resultant proximity between one group and another.

- The education system began to reveal clearly defined groupings based on value differences, political orientation, and power resources. While upper management tended to be supportive of the status quo, superintendents of education displayed increasing support for values of democracy and transparency. Teachers displayed a new mood of militancy and political activism and openly defied the authority of
the Department and its officials. Parents, too, became a part of this change: with a few notable exceptions, they formed new alliances with teachers in exerting pressure on principals and attacking the Department (see sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2).

4.3.4.1.2 Heightening of value conflicts and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes

The fragmentation in the interpersonal relations was itself partly a result of a general heightening of value conflicts and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes. This may be noted in:

• While the education department focussed attention on the efficient functioning of the system despite reduced financial resources, teachers were concerned with political and teacher organisation priorities (see sections 4.3.1.2.2 and 4.3.1.2.3).

• While the Minister saw his actions as contributing to 'excellence in education', the Chief Executive Director and the organised teacher body saw it as being 'political interference' (see sections 4.3.1.1, and 4.3.1.2).

• Both superintendents of education and teachers began to adopt new values that contributed to conflict with upper management and the Minister of Education and Culture (see sections 4.3.1.3 and 4.3.1.4).

• The organised teacher body encouraged political engagement among Indian teachers and the defiance of the education department (see section 4.3.2.2).

4.3.4.1.3 Influence of perceived self-interest

Many of the policy crises that occurred during the transition years suggest that policy implementation is influenced by the perceived self-interest of policy actors rather than by substantive aspects of policies themselves. While this is true of any policy implementation situation, during a period of societal transition the operation of perceived self-interest is likely to be more pronounced as individuals and individual groups of policy actors seek to gain organisational acceptance of their emergent value priorities, struggle to expand and entrench their new power resources, and act vigorously to increase their work benefits (see section 6.3.2.4). This pattern of processes is suggested in:
In the policy crisis relating to 'merit' achievement awards, despite the fact that the organised teacher body had made manifest its opposition to the policy, individual members deviated from the union position because of monetary and career benefits (see section 4.3.1.2.3).

The 'pens-down' protest by superintendents of education during the May 1993 chalkdown in Indian schools was the outcome, at least in part, of a perceived damage to their professional standing in the eyes of school-based educators because of the suggestion that they had contributed to the crisis by negligence during the implementation process (see section 4.3.1.3.1).

Parents' support of teachers against principals and the Department was partly the result of their concern about frequent interruptions in the education of their children. They exerted pressure on the Department to yield to teacher demands so that school disruptions may be kept to a minimum. The actual merits of education policies were not the basis of their response. They also did not seek to establish the validity of teacher opposition to policies (see sections 4.3.1.4.1, 4.3.1.5, 4.3.1.6, and 4.3.1.7).

Teacher opposition to the formation of PTAs in terms of Departmental policy was partly due to the perception that the teacher voice would be overwhelmed if parents were in the majority on these structures (see section 4.3.2.2).

Teacher opposition to superintendents of education was designed to free teachers from the control of the Department. Moreover, open defiance by teachers of the authority of the education department despite the threat of disciplinary action was partly a result of an awareness that the organised teacher body would use all its resources to protect its members and partly the result of a recognition that their resistance to control was invested with an aura of political legitimacy (see section 4.3.1.4.2).

4.3.4.1.4 Alterations in power relations among policy actors and structural adjustments

Conflicts and tensions in the system and accommodative responses by the education department produced both alterations in the power relations among policy actors and adjustments in structural aspects of the system. This pattern of alterations in the system may be noted in:

- The 'pens-down' protest (see section 4.3.1.3.1) occurring in the
midst of a larger confrontation between the Minister of Education and Culture and the education department on the one hand and the organised teacher body on the other had five structural impacts:

- It reinforced the professional autonomy of superintendents of education.
- It weakened the authority linkages within the Department.
- It made visible the informal power of superintendents of education and their willingness to exercise it collectively to secure group objectives.
- It revealed a shift among superintendents of education towards the value position of teachers.
- It established their identity as a group apart from the corporate identity of the Department.

• The relation between the Department and teachers underwent a radical alteration in power resources, a situation which generated fundamental structural impacts:

- It led to general absence of policy control and teacher supervision functions (see section 4.3.1.4.2).
- It increased the professional autonomy of individual teachers (see section 4.3.1.4.2).
- It increased the organised teacher body's ability to force the Department to retract and terminate unpopular policies (see section 4.3.1.4.1).

• In each policy crisis, the Department was forced to retreat from its position to avert continued disruption of schools (see sections 4.3.1.2.3, 4.3.1.3.1, 4.3.1.3.2, and 4.3.1.4.1).

• When the situation involved principal-teacher and principal-parent conflicts, the Department often yielded by transferring the principal (see section 4.3.1.6.2) or suspending the principal (see section 4.3.1.7). The overall effect was that principals felt that they could not depend on the Department for support in school-level conflicts and thus tended to develop an accommodative relationship with their staff (see section 4.3.1.6).

• The polarisation of values between upper management and the various policy actors at lower levels in the system was generally in terms of values oriented towards system maintenance and values oriented
towards system transformation. Structural adjustments occurred at points where conflicts and tensions occurred in the system (see sections 4.3.1.4.1, 4.3.2.2, and 4.3.2.3).

4.3.4.1.5 General weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages

With each education crisis and policy failure, structural changes occurred as a result of fundamental value differences and altered power relations. At the macro-level this was evident in altered patterns of relationship between upper management and superintendents of education and upper management and the organised teacher body (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.3, and 4.3.1.4). At the micro-level, there was a general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages as a result of teachers' insistence on decision-making powers and acceptance of their value orientation (see sections 4.3.1.6, 4.3.1.7, and 4.3.2.2). The fragmentation of the once stable cultural and value context of the Indian education department thus not only contributed to increasing conflict among policy actors but to structural changes. For the system as a whole this had the effect of further de-coupling the components of an already loosely coupled system.

The crisis that followed the implementation of E.C. Circular Minute No. 2 of 1991 (see section 4.3.1.4.1) well illustrates this process:

- The implementation of the policy produced a rapid fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence in interpersonal relations among policy actors through emergent conflicts and tensions.

- The heightening of value conflicts and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes was evident in:
  - the rational-bureaucratic stance of the education department as opposed to the unionist stance of the organised teacher body
  - the overtly political stance of the organised teacher body which demanded the dissolution of the tricameral system of government and the establishment of a unitary department of education
  - the anti-Department position generally adopted by parents and the community organisations and their support of teacher militancy.

- The crisis rapidly became an arena for teacher and parent attack on the legitimacy of the education department and for a larger campaign against government structures.
Elements of perceived self-interest were evident in that teachers were resisting an increase in their work load and the 'haunting spectre' of retrenchments. Thus the professionally and politically saturated surface structure of the protest also had a deep structure that reflected a concern to protect the work advantages of the past.

The conflict reflected a power struggle between the Department and the organised teacher body, a struggle which saw a reduction in the Department's authority over its schools and an acceptance by it of the need to consult and negotiate with teachers.

The crisis also pointed to the fact that policies which seek to impose controls on the teacher's sphere of work are likely to elicit resistance from this group (see sections 4.3.1.3.2 and 5.3.3.1).

4.3.4.2 Modification and elaboration of the hypothesis

The historical data also suggests a need to modify and elaborate the hypothesis to include the significance of policy content and policy quality, the relevance of political interference and political pressure, and the operation of bias and favouritism in policy implementation.

4.3.4.2.1 Influence of policy content

The data suggests that policy content acted as a significant variable in the response of educators during the implementation phase. This may be discerned in:

- Policies that sought to increase the workload of teachers were strongly resisted (see section 4.3.1.4.1).

- Policies that were directed at reducing the general autonomy of teachers were also strongly resisted (see section 4.3.1.4.2).

4.3.4.2.2 Relative unimportance of quality of policy

The data suggests that the substantive quality of education policies was seldom the focal issue. Often attack on education policies were motivated by self-interest and pursuit of teacher union and political goals. This may be noted in:
Resistance to E.C. Circular 2 of 1991 swiftly became a campaign of attack on the tricameral system of government and a call for the dissolution of the system. There was no objective analysis of the merits of the policy nor its efforts to address the problem of reduced education funding from the central government. Efforts by the Department to present the 'facts' to the public were strongly opposed by the teacher body (see section 4.3.1.4.1).

The chalkdown in May 1993 flowed from the teacher union's opposition to 'merit' awards. Again, there was no effort to examine the quality of the policy nor its contribution to teaching excellence. For the teacher union, the crisis became a political programme of action and sanctioning of recalcitrant members. Again efforts to present the 'facts' to the public did not alter the shape of the education crisis (see section 4.3.1.2.3).

4.3.4.2.3 Impact of political interference and political pressure

The politics of the tricameral system of government played a significant role in the policy implementation process. This may be discerned in:

- The conflict between the Minister of Education and Culture and the Chief Executive Director in 1990 stemmed from the active role of the former in the educational administration and policy implementation sphere (see section 4.3.1.1).

- The conflict between the Minister and the organised teacher body also emanated from the latter's opposition to what it perceived to be 'political interference' in the functioning of the education department (see section 4.3.1.2).

- The teacher organisation itself used the policy implementation process as an arena for contestation of political values and political priorities, using each policy crisis as a platform to attack the legitimacy of the education department, to campaign for a dissolution of the tricameral system of government, and to call for the establishment of a unitary department of education (see sections 4.3.1.4.1 and 4.3.2.2).

- Upper management tended to yield to the pressure exerted by the Minister of Education and Culture, even if this meant policy conflict with lower level personnel (see section 4.3.3.1). There is, however, also a suggestion that upper management sought to avoid political pressure and to undermine Ministerial authority by not keeping the
Minister fully informed about policy outcomes and developments in the education system (see section 4.3.1.2.3).

- Ministers of Education and Culture in the House of Delegates seem to have been motivated to exert political pressure on the system because of the political criticism and attack directed at them in parliamentary debates of education crises (see section 4.3.1.2.3).

**4.3.4.2.4 Operation of bias and favouritism in policy implementation**

Some of the conflict among policy actors in the system was, at least in part, due to the perception of bias and favouritism in policy implementation. This may be noted in:

- The public confrontation between the Minister of Education and Culture and the Chief Executive Director in 1990 was due to the latter's perception that he was being instructed to implement decisions which could be construed to be acts of favouritism (see section 4.3.1.1).

- The teacher organisation's opposition to evaluation by superintendents of education was partly due to the 'secrecy' of the method and a fear of victimisation by Departmental officials (see sections 4.3.1.2.1 and 4.3.1.4.2).

**4.4 CONCLUSION**

The primary purpose in this chapter has been to provide a brief historical report of education policy implementation in the Indian education system. In the process, attention has also been directed at discovering a pattern in the stream of policy events and policy crises. The historical data, indeed, is strongly supportive of the hypothesis advanced in this study: policy implementation was accompanied by a general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages; it reflected a general fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence of the system through emergent conflicts; it produced a general heightening of value conflicts and an emergence of competing interpretive schemes; it was influenced, at times, by the perceived self-interest of policy actors; and it produced fundamental alterations in power relations and resultant structural adjustments at the points of conflict and tension. The various policy crises also suggested that quality of policy proposals
was not the basis of dispute. Often the policy implementation process served as an arena for contestation of values, political ideologies, and power resources.
CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY: QUESTIONNAIRE
AND STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 Outline of chapter

This chapter shall present the findings based on the questionnaire and the structured interview used in this study. Like Chapter 4, this chapter shall focus on education system impacts associated with policy implementation in a society in transition. Attention shall be directed at alterations in the interpersonal, cultural, and structural aspects of the system. In the course of analysing the findings relating to each of these categories of changes, the researcher shall also examine the validity of the hypothesis presented in Chapter 1 (see section 1.2.2).

5.1.2 Questionnaire and structured interview

Administered at the end of 1992 and the beginning of 1993, the questionnaire (see Appendix 3) was completed and returned by 532 respondents, comprising 321 teachers, 128 heads of department, 11 deputy principals, 45 principals, 6 superintendents of education (management), and 21 superintendents of education (academic). The demographic data relating to these respondents are presented in Appendix 2.

The structured interview was administered mainly in February and March 1993. The objectives of the interview were both to increase the validity of the data collated via the case study and the questionnaire and to explore in greater depth some of the areas incorporated in the questionnaire (see Appendix 4). There were 57 interviewees who participated in the study, comprising 17 teachers, 16 heads of department, 4 deputy principals, 10 principals, 4 superintendents of education (management) and 6 superintendents of education (academic).
The demographic data relating to these interviewees are presented in Appendix 2.

While the questionnaire was structured to elicit quantitative data, the structured interview was designed to elicit qualitative data and to establish the general background of attitudes and views relating to policy implementation in an education system in a society in transition and to present the feeling of movement, human drama, and tensions that characterise an organisation located in a turbulent, densely-textured environment.

5.1.3 Description of findings

Basic quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods such as counting, sorting, and combining of items were used in uncovering patterns in the responses. As the educator component of the education system is structured hierarchically and as policy implementation involves varying degrees of control and coordination by superordinate officials, the researcher also crosstabulated the data with the position of the participants in the study. For this purpose, both samples were divided into four position-based sub-samples:

1. Teachers (i.e. Level 1 educators)
2. Heads of department
3. School-based senior management (i.e. deputy principals, acting principals and principals)
4. Superintendents of education (management and academic).

The responses of these four groups were compared to uncover the ways in which their angle of vision and value systems affected the policymaking and policy implementation processes.

To facilitate cross-referencing with items in the questionnaire and the structured interview schedule, the researcher has used the numbers in the right hand margin of both these documents. These numbers refer to the column location of an item on the 80-column computer analysis format used during data analysis (see section 3.4.5). As more than 80-columns were required for the items in the questionnaire, there is a second series of numbers ranging from 5 to 48 in the latter section of this instrument. These items are distinguished from the first set of items with similar numbers by a slash followed by 2. Thus 'item 48' refers to the first item with this column identification in the right hand margin and 'item
48/2' refers to the second item listed as 48 in the right hand margin of the questionnaire (see Appendix 3).

Finally, in the description of findings, comments made by interviewees during the clarification of their scaled responses have been quoted to illustrate the views and feelings of different groups of policy actors on specific issues (see section 3.4.5.2).

5.2 POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN A SYSTEM IN TRANSITION

During the structured interview respondents were asked the following question (item 17):

To what extent has the pace of social and political change in the country affected the implementation of educational policies in our schools?

Interviewees were first required to respond on a 5-point scale ranging from 'To a very great extent' (1) to 'Not at all' (5).

All 57 of the interviewees in the sample were quite emphatic in their belief that the transition processes in the larger society had affected education policy implementation in Indian schools. Of the 57 respondents, 94,74 percent indicated that education policy implementation had been affected 'to a very great extent' and 5,26 percent that it had done so 'to a great extent.' That education policy implementation processes are affected by the pace of social and political change in the larger society was thus strongly borne out by the response of interviewees.

In the comments that expanded on this response, interviewees consistently expressed the view that the processes of political and social transition were directly responsible for the problems of policy implementation in the education system. Many interviewees also expressed the view that the social and political changes in the larger society had produced a general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages in the system. A head of department, for example, voiced this comment:

Not a sphere of school life has been spared by the pace of change in the world outside. But the change in our schools has not been a positive one: the order and stability that once characterised our schools is gone. In its place we have a rejection of authority, a weakening of education goals, a support of political activism in our schools, and a general intimidation of anyone opposed to the union.

The politicisation of Indian educators was often noted by interviewees as one of the most visible changes reflective of a fragmentation of pre-
transition coherence in interpersonal relations among policy actors through emergent conflicts and tensions. It was also identified as one of the significant indicators of alterations in the cultural context of policy actors and the resultant heightening of value conflicts and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes (see sections 4.3.2.2 and 4.3.2.3). It was frequently perceived by interviewees as being the intervening variable between the changing social and political environment and the problems of education policy implementation in Indian schools during the transition period. Policy resistance thus was often identified as being due to political motives rather than specific opposition to the quality of the policy (see sections 5.3.2.2 and 5.3.2.3).

First, there was open defiance of Departmental officials and senior management staff. A head of department, for example, noted:

The level of political activity among educators in our schools has increased dramatically to keep pace with the changes outside. One of the less pleasant side effects of this is that educators now openly defy officials and senior school administrators on many key policy issues.

Second, there was frequent questioning of the political and educational basis and validity of education policies issued by the Department. Commenting on this, a principal stated:

The fabric of our education system has been torn to shreds by anti-HOD forces which have become more vociferous as the political changes have increased in our country. With this, policy implementation has become adversely affected. Teachers have become more questioning, the union more willing to exercise its powers to halt certain policies, and public opinion more hostile.

Third, there was the emergence of teacher militancy and teacher unionism in the Indian education system, a development that produced a new interpretive scheme for teachers, one that challenged the authority structures and value systems of the past. Commenting on this development, a deputy principal expressed this view:

The whole system reflects the pace of change in the larger social-political system. Order in our schools has collapsed. Level 1 educators and the union now run our schools. In many schools principals are intimidated by the sheer problem of managing in this period of uncertainty.

Evident in these comments and in the sample as a whole was a distinct difference in tone and posture adopted by different groups of interviewees. Those belonging to the management ranks were generally critical of the destabilising influence the changes in the larger society had had on Indian education system and the policy implementation process in Indian schools. The coherence and functioning of the system in terms of established norms and practices of the past were no longer possible:
there was a heightening of value conflicts and change in power relations. A tone of criticism and anger at this change is clearly evident in this comment by a superintendent of education:

To say that our system has become chaotic in the last few years is to put it mildly. All that gave our system stability has crumbled. Conflict in our schools is common; principals have lost the will to lead; achievement of education goals is now a very low priority among teachers who have made the achievement of political goals central to their vision of the future.

Teachers, in contrast, saw the pace of change as a politically liberating influence. This comment of a teacher captures the sense of political purpose and optimism:

The pace of change has set us free from the claustrophobic control of the Department. We are now free to challenge the legitimacy of the Department and its officials; we are now free to examine the hidden agenda of the curriculum; and we are free to fight for a unitary, democratic education system.

These two views are also suggestive of the widespread agreement among participants in this study about the general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages, the increased loosely coupled, almost anarchic, chaotic functioning of the system, and the general problems of policy implementation and policy outcomes in a system in transition.

5.3 EDUCATION SYSTEM IMPACTS

There was a general consensus among interviewees and respondents that education policy implementation against a background of transition in the larger society had produced alterations in the interpersonal, cultural, and structural features of the education system.

5.3.1 Changes in interpersonal relations among policy actors

5.3.1.1 The education department and key stakeholders

The interaction between the education department and key stakeholders such as parents and educators was generally perceived to be negative, with the Department labelled as being insensitive and inconsiderate. Thus of the 532 respondents in the questionnaire sample, 72.32 percent
generally disagreed with the view that the Department acted 'responsibly and in the best interests of all educators, pupils and parents in its policymaking and policy implementation duties' (item 58).

The position of respondents had a statistically significant impact on the pattern of responses. Table 5.1 presents the differences in perception.

Table 5.1 Distribution of responses for item on Departmental effectiveness in policymaking and policy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM 58</th>
<th>1 N = 321</th>
<th>2 N = 128</th>
<th>3 N = 56</th>
<th>4 N = 27</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46,26</td>
<td>27,21</td>
<td>15,65</td>
<td>10,88</td>
<td>27,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,25</td>
<td>31,25</td>
<td>41,07</td>
<td>59,25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65,63</td>
<td>22,92</td>
<td>8,59</td>
<td>2,86</td>
<td>72,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78,75</td>
<td>68,75</td>
<td>58,93</td>
<td>40,74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60,26</td>
<td>24,11</td>
<td>10,55</td>
<td>5,08</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Position-based sub-samples: 1 = teachers; 2 = heads of department; 3 = school-based senior management; 4 = superintendents of education.

p < .0001 with 3 df.

Teachers were generally negative in their response with 78,75 percent of them being critical of the Department. The percentage of respondents disagreeing gradually diminishes with 68,75 percent of heads of department, 58,93 percent of school-based senior management, and 40,74 percent of superintendents of education falling into this category. The steady reduction in the level of disagreement suggests that the relationship between the education department and lower level participants was generally negative and sharply polarised. There is also the suggestion that upper management were influenced by priorities different from those of educators lower in the hierarchy.

5.3.1.2 The education department and communication with school-level policy actors

Because the communication of policies may influence the policy
Table 5.2 Distribution of responses for items that focussed on the communication of policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) (3 df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 532</td>
<td>N = 321</td>
<td>N = 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Departmental circulars are clear and unambiguous.</td>
<td>38.53</td>
<td>61.47</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Departmental circulars need superintendents of education to clarify their aims and procedures.</td>
<td>53.48</td>
<td>46.52</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Superintendents of education speed up the communication process by verbal interaction.</td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. With respect to the specific responses of teachers (group 1), heads of department (group 2), school-based senior management (group 3), and superintendents of education (group 4), the table only reflects percentages relating to AGREEMENT with the items.

2. Responses were on a 6-point scale ranging from 'Strongly agree' (1) to 'Strongly disagree' (6). Here and elsewhere in this chapter responses 1, 2, 3 were recoded as 'Agree' and 4, 5, 6 as 'Disagree'. These recoded responses were used in computing the chi-square statistics.

3. The chi-square was computed for four groups using a 2 x 4 table. This approach has also been used for all tables where the responses of the four sub-samples are compared.
implementation process, several items sought to establish general perceptions on this matter. Table 5.2 presents a summary of responses to three items (52, 55, 60) which centred attention on this issue. An examination of the table shows that 61.47 percent of the respondents disagreed with the view that Departmental circulars were clear and unambiguous. Following from this, it would seem, 53.48 percent of respondents noted the practice of calling upon superintendents of education to explain the 'underlying aims and procedures' presented in Departmental circulars. Together these items suggest the possibility of significant variations in the grasp of policy goals and procedures. They also hint at the likelihood that many educators did not appreciate the relevance of policy changes nor implement them in the manner intended by the policymakers.

Table 5.2 also summarises statistically significant position-based differences and also presents the statistical significance level of the differences. An examination of the table indicates clearly that teachers and heads of department generally perceived the communication of policies as being less effective than did school-based senior management staff and superintendents of education. These differences also suggest the emergence of differences in the definition of situations among policy actors. While the former were influenced by a general rejection of the legitimacy of the system, the latter were influenced by managerial priorities such as retaining in the education system coherence and functioning consistent with their values and managerial priorities (see section 5.2).

5.3.1.3 Conflict and division among Department level policy actors

To establish changes in the interaction pattern among policy actors at Departmental level, the researcher introduced two items into the questionnaire to elicit information on this issue. Table 5.3 presents the distribution of responses for these items.

The table reveals widespread agreement that special interest groups and sub-groups had emerged in the Department, each competing with others for special advantages and control. There was thus the likelihood that many Departmental officials showed greater loyalty to individual and group goals than to organisational goals and priorities. This situation may also have been aggravated by the generally negative perception of upper management among superintendents of education (see sections 4.3.1.3 and 5.3.2.1).
Table 5.3 Distribution of responses for items that focused on conflict and division among Department level policy actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>N = 72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/2</td>
<td>Groups are becoming more vocal in support of their special goals.</td>
<td>86.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/2</td>
<td>In-fighting and competition for control are on the increase.</td>
<td>81.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The position of respondents did not impact significantly on the pattern of responses. There was, indeed, general unanimity among principals and superintendents of education in their response to both the items in Table 5.3.

5.3.1.4 General rejection of superintendents of education by school-based educators

Table 5.4 presents a distribution of responses for items that focussed on superintendents of education. An examination of responses indicates that 73.68 percent of the respondents did not believe that these officials possessed knowledge and expertise that could imbue them with legitimacy in the exercise of their functions. Faced with this situation, it would seem that many resorted to the use of their authority and their ability to grant 'special benefits' to elicit co-operation during the policy implementation process.

Table 5.4 also notes the position-based differences in the pattern of responses and presents their statistical significance. A study of these group differences suggests that superintendents of education were generally perceived negatively by school-based educators, especially by those in lower ranks. Many school-based senior management staff also seemed to align themselves with teachers and heads of department. Superintendents of education did not seem to see this.

In the final section of the questionnaire the attention of principals and superintendents of education was again directed to the impact of the
Table 5.4  Distribution of responses for items that focussed on superintendents of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
<th></th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th></th>
<th>\chi^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 532</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 df)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>SE's elicit co-operation during policy implementation through use of rewards.</td>
<td>52.64</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>54.86</td>
<td>61.72</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Departmental officials are highly competent.</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>27.34</td>
<td>33.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>SE's instruct subordinates to carry out their instructions.</td>
<td>52.73</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>55.12</td>
<td>41.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>SE's speed up policy communication through verbal interaction.</td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>47.66</td>
<td>67.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: With respect to the specific responses of teachers (group 1), heads of department (group 2), school-based senior management (group 3), and superintendents of education (group 4), the table only reflects percentages relating to AGREEMENT with the items.
reduced role of superintendents of education in Indian schools. They were required to respond to an item (41/2) which expressed the view that the policy implementation duties of principals were affected by the reduced role of superintendents of education. Of the 72 respondents in the senior management sub-sample, 69.44 percent agreed with the view that principals found it more difficult to execute their policy implementation responsibilities without the regular, visible support of the superintendent of education. The response to this item, however, also revealed statistically significant differences in the responses of principals and superintendents of education (p < .01). While 57.78 percent of principals agreed that their policy implementation tasks had become difficult with the reduced role of superintendents of education, 88.89 percent of superintendents of education did so. This difference points to two possibilities. First, many principals may have been unwilling to admit that they were experiencing management difficulties (see section 4.3.1.6). Second, most superintendents of education, adopting a system-wide perception, may have been convinced that their reduced monitoring and general evaluative functions had produced problems for principals.

To probe more deeply the attitude of school-based educators towards superintendents of education, interviewees were asked the following question during the structured interview (item 7):

In recent years teachers have strongly reacted against evaluation of their work by superintendents of education. What would you say is the extent of this opposition?

Interviewees first responded on a 6-point scale ranging from 'No opposition' (1) to 'Very strong opposition' (6).

All 57 of the interviewees indicated that there was widespread teacher opposition to superintendents of education (see section 4.3.1.4.2). The mean response of 4.81 with a standard deviation of 0.99 on a 6-point scale also testified to the fact that responses were concentrated at the 'strong' and 'very strong opposition' end of the scale. This general response, however, was modified by position-based differences that were statistically significant (p < .05). While 76.47 percent of teachers rated the level of opposition as 5 and 6 (strong and very strong opposition), 56.25 percent of heads of department, 64.29 percent of school-based senior management, and 20.00 percent of superintendents of education did so. With the responses of school-based educators tending to cluster together, there is the suggestion that superintendents of education tended to underrate the extent of the opposition to their monitoring and evaluative role.

However, in the discussion that followed, several superintendents of education acknowledged the opposition to their presence in schools. They attributed this opposition to teacher militancy, teacher insistence on
their professionalism, and the negative image that subject advisors had acquired over the years. One superintendent of education (academic) voiced his perception of the problem in these words:

No teacher has been seen in the classroom by me since 1991. This is largely due to opposition by educators to this form of evaluation. Yet my subject requires classroom visitation to truly establish outcomes and teaching success.

Some superintendents of education (academic) attributed the opposition to their presence in schools to the image of superintendents of education. One of them expressed his thoughts in these words:

Where there is much resistance to superintendents of education, I believe this is due to the image that superintendents have acquired over the years of being prescriptive bureaucrats. The reality of professional interaction which is true of our conduct today is denied.

Principals, deputy principals, heads of department, and teachers in the sample also touched upon the image of superintendents of education in their comments. A principal, for example, stated his opinion on the matter as follows:

When I think of my own years as a teacher whose work was regularly examined by subject advisors, of the tension and pain it caused me, I am not surprised at the attitude of teachers today. With the power of the union behind them, they can fearlessly reject superintendents of education. I do not agree with the total rejection but I can understand it.

The image of superintendents of education being authoritarian, prescriptive, and generally unsympathetic also surfaced in the comments of teachers. A young teacher who had not yet had any direct interaction with a superintendent of education said:

While there seems to be a generally strong negative sentiment towards superintendents among Level 1 educators, I do not feel as strongly as I have not yet had a superintendent oversee my work. Nevertheless, I do not look forward to any visit from them, given the negative impression I have of them. Like me, there are several others whose work has not been inspected at all. And like me, they, too, do not have much confidence in their professionalism.

A principal, focusing on teacher militancy, noted the role of 'site committees' in enforcing teacher opposition to superintendents of education. He described the situation at his school as follows:

My site committee insists on being present when a superintendent of education (academic) visits my school to discuss the reasons for his visit. Even if a teacher is willing to interact with an SE(A), staff pressure is brought to bear to stop this.

Collectively, the comments to the question on the evaluation-monitoring role of superintendents of education indicated that the functioning of
these officials was greatly circumscribed by teacher opposition and teacher militancy. There is also the suggestion that policy resistance, especially in policies that affected the professional core of the school, was also due to teachers' defence of their professional autonomy (see section 5.3.3.1). Consequently, these responses also point to the influence of perceived self-interest of policy actors as individuals and groups. The role of 'site committees' also points to changing power relations and accompanying structural adjustments.

5.3.1.5 The principal as man-in-the-middle

Several items in the final section of the questionnaire touched upon the principal's relationship with superordinate and subordinate policy actors. They touched upon the principal's accountability for policy implementation to the Department and the need to balance this with the accountability to other stakeholders. Table 5.5 presents the distribution of responses for these items.

A study of Table 5.5 shows a high level of consensus about the principal's accountability to the Department for policy implementation. Of the 72 principals and superintendents of education who responded to this section of the questionnaire, 95.83 percent were of the view that the principal was accountable for the implementation of Departmental policies (item 45/2). Moreover, 88.89 percent maintained that the principal should ensure the implementation of these policies until they were formally changed or terminated (item 46/2). Respondents however, were equally strongly of the view that the principal's policy implementation role required a high level of sensitivity and flexibility. Thus 91.67 percent of respondents were of the view that the principal was the man-in-the-middle: he had to address the needs of pupils, educators, and the community while also fulfilling the policy expectations of the Department (item 44/2). This situation clearly had the potential for conflict. In situations where a Department policy was rejected as unacceptable by educators, parents, or the community, the principal could either remain a loyal civil servant, adjust and adapt the policy till it was acceptable, or work with external groups to bring pressure to bear on the Department to change the unwelcome policy (item 47/2). Of the 72 respondents, 61.11 percent maintained that the principal should work with other stakeholders to pressure the Department to change unwelcome policies (see section 4.3.1.6).

This response seemed to contradict the earlier view that principals should ensure the implementation of Department policies until they are formally changed (item 46/2). Possibly, respondents were of the view that principals should actively campaign for change while implementing
'unwelcome policies.' This response is also suggestive of principals wanting to distance themselves from the education department when faced with policies that were viewed negatively by educators and the community.

Table 5.5 Distribution of responses for items that focussed on the principal's accountability for policy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>N = 72</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45/2</td>
<td>The principal is accountable for the implementation of Departmental policies.</td>
<td>45/2</td>
<td>95,83</td>
<td>4,17</td>
<td>1,75</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46/2</td>
<td>Until policies are formally changed, the principal should ensure their implementation.</td>
<td>46/2</td>
<td>88,89</td>
<td>11,11</td>
<td>2,33</td>
<td>1,16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44/2</td>
<td>The principal is the man-in-the-middle when it comes to education policy implementation.</td>
<td>44/2</td>
<td>91,67</td>
<td>8,33</td>
<td>1,78</td>
<td>1,06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47/2</td>
<td>The principal should work with other interested groups in forcing the Department to change unwelcome policies.</td>
<td>47/2</td>
<td>61,11</td>
<td>38,89</td>
<td>3,39</td>
<td>1,64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1.6 The principal's influence on Departmental officials

To establish more clearly the nature of the relationship between the principal and the Department, one of the questions (item 11) posed during the interview was:

To what extent do principals influence the decisions of Departmental officials during the policy implementation process?

Interviewees, were first required to respond on a 5-point scale ranging from 'To a very great extent' (1) to 'Not at all' (5).
Of the 57 interviewees, 73.68 percent were of the view that the principal exerted a noticeable influence on decisions of the Department during the policy implementation phase. The mean of 3.07 and standard deviation of 0.78 on a 5-point scale also suggest a concentration of responses in the mid-range of the influence scale. The position of interviewees did not influence the pattern of responses.

During the discussion of the scaled response, a fairly frequently expressed view was that principals played a pivotal role in alerting Departmental officials to possible problems and barriers to the implementation of specific policies. They also often identified the possible adjustments needed to make policies more acceptable to educators. A principal said:

> Often policies which have the potential for problems are finally implemented without much resistance because we have discussed our reservations with Departmental officials and often won approval for our adaptations and adjustments. My superintendent of education has given me his private phone number - as he has done with all the principals in his circuit - and expects me to keep him informed of all developments in my school so that he can assist me in a timeous fashion.

Some interviewees, however, asserted that principals did not display leadership and management skills in coping with the exigencies of policy implementation: they referred all problems to Departmental officials. A superintendent of education (management) voiced this opinion:

> I value the assistance and inputs of my principals and convey their views to senior management. At the same time I am seriously perturbed at the lack of management skills and leadership ability displayed by many of my principals. Every problem is referred up to me.

Most teachers, in contrast, were generally positive in their assessment of the principal's influence. One teacher described the approach used by his principal as follows:

> My principal discusses all policies and circulars at staff meetings and elicits viewpoints about policies and their implementation. Should we advance reasons for amendments or, in some cases, resistance, he approaches the Departmental officials in a firm, professional manner. As a result he plays an important role in the implementation phase decision-making process.

Thus the general impression that emerged from the comments was that principals acted as a major communication link between their staff and the Department on all policy issues. This tended to expose principals to conflicting pressures from Departmental officials and teachers as the processes of systemic changes unfolded.
5.3.1.7 Principals' avoidance of close supervision of teachers

Given the increasing militancy of teachers, the researcher wished to establish the nature of principal-teacher interactions in Indian schools. Table 5.6 presents the distribution of responses for items that probed this issue.

A study of the table indicates that several elements of bureaucratic organisation prevailed in Indian schools. There is, for example, the suggestion that principals were generally upward looking and significantly influenced by the hierarchical structure of the managerial system (see section 5.3.3.2). Emphasis was placed in many schools on the written transmission of information relating to education policies and on the recording in the minutes of staff meetings of the specific tasks educators were expected to carry out because of these policies. Management staff, however, tended to avoid any direct monitoring and evaluation of the implementation and outcome of education policies. Instead, they stressed the accountability of individual staff members for the implementation of education policies, generally aware that teachers may not adhere to Departmental policies despite this underscoring of individual accountability (see section 5.3.3.2).

Table 5.6 also reveals significant differences in the perception of superintendents of education and school-based educators on key policy issues. Superintendents of education tended to record significantly higher levels of agreement on these policy issues than school-based educators. In contrast, the perception of teachers and heads of department tended to be similar, indicating a degree a affinity among educators in the lower rungs of the education hierarchy. These differences suggest the emergence of different interpretive schemes, different perceptions of reality, and general alterations in relations among policy actors (see section 5.3.1.8).

5.3.1.8 Impact of the teacher union on the management subsystem

Table 5.7 presents the distribution of responses for items that focussed on the impact of the organised teacher body on the management of Indian schools.

A study of the table indicates that it was widely accepted (as early as January 1993 when the final questionnaires were collected from...
Table 5.6 Distribution of responses for items that focussed on the bureaucratic functioning of schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE N = 532</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th>X² (3 df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>% Disagree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>The principal makes school requirements known.</td>
<td>89,45</td>
<td>10,55</td>
<td>2,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Educators duties are recorded in writing.</td>
<td>82,71</td>
<td>17,29</td>
<td>2,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>The principal seeks Departmental guidance for non-routine decisions.</td>
<td>75,38</td>
<td>24,62</td>
<td>2,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Teachers need prior approval for implementing their own decisions.</td>
<td>63,09</td>
<td>36,91</td>
<td>3,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Staff are regularly monitored.</td>
<td>65,04</td>
<td>34,96</td>
<td>3,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>The principal expects staff compliance.</td>
<td>52,08</td>
<td>47,92</td>
<td>3,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>The principal bypasses Department policy if necessary.</td>
<td>39,81</td>
<td>60,19</td>
<td>3,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ideas different from those of SE's are discouraged.</td>
<td>25,38</td>
<td>74,62</td>
<td>4,43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. With respect to the specific responses of teachers (group 1), heads of department (group 2), school-based senior management (group 3), and superintendents of education (group 4), the table only reflects percentages relating to AGREEMENT with the items.
2. Chi-square levels of significance have been presented only for statistically significant position-based differences in the distribution of responses.
Table 5.7 Distribution of responses for items that focussed on the impact of the organised teacher body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) (3 df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( N = 532 )</td>
<td>( 1 )</td>
<td>( 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>The organised teacher body is more concerned with the rights of teachers than the needs of pupils.</td>
<td>49,25</td>
<td>50,75</td>
<td>3,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2</td>
<td>It is likely to 'strike' when negotiations with the Department fail.</td>
<td>85,15</td>
<td>14,85</td>
<td>2,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2</td>
<td>Its actions affect the principal's ability to run the school.</td>
<td>64,10</td>
<td>39,90</td>
<td>3,12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. With respect to the specific responses of teachers (group 1), heads of department (group 2), school-based senior management (group 3), and superintendents of education (group 4) the table only reflects percentages relating to AGREEMENT with the items.
2. Chi-square levels of significance have been presented only for statistically significant position-based differences in the distribution of responses.
respondents) that the teacher union serving Indian teachers was prepared to engage in industrial-type protest action (item 11/2). There was also a general perception among many groups of educators that the teacher union was more concerned with the protection of teacher rights than those of pupils (item 10/2). The militancy associated with both these views led many respondents to the view that the actions of the organised teacher body affected the principals' ability to manage their schools (item 12/2).

Position-based differences indicate that management staff were inclined to be more critical of the organised teacher body than teachers. Moreover, the level of critical response tended to increase with seniority in the education hierarchy. This critical response of senior education personnel was also noted in items that directed more specific attention to the impact of the organised teacher body on the management of schools. Table 5.8 presents the distribution of responses for items that touch on this issue (as perceived by principals and superintendents of education). An examination of the table shows that a large majority (81.94 percent) of this management group believed that the emergence of the teacher union had reduced the Department's ability to control events in Indian schools (item 36/2). Most respondents also believed that the increased frequency of teacher-Department conflicts was due to the power of the teacher union and its ability to protect its members from punitive measures (item 37/2) (see sections 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.2, and 4.3.2.3).

At the micro-level of the school also the emergence of the teacher union was strongly felt: 90.28 percent of respondents believed that the power of the teacher union had changed the pattern of school control (item 35/2). Most respondents noted that teacher militancy was directed at the reduction of the principal's authority over them (item 39/2) and a loosening of the Department's control over schools. Thus 72.22 percent of respondents perceived a deliberate effort by teachers to prevent school-based senior management staff from being compliant to Department-sanctioned policies (item 40/2).

The overall effect of these developments was that 81.95 of the senior management sub-sample believed that their ability to effect their role functions had been affected by the influence of the organised teacher body over the Department, its members, and the community (item 38/2). The emergence of 'site committees' in Indian schools, for example, created a situation where the authority of the superintendent of education and the principal was directly challenged by staff members at each school (see section 4.3.1.4.2).

These findings were confirmed during the structured interview. To elicit opinions about the impact of the teacher union, interviewees were asked the following question (item 12):
Table 5.8 Distribution of responses by senior management personnel for items that focused on organised teacher body - management interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>N = 72</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36/2</td>
<td>Teacher unionisation has reduced the Department’s ability to administer schools.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>81.94</td>
<td>18.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37/2</td>
<td>Teacher body power has led to increased conflict between the Department and teachers.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>87.55</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35/2</td>
<td>The power to the teacher union has changed the pattern of school control.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>90.28</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39/2</td>
<td>Teachers want to reduce the principal’s authority to assert control over them.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40/2</td>
<td>Teachers want to channel the authority of senior colleagues away from Department-sanctioned policies.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>27.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38/2</td>
<td>Principals and SEs find it difficult to function because of the organised teacher body.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>81.95</td>
<td>18.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. With respect to the specific responses of principals (group 1) and superintendents of education (group 2), the table only reflects percentages relating to AGREEMENT with the items.
2. Chi-square level of significance has been presented only for the statistically significant position-based differences in the distribution of responses.
How would you describe the impact of the teacher union on the policy implementation process in Indian schools?

Interviewees were first required to respond on a 5-point scale ranging from 'Minor irritant' (1) to 'Major influence' (5).

Of the 57 interviewees, 89,47 were emphatic in describing the teacher union as a 'major influence' on the policy implementation process in Indian schools. The mean response of 4,90 with a standard deviation of 0,31 on the 5-point scale underscores the fact that responses were concentrated at the 'major influence' end of the scale. The position of interviewees did not affect the distribution of responses.

Comments of interviewees, however, revealed different perceptions about the nature of this 'major influence.' Some, for example, were of the view that the Department's authority over its schools had been considerably eroded by its 'policy of appeasement' in all dealings with the union. The comment of a superintendent of education (management) is representative of this line of thinking. Attributing the influence of the union to the Department's reluctance to antagonise the teacher union, he said:

The Department is viewed by many principals and non-union members as having allowed itself to be dominated by the union on all major issues. Its policy of appeasement is tantamount to an abandonment of basic education goals.

Several interviewees also focussed upon the strategies used by the union in exercising its influence on education policymaking and education policy implementation. Critical of these strategies, a principal commented as follows:

Since the disbanding of TASA, Indian teachers have become like factory workers. If they do not get their way, they strike, engage in chalkdowns, and incite parents and the public against the Department.

A variation of this theme was that the union was politically aligned and often confrontationist in its relationship with the Department, seeking a general destabilisation of the system. A principal voiced this view in these words:

By being aligned to the ANC our teacher union has adopted a confrontationist attitude towards the Department. It has also created a division between school management staff and Level 1 educators.

Indeed, several interviewees belonging to the school-based management ranks stated that pressure was exerted upon them by union members to support their position on all policy issues. A deputy principal described his experience as follows:
As a senior manager at school level, you are constantly pressurised by SADTU members to ensure that SADTU views are not opposed at staff meetings.

Also touching upon school-level dynamics, many interviewees noted the emergence of site committees as union structures at schools. A superintendent of education (management) reported his perception of their role in this comment:

Site committees in some schools virtually dictate to the principal what he shall or shall not implement as school policy. They insist on a direct role in school management. In the name of being professionals they reject any form of supervision of their work.

Some heads of department and many teachers, however, saw the influence of the union in more positive terms. A head of department, for example, maintained that the teacher union ensured that the Department did not exercise its authority in an arbitrary fashion. He stated:

SADTU has developed a close working relationship with the Department. Its 'no nonsense' attitude during negotiations ensures that all policies are the result of transparency and full discussion of critical points.

Several teachers also saw the Department as an apartheid structure which sought to thwart the 'professionalism' of teachers. Thus the union's reduction of the authority of the Department over school-based educators enabled them to develop as 'professionals'. A teacher described this view as follows:

The teacher union has freed education from the 'baaskap' mentality of the past. We now have the power to shape our lives as professionals.

All the comments had one thing in common: they expressed the view that the emergence of teacher unionism and teacher militancy had had a destabilising influence on the management subsystem, producing alterations in power relationships and a general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, structural linkages in the system.

5.3.1.9 Parent-Department-teacher interaction

Parent attitude towards the Department was generally negative (see section 4.3.1.5). An examination of Table 5.9 reveals that all the items listed there elicited agreement from a great majority of the respondents. Parents, it would seem, were disturbed by the frequency of education crises and 'major disruptions at school level' (item 16/2). Not being able to exert direct pressure on teachers, parents turned against the
Table 5.9  Distribution of items that focussed on the influence of parents on education policymaking and policy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th>X² (3 df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 532</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/2</td>
<td>Parents are becoming increasingly critical of the Department.</td>
<td>84.37</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/2</td>
<td>Parents are beginning to question the authority of the principal in several areas.</td>
<td>78.01</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/2</td>
<td>Parents do not hesitate to lodge complaints against teachers.</td>
<td>95.44</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/2</td>
<td>Individual parents use political influence to exert pressure on policy matters.</td>
<td>79.14</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. With respect to the specific responses of teachers (group 1), heads of department (group 2), school-based senior management (group 3), and superintendents of education (group 4) the table only reflects percentages relating to AGREEMENT with the items.
2. Chi-square level of significance has been presented only for the statistically significant position-based differences in the distribution of responses.
Department for formulating policies that generated crises and for being unable to manage the system without producing education crises.

Moreover, not being able to exert direct pressure upon teachers (see comments below), parents seemed to turn more frequently to principals and the Departmental officials with complaints against individual teachers (item 18/2). Clearly, they expected these senior officials to act against the teachers concerned for alleged violation of teaching and professional responsibilities.

Individual parents also used their political influence and political 'contacts' to exert pressure on principals and the Department to attend to matters which they believed to be unsatisfactory at their schools (item 21/2). That parents were beginning to adopt a militant approach in securing their interests is also made evident in their increasing unwillingness to submit to the authority of the principal on school-level policy matters (item 17/2) (see sections 4.3.1.6 and 4.3.1.7). What one notes in the response to item 21/2 is the statistically significant pattern of increasing percentage of agreement with seniority in the education hierarchy. The political influence of parents, it would seem, was more frequently experienced by senior officials than those lower in the hierarchy.

Essentially, what these responses show is that parents tended to avoid direct confrontation with teachers but used every resource available to influence the functioning of the education system (see sections 4.3.1.5, 4.3.1.6, 4.3.1.7, and 4.3.1.8). Concurrently, there was a generally negative attitude towards the Department (see section 4.3.1.5). This was also evident in interviewees' response to the following question (item 14):

To what extent is the community supportive of the Department as an agency of educational provision and control?

Interviewees were first required to respond on a 6-point scale ranging from 'Actively opposed' (1) to 'Actively supportive' (6).

Of the 57 interviewees, 57.89 percent stated that the community was opposed to the Department. In contrast, no interviewee believed that the community was supportive of the Department. Those that did not rate the community as being opposed to the Department saw it as being either uninterested or uninvolved in matters educational. The position of interviewees did not influence the distribution of responses. Comments of interviewees during the clarification of their responses gave added insight into the ways in which educators perceived the community, especially the parent component of the community, and its attitude towards the Department. One group of interviewees, for example, judged parents as not being objective in their attitude towards the Department.
A superintendent of education (management) expressed this viewpoint as follows:

Parents are unwilling to view the actions of the Department objectively. They oppose it on every possible issue. Often what we have is a self-interested support of teachers because parents fear that if they do not do so, then their children will suffer as a result of prolonged conflict between the Department and teachers.

The comments also revealed other reasons for parents' negative attitude towards the Department. Some interviewees maintained that parents were influenced by teachers to adopt their perception of the Department. A superintendent of education (academic), for example, said:

Teachers are generally opposed to the Department. They often influence parents to support them against the Department. As a result the image parents have of the Department is sharply skewed to encourage opposition.

A second group of respondents attributed the negative image of the Department to its linkage with the tricameral system of government. A superintendent of education (academic), for example, explained her assessment of the situation in these words:

The community is often hostile towards the Department because of the ridicule with which 'tricam' politicians are viewed by the public at large. Often these parents are politically driven or supporters of teachers at their schools.

A third group argued that the community opposition or lack of support was due to the perception that the Department and its education policies were out of touch with current realities. A principal expressed this view as follows:

Parents are hostile towards the Department because they, with teachers, believe that the attitude of the Department is out of touch with current realities.

A fourth group of interviewees maintained that parents were disturbed by the 'poor management' of education by the Department. A head of department, for example noted:

Many parents believe that the present discontent and disarray in our schools are the result of poor management and leadership on the part of the Department. Some parents have become so frustrated with the decline in the quality of instruction that they have removed their children and enrolled them in Model C schools at great cost.

Falling into a separate group altogether were the comments of interviewees who attributed parents' lack of support for the Department to lack of interest and general ignorance. A teacher expressed her perceptions in these words:
Parents are totally unaware of the larger political and educational struggle in our schools. Attendance at parents meetings is generally low - parents who should be attending to discuss their children's problems are most conspicuous by their absence.

Both responses to the items in the questionnaire and the question on the structured interview underscored the fact that the Department did not enjoy wide support in the community. There was a tendency among parents to support teacher resistance to policies without impartial, objective analysis of the basis of the education department-teacher conflict, without establishing whether policy resistance was due to self-interest or fundamental inadequacy of the relevant policy itself.

5.3.2 Changes in cultural aspects of the system

5.3.2.1 The Department's failure to adjust to the altered political and value context

Of the 532 respondents to the questionnaire, 79.14 percent maintained that the Department did not make all 'policy decisions openly and with adequate inputs from all interested groups' (item 53). Despite the changes towards transparency and consultation in the larger society, the Department was perceived as persisting with a top-down approach.

The position of respondents had a significant impact (p < .05) on the detailed distribution of responses. Both teachers (17.13 percent) and superintendents of education (14.81 percent) returned lower levels of group agreement than heads of department (28.91 percent) and school-based senior management (26.79 percent). In short, both teachers (at the lowest level in the school hierarchy) and superintendents of education (at the lowest levels in the Department hierarchy) seemed to experience strongly exclusion from the policymaking processes.

In Part 4 of the questionnaire, which was completed only by principals and superintendents of education, two items (23/2 and 33/2) revisited the issue of the policymaking practices of the Department. Table 5.10 presents the distribution of responses for these items. A study of the table indicates that most respondents at the senior management level perceived little consultation with all stakeholders in the policymaking process at macro-level.

The majority of superintendents also expressed the view that they were excluded from the policymaking process at Departmental level. The position-based differences, however, suggest that many principals were
### Table 5.10 Distribution of responses for senior management perception of policymaking by the Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>N = 72</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/2</td>
<td>Major policy decisions tend to be made by the Chief Executive Director and his executive team.</td>
<td>79,17</td>
<td>20,83</td>
<td>2,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33/2</td>
<td>Superintendents of education have great influence on the formulation of all policies.</td>
<td>27,78</td>
<td>72,22</td>
<td>4,25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For the distribution relating to principals (Group 1) and superintendents of education (Group 2), the table only reflects percentages relating to AGREEMENT with the items.
under the impression that superintendents of education were consulted by senior officials during the policymaking process. These responses thus give added support to the full-sample responses noted earlier: policy continued to be formulated by executive level officials despite the regular education crises and the political and educational changes in the larger system.

The Department was also perceived as showing a general lack of sensitivity to the views and values of significant stakeholders in the community: 67.86 percent of respondents generally disagreed with the view that 'Departmental policies reflect a sensitivity to social and political forces in the community it serves' (item 54). Again the position of respondents significantly influenced responses (p < ,005). Smaller numbers of heads of department (59.38 percent) and school-based senior management staff (51.79 percent) disagreed with the statement than teachers (73.83 percent) and superintendents of education (70.37 percent). In short, both teachers and superintendents of education were more inclined to view policymaking as not being sensitive and responsive to the social and political changes in the community and the larger society.

An examination of Table 5.11 indicates that there was also general agreement among principals and superintendents of education that the Department was not adapting effectively to changes in the larger society: 88.89 percent of respondents were of the view that little policymaking energy was directed at preparing for a unitary system of education (item 25/2). Education policies seemed to be shaped by short-term needs rather than any vision of the future (item 24/2). Even these policies were often perceived as not being the product of any careful 'cost-benefit analysis' (item 32/2). For example, when faced by budgetary cutbacks, cost containing adjustments seemed to have been effected without any careful weighing of priorities (item 29/2). In concentrating on the need for system stability in the immediate present, upper management seem to have neglected attention to pressures from the larger environment.

This general lack of congruence between education policies and the larger processes of change was also confirmed by the fact that 83.33 percent of respondents in the sub-sample maintained that the Department often ignored 'information about risks, altered circumstances, and changed management contexts, resulting in continued commitment to policies made under different conditions and no longer appropriate' (item 31/2). When confronted by crises generated by this mismatch, the Department, according to 90.28 percent of respondents, often seized upon hastily devised solutions without adequate examination of long-term consequences (item 34/2). These hastily formulated policies and policy changes contributed to policy implementation failures and education crises. Respondents noted that senior Department officials, however, often did not perceive the problem as being rooted in their failure to adjust to
Table 5.11 Distribution of responses for items that focused on the policymaking practices of the Department during transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>N = 72</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/2</td>
<td>Policies address short-term needs rather than long-term goals.</td>
<td>86,11</td>
<td>13,89</td>
<td>2,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/2</td>
<td>Limited policymaking energy is directed at preparing for a unitary system.</td>
<td>88,89</td>
<td>11,11</td>
<td>2,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/2</td>
<td>Cutbacks are effected after a careful weighing of priorities.</td>
<td>30,56</td>
<td>69,44</td>
<td>4,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32/2</td>
<td>Policies are only adopted after a careful cost-benefit analysis.</td>
<td>37,50</td>
<td>62,50</td>
<td>4,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/2</td>
<td>Often ignoring altered circumstances, the Department remains committed to policies no longer appropriate.</td>
<td>83,33</td>
<td>16,67</td>
<td>2,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34/2</td>
<td>When faced by crises the Department seizes upon hasty solutions.</td>
<td>90,28</td>
<td>9,72</td>
<td>2,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/2</td>
<td>Department officials are made scapegoats for policy failures.</td>
<td>88,89</td>
<td>11,11</td>
<td>2,15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. With respect to the specific responses of principals (Group 1) and superintendents of education (Group 2), the table only reflects percentages relating to AGREEMENT with items.
2. Chi-square levels of significance have been presented only for statistically significant position-based differences in the distribution of responses.
an altered reality. They tended to attribute blame to management staff entrusted with overseeing the policy implementation process. As a result, 88.89 percent of the respondents were of the view that Department officials were 'made the scapegoats for policy failures and organisational crises' (item 26/2).

As Table 5.11 indicates, there was a high level of consensus among principals and superintendents of education on the Department's failure to adjust its education policies to meet the challenges of change effectively. Two of the items, however, displayed statistically significant differences in the responses of principals and superintendents of education. First, while 51.11 percent of principals believed that the Department adopted policies after a careful cost-benefit analysis, only 14.81 percent of superintendents of education did so (item 32/2). Second, while 82.22 percent of principals perceived the scapegoating of Departmental officials for policy failures, 100.00 percent of superintendents of education did so (item 26/2). Being closer to the macro-level policy arena, superintendents of education seemed to perceive these trends more strongly.

All the responses thus underscore one significant point: the Department, in the opinion of most senior level respondents, had failed to grasp that the environment had changed radically and that policies and policy implementation practices which had been effective in the past were now often neither relevant nor effective. Instead of a critical evaluation of their management practices, senior Department officials often displaced responsibility for policy failures and education crises from policymakers to policy implementers. The responses, in addition, point to the absence of effective strategic planning and strategic management in the education department. The focus seems to have been on sustaining system stability in the face of immediate threats to orderly operation than on meeting the challenges of transition to a unitary system of education. Executive level participation in provincial, inter-departmental strategic planning was not perceived as having had any visible impact on the internal functioning of upper management (see sections 4.3.1.1 and 6.2.6.1).

5.3.2.2 Rejection of the legitimacy and the ideological basis of the Department

The Department was viewed negatively not only because of its unpopular policymaking practices and perceived ineffectiveness in matters such as communication of policies but also because of its apartheid origins and functioning. Indeed, of the 532 respondents in the questionnaire sample, 74.81 percent believed that policy changes would be "resisted by
educators as long as there was an 'Indian' department of education" (item 61). The position of respondents did not affect the distribution of responses (see section 4.3.2.2).

During the structured interview attention was again directed to the general image of the Department. Interviewees were asked to assess the Department's management of the education budget (item 6). They were first required to respond on a 6-point scale ranging from 'spent appropriately' (1) to 'spent inappropriately' (6). Of the 57 interviewees in the sample, 85.96 percent responded negatively. The mean response of 4.44 with a standard deviation of 0.93 on a 6-point scale underscored the concentration of responses on the negative end of the scale. The position of interviewees also influenced their responses. Thus while 100.00 percent of teachers and heads of department were critical of the Department's management of available funds, 78.61 percent of school-based senior management staff and only 50.0 percent of superintendents of education were equally critical, pointing to the existence of different definitions of the situation.

The comments of interviewees revealed some of the reasons for the negative image of the Department. Many interviewees maintained, for example, that the Department had not aligned its education priorities to the changes in education financing and the transition process in the larger society. A head of department expressed this view as follows:

It is true that our funds are being reduced. This is as it should be if the deprived groups are going to have their education backlogs removed. But what is wrong with our Department is that it has not brought a new vision to bear on the problem. We are, for instance, continuing with projects such as maximum curriculum differentiation and computerisation of schools without seeing that we need to start anew in all areas.

Many interviewees also asserted that economic considerations were given precedence over educational considerations. A superintendent of education (academic) commented:

Money can be spent more fruitfully if education rather than economy acts as a driving force for all budgetary decisions. What I find especially frustrating is the cutback in orientation courses which are absolutely essential to enable us to meet teachers in the field, to encourage curriculum innovation, to give group guidance in a situation where teachers do not welcome individual attention.

Some interviewees also stated that the Department's priorities were influenced by political rather than educational factors. Upper management was perceived as yielding to politicians who were more concerned with the political ideology of the past than with the present and future needs of a changing situation. A secondary school principal, for example, articulated this view as follows:

The Department lacks in clear vision about the priorities of Indian education. We are
trapped by an apartheid mentality: we continue to build Indian schools because of pressure from discredited Indian politicians in a discredited political system. We are not investing money in books, new approaches to handling the learning deficits of black pupils, etc.

Many interviewees also asserted that the Department exercised such close control of expenditure that large amounts of money were returned to the Treasury at the end of each financial year. A variation of this theme was that the administrative wing of the Department was driven by bureaucratic rather than educational goals, concerned more about system stability than about functional adjustment to a turbulent environment. A deputy principal, for example, said:

Each year we hear of large sums of money being returned by the Department. This clearly indicates a bureaucratic concern to please central government administrators rather than to serve educational needs of the community.

Generally, the responses and comments revealed a critical attitude towards the Department. The prevalent view seemed to be that the policymaking and policy implementation tasks of the Department were not guided by a clear vision of the political and value changes occurring in the larger society.

5.3.2.3 Politicisation of education

Among lower level participants in the system, during the transition years there was a distinct adoption of a political stance in relation to education and changes in the larger society (see section 4.3.2.2). This often found expression in repeated attacks on the legitimacy of the Department, calls for its dissolution, and, at times, open defiance of its authority (see section 4.3.1.4). Two items in the questionnaire sought to establish the extent of this politicisation of education. Responses to both these items indicated widespread agreement with the view that political motivation had become a strong factor in the Indian education system.

Thus 74.81 percent of the respondents agreed with the view that resistance to education policies was partly due to the 'Indian' identity of the education department (item 61). In Part 3.3 of the questionnaire respondents were presented with the statement that education had become a major political issue in the community and served as a means to attack the tricameral system (item 22/2). Of the 532 respondents, 74.24 percent agreed with this statement. This item, however, also elicited responses that revealed statistically significant position-based differences (p < .01). These differences also revealed a higher percentage of
agreement with seniority in the education hierarchy. Thus while 69.47 percent of teachers agreed with the view that education had become politicised, 78.13 percent of heads of department, 83.93 percent of school-based senior management staff, and 92.59 percent of superintendents of education did so. Senior education personnel possibly felt the weight of political pressures more severely than teachers (see section 5.3.1.9).

5.3.2.4 Influence of religious, sectional, and language factors on the system

There are three major religious groups in the Indian community: Hindus, Moslems, and Christians. In each of these three groups there are several sub-groups, sects, and denominations. The different sub-groups and sects of Hindus in the country, for example, are closely connected with the different language groups. There are thus Tamil-speaking Hindus, Telugu-speaking Hindus, Hindi-speaking Hindus, and Gujarati-speaking Hindus, each group adhering to different practices and rituals. There are, for example, those who eschew all forms of animal sacrifice and those who see this as an integral part of some of their rituals. Then there are Hindus who regard the eating of meat as being sinful and those who consider it permissible.

The influence of religion in the Indian education system can be inferred by the action of Moslem parents at Isipingo Beach Primary School in October 1992: they removed their children from the school on the day of a brief programme to mark Diwali, a day sacred to Hindus. A correspondent to the press ('Disgusted', 1992: 21) described the response as 'shameful behaviour' and a 'ludicrous act.'

The influence of language allegiances in the Indian education system can also be inferred from a criticism of the Department by Mr K Panday, a House of Delegates Member of Parliament, in February 1992. He stated in Parliament that the Indian education system was controlled by a few people known as the 'Tamil Tigers'. Using the 1991 promotion list, he also stated that an inordinately large proportion of those promoted were Tamil-speaking educators (Post Natal, February 5-8, 1992, p.5). Responding to Mr K Panday's statement, Mr M Pillay, the Acting Chief Executive Director at the time, said (The Daily News, February 4, 1992, p.7):

As far as I am concerned there is no substance to Mr Panday's claims. If there is such a clique in my department they are operating without my knowledge and it goes against my principles. I want to assure everyone concerned if I have proof that such a clique in fact does exist in the department, then I would do my utmost to weed them out.
Noteworthy in this comment is the absence of a categorial denial that 'Tamil Tigers' existed in the education department.

Because of these differences, respondents were asked whether religious and sectional values entered schools and affected their functioning (item 19/2). Of the 532 respondents, more than half (55.64 percent) responded in the affirmative. The response to this item was also characterised by statistically significant position-based differences (p < .001). While 52.02 percent of teachers perceived the influence of religious and sectional values in the functioning of schools, 60.93 percent of heads of department, 48.21 percent of school-based senior management staff, and 88.89 percent of superintendents of education did so. It would seem that when a complaint relating to religious, sectional, or language issues was not serious enough, parents and community organisations preferred to approach teachers and heads of department. On the other hand, if it was serious, they preferred to discuss the issue with Departmental officials. The pattern of responses suggest that the senior group handled many such complaints.

During the structured interview, the issue was revisited. Interviewees were asked the following question (item 15):

Our community is characterised by great diversity in language, religion and culture. Often one hears and reads allegations of favouritism because of these forces. In your opinion, are such allegations valid?

Interviewees were first required to respond on a 4-point scale ranging from 'YES' (1) to 'NO' (4). Of the 57 interviewees, 82.46 percent were positive in their response. In short, they were convinced that religious, sectional, and language factors influenced the functioning of the education system. The position of interviewees had no significant influence on the pattern of their responses. Both those in senior management positions as well those in lower positions in the education hierarchy were equally positive on the issue.

The comments of interviewees provided further insights into the influence of religious, sectional, and language factors. Many, for example, maintained the favouritism arising from these factors still existed despite the greater transparency of the management process. A superintendent of education (management) expressed this view as follows:

Teachers and principals often cite examples of appointments, secondments and transfers which they allege are the result of high level intervention. The frequency of these allegations have not decreased with a more transparent system of promotions.

The only difference from the past, some interviewees stated, was that the process had become 'more subtle and disguised.' A principal noted:
At one stage you had to be a 'Singh' to be promoted to a certain category of schools. One year you had to be an active supporter of the National People's Party. Nowadays the only change is the process has become more subtle and disguised.

The belief that Departmental officials such as superintendents of education allowed their religious and language loyalties to influence their management decisions was regularly expressed by educators. One teacher said:

Transfers, promotions, acting positions are heavily influenced by matters not related to the actual ability of the people concerned. At my school, one applicant for long leave had his application rejected. He then approached a superintendent of education belonging to his language/religious group and the decision was reversed.

Some interviewees were convinced that Departmental officials formed coalitions based on religious, sectional, and language affiliations. Each such group, these interviewees maintained, worked with outside groups to further the interests of educators with similar affiliations. A head of department expressed this view as follows:

There are strong coalitions based on language and culture in the Department - each group supports and advances its own members. Therefore SADTU insists that it has its observers at all levels of the promotion process to eliminate this type of favouritism.

This comment also touches on another theme that recurred during the interview - the watchdog role of the teacher union. Many interviewees stated that the incidence of this problem, especially in the area of the evaluation and promotion of educators, had been substantially reduced by the militancy of the organised teacher body. A principal expressed her view as follows:

In my 27 years of experience, I have come across several examples of blatant favouritism. Some of these were uncovered by the James Commission. In recent years, however, the watchfulness of SADTU has reduced the problem significantly - but not completely. If you belong to a certain language-religious group, long leave applications, for example, are more likely to be successful.

Most interviewees were quite emphatic that religious, sectional, and language factors coloured the management decisions of education officials. Even if these perceptions were not factually accurate, they were likely to influence school-Department and community-Department interactions.

5.3.2.5 Staff tensions and feelings of alienation

Transition processes in the larger society also affected the cultural and
value milieu of individual schools, producing staff tensions and feelings of alienation in many educators. Table 5.12 presents the distribution of responses for items that touched on this issue.

A study of the table suggests that many Indian schools were places of conflicting values with struggle for vested interests occurring below the surface of professional interaction. An important binding force, nevertheless, seemed to be the active involvement of many members of staff in the activities of the organised teacher body. The table also reveals that the perception of superintendents of education, who reported their general impression of staff interactions in schools, was distinctly different from that of school-based educators. These Departmental officials tended to see a higher level of divisiveness in schools than school-based educators themselves (see section 5.3.1.7).

A study of Table 5.12 also reveals that the level of alienation among educators in Indian schools was fairly high. Many respondents did not feel a sense of pride or accomplishment in their work. Again it is noteworthy that superintendents of education saw the problem as being more widespread than school-based educators.

5.3.2.6 Generally low levels of job satisfaction

During the preliminary field work for the study, many educators reported increased work stress and lower levels of job satisfaction as a result of a changing, turbulent education environment. Therefore one of the questions (item 16) posed during the interview was:

Willingness to implement educational policies is clearly linked to educators' level of job satisfaction. If you were to rate your level of job satisfaction during the last 12 months, how would you rate it on an 5-point scale?

The 5-point scale interviewees were asked to use in assessing their level of job satisfaction ranged from 'Very low' (1) to 'Very high' (5). The distribution of responses indicated that not one of the 57 interviewees in the sample rated the level of job satisfaction as being 'very high', 15,79 percent rated their job satisfaction as being 'high', 33,33 percent as being average, 35,09 percent as being 'low' and 15,79 percent as being 'very low'.

While position did not influence the pattern of distributions in a statistically significant manner, a pattern was noted in the distribution of responses: all the interviewees who reported 'high' and 'very high' levels of job satisfaction came from the ranks of teachers (29,42 percent) and heads of department (25,00 percent). In contrast, the
Table 5.12  Distribution of responses for items that focussed on school culture factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th>$X^2$ (3 df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 532</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%  Mean  SD</td>
<td>N = 321  N = 128  N = 56  N = 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Staff at the school are like a family.</td>
<td>65.85  2.92  1.59</td>
<td>63.64  73.44  78.57  29.63</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>There is a general lack of togetherness in the staffroom.</td>
<td>41.89  3.91  1.66</td>
<td>41.38  42.19  32.14  66.67</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2</td>
<td>Educators at the school are active members of the organised teacher body.</td>
<td>56.79  2.24  1.54</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>Competition and struggle for control are on the increase.</td>
<td>39.92  3.93  1.54</td>
<td>39.38  34.38  32.14  98.89</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Success in the profession depends solely on ability.</td>
<td>38.16  4.18  1.79</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>Many educators do not experience pride and accomplishment in their work.</td>
<td>57.25  3.35  1.72</td>
<td>51.25  66.41  57.14  85.19</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>I feel pride in working for the H.O.D.</td>
<td>45.20  3.91  1.74</td>
<td>39.06  46.88  75.00  48.15</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. With respect to the specific responses of teachers (group 1), heads of department (group 2), school-based senior management (group 3), and superintendents of education (group 4) the table only reflects percentages relating to AGREEMENT with the items.

2. Chi-square levels of significance have been presented only for statistically significant position-based differences in the distribution of responses.
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majority of principals (64.35 percent) and superintendents of education (80.00 percent) reported low levels of job satisfaction.

The comments of interviewees reinforced the impression that job satisfaction was generally low among all groups of educators. Comments indicated that both superintendents of education and school-based educators were affected by the rapidity of change in the environment. Some organisationally pertinent consequences of this inability to cope with the transition process, according to interviewees, were high levels of teacher absenteeism, alcoholism, sickness, tiredness and depression, and a general lack of a sense of achievement. A superintendent of education (management), for example, touched upon the impact of the processes of change and transition in these words:

I do my job to the best of my ability. But I must admit that recently what with all the political and professional tensions that have invaded our schools, I have lost much of the excitement and anticipation with which I once faced each day.

A teacher described the emotionally taxing effect of the rapid changes in the larger society as follows:

We are now working in an environment of distrust, chaos, and multiple pressures. The sense of purposeful progression towards a clearly perceived goal has vanished. Alcoholism, depression, sickness are now rife among members of the profession. Some days it is a real struggle to get out of bed.

Several interviewees noted that the work environment had changed rapidly in the last few years. It was now characterised by a state of organisational decline, teacher chalkdowns and strikes, multiple pressures from the Department, teachers, pupils, parents, and the community, divisiveness in the staff, anti-Department attitude among school-based educators, uncertainty and political instability, political violence, and the general absence of clearly perceived educational goals. Aggravating the impact of these forces was the Department's perceived inability to cope with school pressures, teacher militancy, and community lack of support. A principal described the situation as follows:

The job has become an uphill struggle - one step forward and two steps back. Often I feel frustrated when weeks of planning and effort end in failure because of teacher resistance to ideas focussing on quality and accountability.

A head of department attributed this general drop in job satisfaction to what she referred to as 'organisational decay':

There is definitely an air of organisational decay in our schools - look only at one factor - the rate of teacher absenteeism and you will see the frustration in many educators. I, however, feel quite comfortable with my work. Not as much as I used to but not as low as some of my senior colleagues.
Faced with this situation, many management level personnel felt so deeply stressed by the pressures of their rapidly changing work world that they sought or longed for premature retirement. A deputy principal's comment vividly illustrates this development. He said:

I am waiting to be 'boared' out. The conditions at our schools in the last few years, the violence in society, the uncertainty about the future all make one go through the motions at school without feeling emotionally and professionally alive. By the end of the day, I feel tired and depressed.

A relatively small percentage of management personnel in the sample, however, presented a different picture. They reported that they coped fairly well with the pressures of change. Reasons often advanced for this positive capacity were good management-staff interactions and parent support in the orderly functioning of the school. A principal, for example, made this comment:

Despite all the problems that principals now confront, I generally enjoy my work. I have a good staff and a good parent community. However, the incidence of chalkdowns, site committee interference and adverse press publicity has robbed the job of the prestige it commanded in the community. I find this occasionally a source of distress.

The general inability of educators, especially those in management positions, to cope with the pressures of change and transition recurred as a strong theme in the comments of interviewees. Often there was a harkening to the past as a period of order and stability.

5.3.2.7 General decline in senior management morale

In Part 4 of the questionnaire, principals and superintendents of education were asked to express their level of agreement/disagreement with the view that morale was generally high among management staff at all levels within the Department (item 27/2).

Of the 72 respondents in the sub-sample of principals and superintendents of education, 75.00 percent denied that management morale was high. The response to this item was also characterised by statistically significant (p < .005) differences in the responses of principals and superintendents of education. While 62.22 percent of principals perceived low levels of management morale, 96.30 percent of superintendents of education did so. What this suggests is that those with management accountability for policy implementation were themselves carrying out their responsibilities with relatively low levels of motivation.
5.3.3 Changes in the structural aspects of the education system

5.3.3.1 Structural impact of resistance to and rejection of education policies

General resistance to key policies forced the education department to make rapid policy changes and policy adjustments. Each such adjustment contributed to loss of power, elicited stronger efforts at policy control from the Department, led to an increase in teacher resistance and more policy changes to accommodate teacher opposition, and produced an expansion of the professional autonomy of teachers (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.2, and 4.3.2.3).

5.3.3.1.1 General disagreement with policies

Table 5.13 presents, in rank order, the level of agreement expressed by the full sample to the education policies listed on the questionnaire. A study of the 'Total' column of the table shows that only 6 of the 13 policies had more than 50.00 percent of the sample expressing some agreement with them.

The pattern of general agreement and disagreement with policies suggests that policies which touched on the core activities of the teaching situation were more likely to evoke strongly negative response from school-based educators, especially teachers. In contrast, policies that touched on general administration matters were less likely to evoke strongly negative responses. There is thus the suggestion that teachers' concern to protect their professional autonomy influenced their resistance to certain policies. In short, perceived self-interest rather than quality of policy sometimes contributed to policy resistance.

Table 5.13 also indicates that 8 of the 13 policies elicited statistically significant differences in the pattern of responses. The table suggests that educators in more senior positions were more inclined to agree rather than disagree with policies. Only in policies that evoked strongly negative responses from both teachers and heads of department did senior officials incline towards higher percentages of disagreement, suggesting the upward pressure of lower level participants on senior staff.
Table 5.13 Level of agreement with education policies of the transition years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>POLICIES</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE N = 532</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Technical vocational education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Admission age of J.P. pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Curriculum in your subject</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Education welfare board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Supervision for staff development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Promotion/retardation of pupils</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parent teacher association</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Finance control</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Plant maintenance/cleaning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Use of corporal punishment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Provision of stocks and books</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Evaluation and promotion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Staffing and staff rationing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Position: 1 = Teachers; 2 = Heads of department; 3 = Deputy principals, senior deputy principals and principals; 4 = Superintendents of education.
2. Responses were on a 6-point scale ranging from 'Strongly agree' (1) to 'Strongly disagree' (6). Responses 1, 2, 3 were recoded as 'Agree' and 4, 5, 6 as 'Disagree'.
3. For position-based sub-samples only the percentages for AGREEMENT are presented on the table.
4. Rank order is based on the percentage of the full sample, descending from greatest agreement to least agreement.
5.3.3.1.2 Great change in most policies

Table 5.14 presents the distribution of responses indicating the level of change which policies had undergone in recent years. The 'Total' column which represents the global response of the sample indicates that all policies had undergone change, some more than others.

A close scrutiny of the table suggests that policies which had undergone greatest change were those with a direct bearing on the functioning of teachers. In contrast, the table suggests that policies which were perceived as having undergone relatively less radical change were those relating to curriculum content and administrative aspects of school functioning. Rapid policy change thus seemed to be a structural response to contain teacher militancy and education crises (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.3, and 4.3.1.4).

An examination of Table 5.14 also shows that the position of respondents did not greatly affect the general distribution of responses. Only two of the 13 policies had significant differences arising from the position of respondents. These related to the promotion and retardation of pupils and to finance control.

5.3.3.1.3 Close control over policies

Table 5.15 presents the distribution of responses for items relating to the level of control that the Department attempted to exert during policy implementation.

An examination of the table indicates that the Department was generally perceived as seeking to exert close control over policies in all the listed areas. There is, however, a suggestion that efforts at closest control were experienced in policies that could be described as being more administrative than professional in their focus of attention. In short, superintendents of education seemed to focus more on policy areas that did not lead to direct confrontation with teachers (see section 4.3.1.3).

Table 5.15 also indicates that control during policy implementation was experienced differently by educators and officials at different levels in the education hierarchy. On the issue of supervision of educators by school-based management staff (item 45), for example, the response of teachers was significantly different from that of heads of department, school-based senior management, and superintendents of education. While 55,45 percent of teachers perceived close control, significantly lower
### Table 5.14 Level of change in education policies during the transition years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>POLICIES</th>
<th>RANK ORDER</th>
<th>TOTAL ( N = 532 )</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th>( X^2 ) (3 df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great Change</td>
<td>Little Change</td>
<td>Great Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Curriculum in your subject</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.13</td>
<td>55.87</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Promotion/retardation of pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>54.51</td>
<td>51.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Admission of J.P. pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.96</td>
<td>56.02</td>
<td>41.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Plant maintenance and cleaning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49.43</td>
<td>50.57</td>
<td>51.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Finance control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td>49.25</td>
<td>56.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Technical vocational education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>55.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Education welfare board</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57.39</td>
<td>42.61</td>
<td>58.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Provision of stocks and text books</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58.11</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>58.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Supervision for staff development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58.27</td>
<td>41.73</td>
<td>56.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Use of corporal punishment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.38</td>
<td>37.62</td>
<td>60.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Parent teacher association</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65.28</td>
<td>34.72</td>
<td>66.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Evaluation and promotion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75.94</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>74.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Staffing and staff rationing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77.21</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>79.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Position: 1 = Teachers; 2 = Heads of department; 3 = Deputy principals, senior deputy principals and principals (i.e. school-based senior management); 4 = Superintendents of education.
2. Responses were on 4-point scale ranging from 'Very great change' (1) to 'No change at all' (4). Responses 1, 2 were recoded as 'Great change' and 3, 4 as 'Little change'.
3. For the position-based sub-samples only the percentages for GREAT CHANGE are presented on the table.
4. Rank order is based on the percentage of the full sample, descending from least change to greatest change.
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Table 5.15  Level of control exerted by the Department over the implementation of specific policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>POLICIES</th>
<th>RANK ORDER</th>
<th>TOTAL N = 532</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1  N = 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loose Control</td>
<td>Close Control</td>
<td>Loose Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Supervision for staff development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.13</td>
<td>48.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parent teacher association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.46</td>
<td>66.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Promotion/retardation of pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>72.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Curriculum (in your subject)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.81</td>
<td>71.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Plant maintenance and cleaning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>75.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Technical vocational education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>76.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Education welfare board</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>77.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Provision of text books</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>80.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Evaluation and promotion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>79.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Admission age of J.P. pupils</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>82.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Staffing and staff rationing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>83.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Use of corporal punishment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>84.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Finance control</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>83.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
1. Responses were on a 4-point scale ranging from 'Maximum discretion allowed to school and educator' (1) to 'Very close control by the Department with little or no leeway' (4). Responses 1, 2 were recoded as 'Loose control' and 3, 4 as 'Close Control'.  
2. For position-based sub-samples only the percentages for LOOSE CONTROL are presented on the table.  
3. Rank order is based on percentage of the full sample, descending from 'Loose Control' to 'Close Control'.
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percentages of the other groups did so.

The position-based differences also pointed to the operation of macro- and micro-level dynamics in the exercise of control during policy implementation. On the use of corporal punishment, for example, superintendents of education were unanimous that this policy was very tightly controlled by the Department. In contrast, a small number of principals stated that they had discretionary powers, with an increasing number of heads of department and teachers also expressing this view. There is thus the suggestion that school-based educators internally resolved violations of the policy and that only extreme cases of policy violation were reported to the Department.

Superintendents of education, indeed, generally perceived the control of the Department as being higher than other groups. In short, this group seemed to see a lower level of policy adjustments, policy amendments, and policy violations than was noted by school-based educators. Significantly, the only policy where superintendents of education noted the existence of great discretion during policy implementation by educators was that relating to supervision for staff development by school-based management staff.

Finally, the polarisation of responses between junior educators and senior educators on several crucial education policies clearly points to the possibility of conflict during policy implementation. That almost 30.00 percent of teachers and heads of department, for example, felt that they could exercise their professional judgement in policies relating to the curriculum while only 21.00 percent of principals and 11.00 percent of superintendents of education shared this view pointed to the possibility of conflict surfacing during any supervision and evaluation of the work of teachers and heads of department by higher ranking officials. These responses suggest that alterations were occurring in power relationships, that changes were taking place in control structures, and that structural adjustments were being made to reduce the recurrence of education crises and policy failures (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.3, 4.3.1.4, and 4.3.1.6).

5.3.3.1.4 Relationship among policy variables

Table 5.16 presents a summary of the responses to the 13 policy areas listed on the questionnaire. The distribution of responses suggests that there was some relationship between the level of agreement and the level of change. Often policies which had undergone great change were also those that elicited low levels of agreement from respondents. Policies relating to evaluation and promotion of educators and the staffing of schools, for example, elicited lowest levels of agreement and were also
Table 5.16  Summary of statistics for agreement, change, and control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICIES</th>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE (p &lt;, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>GREAT CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission age of junior primary pupils</td>
<td>62,78</td>
<td>37,22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion/retardation of pupils</td>
<td>53,30</td>
<td>36,70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of corporal punishment</td>
<td>41,73</td>
<td>58,27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum (in your subject)</td>
<td>59,77</td>
<td>40,23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical vocational education</td>
<td>70,89</td>
<td>29,11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education welfare board and disciplinary action</td>
<td>57,36</td>
<td>42,64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57,39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision for staff development</td>
<td>53,38</td>
<td>46,62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and promotion</td>
<td>24,25</td>
<td>75,75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing and staff rationing</td>
<td>14,66</td>
<td>85,34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of stocks and text books</td>
<td>41,51</td>
<td>58,49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant maintenance and cleaning services</td>
<td>46,12</td>
<td>53,88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance control</td>
<td>46,98</td>
<td>53,02</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent teacher associations</td>
<td>47,46</td>
<td>52,54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65,28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The chi-square was computed for four groups using a 2 x 4 table. The statistics are thus with three degrees of freedom. Only chi-squares with significance levels of p<.10 are noted.
perceived to have undergone greatest change (see sections 4.3.1.2.1 and 4.3.1.4).

Similarly, the table suggests a linkage between level of agreement and level of control. Again, policies such as those relating to evaluation and promotion and the staffing of schools elicited the lowest levels of agreement and were also policies that the Department sought to control very closely. This suggests that these policies were likely to become major arenas of conflict between the Department and teachers (see sections 4.3.1.2.1 and 4.3.1.4).

The table, moreover, suggests a relationship between great change and close control. Again, policies relating to the two areas noted above were also perceived as having undergone greatest change and of being closely controlled. The table, however, draws attention to the fact that control tended to be strongest in administrative areas such as finance control and weakest in purely professional areas. Thus although the policy relating to supervision for staff development was rated by 58.27 percent of respondents as having undergone great change, 51.13 percent of respondents also rated the policy as one allowing much discretion to educators and schools.

In short, the table suggests that policies that had undergone greatest change often elicited highest levels of disagreement and often were perceived to be those which the Department sought to control most closely. They were also the points of organisational strain where structural changes occurred, as, for example, in the power relationship between teachers and superintendents of education (see section 4.3.1.4.2).

5.3.3.2 Widespread variation in adherence to policies

To establish the extent of the loosening of system linkages, during the structured interview one of the questions asked was:

When a Departmental policy is one with which you are not in full agreement, how do you respond?

In the scaled response segment of the item (item 10), 80.70 percent of the interviewees stated that they adjusted and adapted such a policy to make it more acceptable; 15.78 percent stated that they ignored it; and 3.51 percent stated that they implemented the policy exactly as formulated despite their reservations. An examination of position-based differences suggested that principals and superintendents of education were likely to fall into this third category.
The comments of interviewees gave some insight into the rationale for these responses. Superintendents of education, for example, generally adopted the view that they could not be seen to be publicly repudiating Departmental policies. If there were education policies with which they were not in full agreement, they preferred to discuss their reservations at Department level and to seek clarity about the limits of policy adjustments and amendments they may allow schools and educators. Thus a superintendent of education (management) explained his response in these words:

I cannot afford to show principals that I am violating Departmental policy for this can imply that they, too, can disregard my directions if they disagree with them. I, however, do approach my chief superintendent of education (management) to discuss my doubts and ask him whether I can allow amendments should principals seek such leeway.

When confronted with unacceptable policies, there appeared to be a general pattern of turning to educators at proximate higher levels in the management hierarchy. Reservations and doubts were discussed with such senior officials and authority to proceed with amendments sought. Sometimes, even if actual permission was not sought for policy adjustments, the mere process of recording reservations was viewed as being adequate to proceed with amendments. A principal, for example, stated:

I make my position known to my superintendent of education (management): I point out the problems and difficulties that I clearly foresee at my school. With the PTA policy (in 1991), my teachers were not prepared to nominate staff representatives for the body in terms of the policy requirements. I allowed them to nominate an equal number of teachers, i.e. equal to the number of parents. Thus I did not stick to the strict requirements of the policy.

A teacher described his response as follows:

I indicate to my head of department my feelings about policies when these are discussed at subject committee meetings. I make it clear that I shall do in my class what I think is best for my pupils.

School-based management staff were also concerned about maintaining an air of management independence in their schools. They did not want to be seen by their staff as being obedient to the authority of the Department on all policy issues. Simultaneously, they had to avoid being seen by Departmental officials as being opposed to the control of the Department (see section 5.3.1.5). A principal outlined his predicament as follows:

As a principal, I am the man-in-the-middle in every sense of the term. I mediate policy between the Department and teachers and between parents and the Department. As a result, I often have to soften the tone and content of Departmental policies to ensure
I achieve policy goals without offending the competing groups.

Many interviewees, in fact, expressed the view that staff consensus on policy matters was more important than fidelity to Departmental policies. The rationale was that it was better to get an adjusted/amended policy implemented than a total rejection of the policy. A head of department voiced this standpoint as follows:

I adapt all such policies [policies with which there is no full agreement] to my subject teaching needs. My teachers appreciate the fact that I authorise such adaptations. If I insist on strict adherence, I know that I cannot monitor teachers' work to ensure this because of their resistance to supervision. By allowing adaptation, I retain their respect and can exercise some form of control.

What also emerged in comments such as these was that heads of department and teachers, who were mainly concerned with policies relating to the curriculum and the actual teaching-learning situation, asserted their professional autonomy and protected their growing sphere of influence. A teacher, for example, stated his position as follows:

I do not neglect the duties associated with being an educator. But if faced with the choice of implementing a policy I do not believe in and being a teacher to my pupils, I do not hesitate ignoring the policy.

What emerged both from the scaled response segment and the comments was the general view that policies which did not elicit full support were generally amended or ignored. What this implies is that the management of policy implementation was often a process of negotiating the limits of freedom available to those who were the subjects of the policy. It also draws attention to the weakening of structural linkages in that a new control relationship had resulted, one in which retention of subordinate acceptance seemed to play a more important role than achievement of policy goals (see sections 4.3.1.5 and 4.3.1.6).

5.3.3.3 General adoption of participative decision making in Indian schools

A study of Table 5.17 suggests that variations of participative decision making and school management were widely prevalent in Indian schools. Principals generally provided staff with information on education policy issues and then involved them in discussion of the information in reaching final implementation details. Staff were also encouraged by many principals to be fully involved in the overall management of the school. But in many schools principals consulted staff without relinquishing their authority for final decisions. This tended to be
Table 5.17  Distribution of responses items that focussed on participative decision making in Indian schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
<th>POSITION-BASED SUB-SAMPLES</th>
<th>X² (3 df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 532</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>The principal provides full information to the staff.</td>
<td>76.69%</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>The principal and staff work as a group in making decisions.</td>
<td>77.69%</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>The principal disagrees with the staff on unionism issues.</td>
<td>35.66%</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Staff disagree with the principal on the management of the school.</td>
<td>27.92%</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Teachers are consulted but the principal makes the final decision.</td>
<td>65.28%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>The principal encourages teacher participation in school management.</td>
<td>87.38%</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: With respect to the specific responses of teachers (group 1), heads of department (group 2), school-based senior management (group 3), and superintendents of education (group 4) the table only reflects percentages relating to AGREEMENT with the items.
done cautiously and selectively as most principals sought to accommodate the pressures of teacher militancy and teacher unionism as much as they could (see sections 4.3.1.6, 4.3.1.7, 5.3.1.7, and 5.3.1.8).

Position-based difference reflected on Table 5.17, however, suggest that there was a higher level of democratic decision making in Indian schools (where a simple staff majority tended to influence policy decisions) than perceived by superintendents of education who believed that principals retained their authority in arriving at the final decision when this, in fact, was refuted by many school-based educators. Principals, it would seem, presented two different images when it came to decision-making processes at their schools - one to their staff and the other to Departmental officials. To their staff they often presented the image of being non-authoritarian and non-prescriptive, of being willing to listen to staff opinions on education policy matters. To Departmental officials they often presented the image of firm control and management of the school in a manner consistent with Department policy (see section 5.3.1.5).

As a result, superintendents of education may have received verbal reports from principals of close control over policy and policy implementation issues, reports that might not have been consistent with the reality in their schools. Being unable to conduct an independent evaluation of the work of teachers and the performance of pupils as a result of teacher opposition to their presence in schools, superintendents of education were unable to conduct an independent assessment of participative decision-making practices in Indian schools. These responses also suggest a higher level of loosely coupled functioning in Indian schools than was recognised by Departmental officials.

5.3.3.4 General weakening of structural linkages in the system

Collectively, the findings on school-based educators point to a general weakening of structural linkages in the system. Many policies were openly resisted; there was a high level of policy adaptation and adjustment; principals were reluctant to use the authority vested in their position to enforce compliance with education policies because of teacher militancy and the possibility of protest action by staff members; democratic decision making was prevalent in many schools; and the presence of superintendents of education and their monitoring role in schools was rejected (see sections 4.3.1.4.2 and 5.3.1.4). Despite these developments, schools functioned as education institutions, each developing its own unique composition of adherence to and defiance of
5.3.4 Analysis

5.3.4.1 Support for the hypothesis

A close examination of the findings presented above suggests a pattern of processes strongly supportive of the hypothesis advanced in Chapter 1 (see section 1.2.2). There was unanimity among all 57 of the interviewees who participated in the structured interview that the pace of social and political change in the country had affected the implementation of education policies in Indian schools (see section 5.2). Specific support for the hypothesis is presented below.

5.3.4.1.1 Fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence in interpersonal relations among policy actors

The findings indicate that there was a fragmentation in the pre-transition coherence in interpersonal relations among key policy actors at all levels of the system through emergent conflicts and tensions. This is evident in the following:

- Policy actors at the Departmental level had splintered into sub-groups with a general increase in in-fighting among them (see section 5.3.1.3).

- Superintendents of education were actively rejected by teachers (see section 5.3.1.4).

- Principals were generally supportive of Departmental policies at an overt level but tended to lean towards parent and teacher positions in situations of policy crisis (see sections 5.3.1.5 and 5.3.1.7).

- The increase in teacher militancy and the emergence of teacher unionism contributed substantially, in the immediate context, to the fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence of the system (see section 5.3.1.8).

- There were statistically significant responses among the various groups of policy actors on many important issues, suggesting separation, polarisation, and emergent conflicts in the education
system:

- The response to item 53 indicates that both teachers at school level and superintendents of education at Departmental level experienced more strongly their exclusion from policymaking processes than heads of department and school-based senior management (see section 5.3.2.1).

- The response to item 54 shows that teachers and superintendents of education were significantly more critical of the Department than the other groups in the sample (see section 5.3.2.1).

- The response to item 22/2 suggests that senior education personnel experienced more strongly political pressures than lower level policy actors (see 5.3.2.3).

- The response to item 19/2 suggests that the divisive pressure of religious, sectional, and language factors was more strongly felt at Departmental level than at school-level (see section 5.3.2.4).

- The isolation of superintendents of education from the mainstream of school activities because of teacher resistance to them is noticeable in their 'inaccurate' perception of the nature of interactions among school-level educators: they perceived a significantly higher level of divisiveness and conflict among school-based educators than noted by the latter themselves (see section 5.3.2.5).

- The polarisation of responses towards education policies indicated a clearly defined divide between management staff and educators at lower levels of the hierarchy (see section 5.3.3.1.3).

- Principals tended to be more concerned with the maintenance of a working relationship with their staff than with the Department (see sections 5.3.3.2 and 5.3.3.3).

5.3.4.1.2 Heightening of value conflicts and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes

The fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence in the interpersonal relations among policy actors was partly the result of alterations that had begun to occur in the pre-transition cultural context of policy actors and the emergence of value conflicts and competing interpretive schemes. This change may be discerned in the following:
There was a general perception among participants in this study that the Department was unwilling or unable to alter its policymaking practices and priorities despite fundamental value changes in the larger society (see section 5.3.2.1).

The Department was perceived to show a lack of sensitivity to the alterations that were occurring in the values and goals of significant stakeholders in the community (see section 5.3.2.1).

Accelerating the emergence of new values and competing interpretive schemes was the general rejection of the legitimacy of the system and its ideological basis (see section 5.3.2.2 and 5.3.2.3).

Value conflicts between the education department on the one hand and teachers and parents on the other were exacerbated by the general perception that the education department was more influenced in its managerial tasks by economic, bureaucratic, and political concerns than concerns relating to educational quality (see section 5.3.2.2).

At school level, there was a general increase in value conflicts with various groups engaged in a struggle for the advancement of group values and priorities (see section 5.3.2.4).

The pattern of agreement and disagreement reflected conflict over issues such as control of teachers, professional autonomy of teachers, and the legitimacy of the education department as the controlling agent over education policies (see section 5.3.3.1.1 and 5.3.3.2).

5.3.4.1.3 Influence of perceived self-interest

Often the policy crisis and opposition to the authority of the education department were not directly related to the quality of the policy. Often policy implementers were influenced by factors that could be attributed to perceived self-interest. The operation of this process may be discerned in the following:

- The Department's policy response was often influenced by the desire to avert political attack from educators and parents. As a result, it was often seen to adopt a strategy of 'appeasement' in its handling of policy opposition from teachers and attacks from parents (see section 5.3.1.8).

- Superintendents of education seemed more concerned about loyalty to individual and sub-group goals and priorities than those of the
Principals often seemed more concerned about maintaining a cordial relationship with their teachers than monitoring the educational quality of their work and their adherence to Departmental policies (see sections 5.3.1.4 and 5.3.1.5).

Teachers were perceived to be more concerned about the protection and advancement of their own rights and privileges than about the needs of their pupils (see section 5.3.1.8).

Parents were generally concerned primarily about the undisrupted schooling of their children: their pressure on the Department to yield to teacher demands was motivated by this priority (see section 5.3.1.9).

The Indian education department seemed to be largely concerned with retaining or re-establishing the pre-transition coherence of interpersonal, cultural, and structural aspects of the system and averting criticism of its control of education (see section 5.3.2.1).

The Department often made hasty policy changes to avert crises and the resultant political pressures on it. Moreover, upper management tended to blame superintendents of education and principals for policy crises rather than accepting the possibility that the fault may lie with it (see section 5.3.2.1).

Some officials were also perceived to be influenced by religious, sectional, and language affiliations in their policy decisions and implementation activities (see section 5.3.2.4).

Teacher disagreement with policies was strongest in areas relating to evaluation of teachers and staffing of schools. Teachers seemed to be partly motivated by the desire to protect and expand their sphere of autonomy and to resist any increase in workload (see section 5.3.3.1.1).

Superintendents of education generally avoided supervisory contact with teachers and concentrated on administration-oriented policies and functions. This was partly due to a general desire not to increase teacher opposition to their presence in schools (see section 5.3.3.1.2).

Principals tended to suppress information suggestive of policy violations at their schools to prevent possible criticism of their managerial role by the Department and to retain the goodwill of their staff (see sections 5.3.3.1.3 and 5.3.3.2).
- Principals tended to present two different images when it came to their management of their schools: to their staff they generally sought to project an image of non-authoritarian, collegial leadership and to the Department an image of being in firm control of their school (see section 5.3.3.3).

5.3.4.1.4 Alterations in power relations among policy actors and structural adjustments

Changes in interpersonal relations and alterations in the value system of policy actors were accompanied by changing power relations and adjustments in structural aspects of the system at the points of conflict and strain. This process may be noted in the following:

- The Department was unable to assert its authority over schools and teachers despite open defiance of its policies because of a fear that militant teachers and the teacher union might respond with a disruption of schools (see section 5.3.1.8).

- The Department was unable to invoke teachers' conditions of service or initiate disciplinary actions against teachers for defying superintendents of education because of the union's ability to protect its members through its threats of system disruption (see section 5.3.1.8).

- Teacher militancy and teacher unionism were successful in reducing the power of superintendents of education and principals and expanding the professional autonomy of school-level educators (see section 5.3.1.8).

- Superintendents of education were unable to execute their control and policy monitoring functions and experienced a general loss of operational status in the system (see section 5.3.1.4).

- At school level, principals averted conflict with teachers by avoiding any close supervision of teachers' work (see section 5.3.1.7 and 5.3.1.8).

- The emergence of 'site committees' at school level reduced the decision-making authority of principals and encouraged active deviation from Departmental policies (see section 5.3.1.8).

- Both teachers at the lowest level of the micro-system and superintendents of education at the lowest level of the macro-system experienced a significantly strong sense of exclusion from
policymaking processes. Both groups were also critical of upper management failure to come to terms with an altered reality (see section 5.3.2.1).

- At school level, principals acknowledged teachers' demand for decision-making powers by generally adopting participative management strategies in an effort to reduce opposition and teacher sanctions (see section 5.3.3).

- Principals and superintendents of education experienced a general reduction in their power and authority in the system (see section 5.3.2.7).

- Teachers defied the authority of the education department as a means of political pressure on the tricameral system of government (see sections 5.3.2.2 and 5.3.2.3).

- In policies that elicited strong teacher resistance, upper management tended to effect swift changes in an effort to contain the associated problem of school disruptions (see section 5.3.3.1.2 and 5.3.3.1.4).

- In policies that elicited strong teacher opposition, principals and superintendents of education tended to avoid confrontation with teachers. In the process, there was recognition of teacher power and structural changes in processes relating to the professional autonomy of teachers (see section 5.3.3.1.2).

5.3.4.1.5 General weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages

All the interviewees who participated in the study were of the view that transition processes in the larger society had, directly and indirectly, contributed to a general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages in the system and had increased the loosely coupled functioning of system to an anarchic, chaotic state (see section 5.2). More specifically, this weakening of linkages may be noted in several alterations in the system. Some of these changes are presented below.

- There was a fragmentation of the pre-transition, hierarchical stability among policy actors (see sections 5.3.1.1, 5.3.1.3, 5.3.1.4, 5.3.1.5, 5.3.1.7 and 5.3.1.9).

- The Department was increasingly isolated from its schools through teacher militancy and teacher and parent attacks on the legitimacy of the tricameral system of government (see sections 5.3.1.4 and
5.3.1.8).

- The Department itself was perceived as being out of touch with the altered reality (see section 5.3.1.9).

- The value system of upper management and those at lower levels in the system began to diverge, leading to heightening of value conflicts and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes (see sections 5.3.1.1 and 5.3.1.3).

- The direct control of the Department over its schools and educators at lower levels in the system was greatly reduced by the emergence of teacher unionism and structures such as 'site committees' (see section 5.3.1.8).

- The system, for some respondents, had altered radically as a result of 'distrust, chaos, and multiple pressures' (see section 5.3.2.6).

- The education system, for other respondents, had begun to display elements of organisational decline and 'organisational decay' (see section 5.3.2.6).

- Superintendents of education were unable to assess the actual functioning of schools because of teacher resistance to them and because of selective reporting by principals (see sections 5.3.3.1.4 and 5.3.3.2).

- Principals generally yielded to teacher pressures and allowed widespread variations in policy implementation at their schools (see section 5.3.3.2).

- Teachers tended to deviate from education policies whenever these conflicted with their values and interests (see section 5.3.3.2).

- The system operated in an increasingly loosely coupled fashion (see section 5.3.3.4).

5.3.4.2 Modification and elaboration of the hypothesis

The findings, however, also indicate underlying processes that suggest a need to modify and elaborate the hypothesis. These processes relate to the influence of policy content, the impact of political interference and political pressure, the operation of religious, sectional, and language factors, and the effect of loss of job satisfaction and morale.
5.3.4.2.1 Influence of policy content

The findings suggest that policy content acts as a significant variable during the policy implementation process. In other words, the level of acceptance of or resistance to policies may be closely linked to their content. This influence may be discerned in:

- Policies that sought to reduce teachers' professional autonomy were more strongly resisted than those that touched on general school administrative issues (see section 5.3.3.1.1).

- Policies that centred on the core areas of the teaching situation and sought to alter the regularities of the teachers' zone of influence were more strongly resisted (see sections 5.3.1.4 and 5.3.3.1.1).

5.3.4.2.2 Impact of political interference and political pressure

In a period of rapid socio-political change, the findings suggest, education policy implementation is also likely to be affected by political interference and political pressure. This process may be discerned in the following:

- Policy opposition and policy resistance were partly an expression of political rejection of the apartheid origins and functioning of the education system (see sections 5.3.2.2 and 5.3.2.3).

- Political factors were at times perceived to exert a greater influence on the policymaking and policy implementation processes than purely educational factors. Upper management seemed reluctant to oppose political interference (see section 5.3.2.2).

- Perceiving this, parents used their political influence and political contacts to exert pressure on educational administrators to yield to their demands (see section 5.3.1.9).

5.3.4.2.3 Operation of religious, sectional, and language factors

In times of fundamental societal transition, the data suggests that there is a possibility of increased group identification and group support on
the basis of religious, sectional, and language factors. This is suggested by the following:

- There was a general belief that senior personnel in the Department had formed powerful groupings on the basis of language and religious identification (see section 5.3.2.4).

- Policy implementation in areas such as promotions and transfers were perceived to be influenced by religious and language affiliations (see section 5.3.2.4).

- Many respondents also perceived the operation of these factors at school level. The response of principals and superintendents on this issue suggest that the impact of these factors were strongly felt (see section 5.3.2.4).

5.3.4.2.4 Effect of the loss of job satisfaction and morale

During a period of rapid societal change, policy actors in the education system are likely to feel more strongly loss of job satisfaction and loss of morale. Both these developments are likely to affect the policy implementation process through loss of emotional and physical energy and through loss of commitment. This was evident in:

- Many educators experienced tensions and feelings of alienation (see section 5.3.2.5).

- There was widespread loss of job satisfaction and morale. Allied to this there was a perceived increase in teacher absenteeism, alcoholism, sickness, and depression (see section 5.3.2.6).

- Management staff who had a major responsibility to oversee the policy implementation process were themselves unable to do the job effectively because of low morale and motivation (see sections 5.3.2.6 and 5.3.2.7).

5.4 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the researcher has presented the findings that emerged from the questionnaire and the structured interview used in this study. The findings generally pointed to an education system which had not successfully coped with the pressures of change and transition. The findings in this chapter also give strong support to the hypothesis
advanced in Chapter 1. The findings, however, also suggested the operation of other variables: policy content influenced the level of policy resistance; the political influence of policy actors was often used as a lever to attain individual and sub-group priorities; group affiliations based on religious, sectional, and language factors affected policy outcomes; and the general decline in job satisfaction and staff morale, especially as it affected senior personnel, also contributed to a lowering in commitment to the achievement of organisation goals.
CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

6.1.1 A pattern of processes

Archer (1984: 179) observes that in a situation of political turbulence, one where 'participants may even envisage toppling policy itself,' policy concessions and compromises by the state are rapid: promises of 'unheard-of concessions are made, unprecedented shifts of principles takes place, entrenched positions are yielded and major reform is hurried on to the statute books.' Similar shifts occurred in the Indian education system during the transition years (see sections 4.3.4 and 5.3.4).

6.1.2 Outline of the chapter

This chapter shall first focus on a discussion of the findings as they relate to education policymaking and policy implementation in a society in transition (see sections 4.3.4 and 5.3.4). Next, these findings shall be summarised and presented as a theoretical model to explain the process. And finally, the theoretical support for the model shall be briefly outlined.

6.2 POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN A SYSTEM IN TRANSITION

In the following sections the findings relating to the hypothesis advanced in this study shall be examined in greater depth. The discussion shall draw both upon the data in Chapters 4 and 5 and relevant literature.
6.2.1 Altered interactions among key policy actors.

In the pre-transition years of the 1980's, the Indian education system was relatively stable with a clearly defined authority hierarchy. The interaction among policy actors in the system was relatively stable: the legitimacy of the system was not actively challenged; the interpretive scheme of the superordinate groups in the system generally held sway; and a clearly defined programme of education expansion was in progress (Naidoo, 1989: 103-123).

Nevertheless, even in this period of relative stability policy implementation was made a difficult and failure-prone process by the number of levels in the education hierarchy and the multiplicity of actors involved (Naidoo, 1989: 109-113). This is consistent with the literature on policy implementation: one of the generally accepted findings is that a multiplicity of policy actors makes coordinated functioning among actors from various levels of the system a complex and difficult process. At each level, decisions made by policy actors in terms of their situational contingencies may lead to a redefinition, modification, or complete obstruction of the policy implementation process. Pressman and Wildavsky (1973: 110), for example, maintain that many problems in policy implementation are 'a function of the number of decision points, the number of participants at each point, and the intensity of their preferences.' In the Indian education system, the frequent efforts by the Chief Executive Director to effect policies relating to close monitoring of the work of Indian teachers were really efforts to institute systems of close control and coordination of the policy implementation process in the face of obstructions at various lower level decision points. Even when the probability of policy implementation is high at each level, 'the cumulative product of a large number of transactions is an extraordinarily low probability of success' (Elmore, 1979: 607). Bardach's (1977), examination of the 'implementation game' draws attention to the strategies that are used by officials at the various levels of the system to hinder and deflect the policy implementation process from its intended goal. In this situation, as LaRocque (1986: 500) points out, the process generally takes on the form of 'negotiation, persuasion and compromise.'

The whole process, however, the evidence presented in Chapters 4 and 5 suggests, acquires yet a higher level of complexity and yet a lower level of success probability when the policy implementation process occurs in a system in transition. The social and political struggles pierce the boundaries of the education system and polarise participants into groups that mirror the emergent social and political divisions in the larger society: the legitimacy of the dominant group is challenged; the ideology underpinning government structures is exposed to attack;
altered and competing interpretive schemes emerge; new definitions of situations occur; the intersubjective reality of system members fragments into sub-group realities; and power struggles become a common feature of the policy landscape. As the interpersonal linkages begin to fragment, each interest group tends to devote more of its energies to securing its own interests, even if this produces disruptive consequences in the general functioning of the system (see sections 4.3.4.1.3 and 5.3.4.1.3).

In the sections that follow, the interaction between various groups of macro-level and micro-level policy actors shall be briefly examined to illustrate the collapse of consensus and coordinated action among policy actors.

6.2.1.1 Minister-Chief Executive Director interaction

As the political head of the education system, the Minister of Education and Culture bears political accountability for the functioning of the system and for ensuring that the education manifesto of his party is realised. To assist him in fulfilling these obligations of leadership and political direction, he has the professional and administrative resources of the education department. As head of the education bureaucracy, the Chief Executive Director therefore liaises closely with the Minister, providing him or her with professional, technical, and administrative support. In a study of the relationship between elected state education legislators and officials of the education bureaucracy, Mazzoni (1985: 76) found that legislators readily acknowledged their dependence on the latter. Heads of education bureaucracies, for example, may set the policy agenda for the political head by identifying which policy problems should receive serious attention for authoritative decisions; they may present alternative solutions and formulations for policy problems as options for authoritative decisions by the Minister; and they may be actively involved with the Minister in the actual selection of policy options for specific problems (Mazzoni, 1985: 68).

This consensual, mutually supportive relationship, however, may disintegrate in periods of fundamental social change and political transition. In the Indian education system, for example, this occurred at the beginning of 1990 (see section 4.3.1.1). What the disintegration revealed was the operation of two types of rationality - political and professional. In a society undergoing fundamental change politicians tend to respond more rapidly to social crises to avoid attacks in Parliament and to avert negative publicity. Moreover, in a period when 'tricameral' politicians were often perceived to be agents of a repressive system, they often sought to re-legitimise their involvement
by providing uninterrupted social and educational services to their community. In contrast, the professional rationality of education department officials made them give precedence to educational and professional issues. Commenting on a similar conflict in the United Kingdom, Stewart (1987: 19) writes that 'the tradition of professional administration' in the education department is responsible for 'failures to respond to political priorities.' In the South African context, an additional factor influencing this response of Departmental officials was the visible effort of many to distance themselves from an increasingly discredited political system, to stress their professional identity, and to show themselves as being positively aligned to the processes of transition to democracy (see section 4.3.1.3).

6.2.1.2 Chief Executive Director-superintendents of education interaction

The efforts by the Chief Executive Director to restore the Department's control over teachers' work brought to the fore the changes and tensions in the relationship between the Chief Executive Director and superintendents of education (see sections 4.3.1.3 and 4.3.1.4.2). Before 1990 there were no visible tensions in the relationship between the two. Under the relatively stable societal conditions in the pre-transition years, there was a general image of unity of purpose and action in the Department. However, from 1990 onwards, as the transition processes gained momentum in the larger society and value and power changes occurred within the education system, concealed cracks in the relationship began to become visible in increasingly open clashes of opinion and values. From 1990, superintendents of education sought to distance themselves from apartheid education structures and from the rational-bureaucratic approach and the general resistance to change in the Department and to develop an image of autonomous professionalism (see sections 4.3.1.3 and 5.3.1.3).

Again, the altered relationship was essentially a product of changes in interpretive schemes and value orientation. While the Chief Executive Director held on to the past, superintendents of education were concerned about the future and their role in a future education system. While the Chief Executive Director was guided by a rational-bureaucratic approach to education management, superintendents of education were moving towards a democratic, professional paradigm (see section 4.3.1.3). Consequently, when the Chief Executive Director called in three superintendents of education identified by him as having played a leading role in the 'sit-in' protest action with the teacher union in March 1994 and questioned them about their 'loyalty to the Department', all three insisted that they had acted in a professionally and morally correct manner as they saw
their first obligation was the establishment of a sound and open relationship with teachers (APROESA, 1994).

His actions suggested that Chief Executive Director had failed to appreciate the influence of a shifting socio-political context on the education system. He still perceived the education management process in terms of hierarchical structures where policy is formulated at the apex of the organisation and transmitted to those at lower levels of the hierarchy. An observation of Salter and Tapper (1985: 24) about the Department of Education and Science in Britain is pertinent here:

... the Department has over time developed its own momentum, its own inertia, which means that its exercise of educational power runs in certain policy grooves. While, on the one hand, the Department has succeeded in expanding its control over policy formation in the interests of greater efficiency in the educational system, on the other, it has shown itself less than adaptable in the face of pressures for educational change.

Policymaking in the Indian education department under the leadership of the Chief Executive Director also continued to run in old 'policy grooves'.

To understand the dynamics of the altered relationship between the Chief Executive Director and superintendents of education, it is useful to view the interaction from a political perspective, which, according to Pfeffer (1981: 7), involves looking at 'those activities taken within organizations to acquire, develop, and use power and other resources to obtain one's preferred outcomes in a situation in which there is uncertainty and dissensus.' From this perspective, the struggle for power emerges as a critical factor in the relationship between the Chief Executive Director and superintendents of education. The former wanted to exert his power of leadership over the whole education system while the latter wanted to establish a new identity distinct from the Department and the political ideology it represented. The power element of this struggle, adopting Lukes' (1974) three-dimensional view of power, can be seen to centre on manipulation of a dominant ideology, control of the policymaking agenda, and the struggle within the decision-making process itself. Lukes (1974: 24) observes that those in power positions must, to remain in positions of unchallenged domination, 'prevent people ... from having grievances by shaping their perceptions, cognitions and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things.' With the political ferment in the larger society and general attack on all structures designed to reproduce the political and cultural hegemony of the ruling elite, this was no longer possible. Within the Department itself, superintendents of education wanted to demonstrate their repudiation of the politics of tricameralism by refusing to be identified with the Minister of Education and Culture and the Chief Executive Director (see section 4.3.1.3.2). Second, these officials insisted on being consulted and registered their opposition
whenever policies were issued in a top-down manner (see section 4.3.1.3.2). Third, superintendents of education insisted that the Department should consult with the organised teacher body on all policies that affected the functioning of teachers (see section 4.3.1.4.2).

Indeed, one of the reasons why they refused to co-operate in the implementation of teacher control policies was that these had not received the endorsement of the organised teacher body (Superintendents of education, DEC, 1992).

6.2.1.3 Superintendent of education—teacher interaction

The interaction between superintendents of education and teachers were influenced by two factors, one structural and the other cultural. First, structurally, even in pre-transition years the loosely coupled nature of the education system prevented close control of teachers' work by externally based officials. This is not unique to Indian schools. Deal and Celotti (1980), for example, found in a study of 34 American school districts that the district, school, and classroom levels of the education system functioned relatively independently as did individuals within each level of the system. Focussing on the dynamics of this process, Gamoran and Dreeben (1986: 628-629) argue that there are linkages between adjacent levels of the hierarchy: state-level decisions are mediated by district-level decisions, and district-level by school-level decisions before they affect classroom decisions. Their findings also lead them to 'agree with the loose-coupling notion that bureaucratic controls such as rules and supervision do not shape classroom instruction.' Looking at the process from another perspective, Hanson (1981) maintains that schools consist of two spheres of influence—that of teachers and that of administrators. These are loosely joined by a 'contested zone' of influence. Teachers operate with a high level of autonomy in their zone of influence as do administrators in theirs. Both groups, however, engage in a constant struggle to defend and to expand their zone of influence. Hence teachers' general resistance to supervisory control.

Second, culturally, superintendents of education in the Indian education system were generally perceived negatively. At the heart of the problem was a conflict of values and perceptions. Although superintendents of education perceived their role as being supportive and guidance-oriented, teachers saw them as being engaged in an exercise of bureaucratic power (see sections 4.3.1.4.2 and 5.3.1.4). Commenting on a similar clash of perceptions among education department officials and teachers in Australia, Tronc and Harris (1985: 47) write:
Although ... some inspectors behaved like 'sympathetic' friends to teachers, nevertheless, their brief and infrequent visits were full of anxiety for those in the schools. Since the inspector possessed the power to advance, delay or destroy a teachers career and to reward or condemn by a word a teacher's labours, it was natural that the inspectoral system would become the basis for a wide network of educational myth and legend. So it was to be expected that attempts to change the inspector's role and image would meet with only limited success, so powerful were the fears and misperceptions about inspectors in the memories, imaginations and conversations of teachers.

Smyth (1986: 334) makes similar observations about role incumbents in the United States of America. He says that 'the legacy of a preoccupation with order, efficiency and control in education' produced an image that makes it 'not hard to understand teachers' long-standing resentment of evaluation.' Smyth, moreover, notes that the 'unwritten but powerful mythology of teaching, inspection and evaluation has left teachers understandably reluctant to open their classrooms voluntarily to outside visitations no matter how benevolent the intent.'

In the Indian education system, teachers' refusal to cooperate with superintendents of education resulted in a situation where the latter were faced with several competing and conflicting value orientations and role expectations. Upper management in the education department were of the view that superintendents of education should continue to exercise their hierarchical authority and enforce the implementation of Departmental policies (see section 4.3.1.4.2). They were expected to attend to all their 'old' role functions: managerial assistance to principals and school-based management staff, control and coordination of all aspects of Departmental policies, monitoring of all aspects of teacher and school performance, and attention to all other aspects of education service to teachers, pupils, and parents. Teachers, on the other hand, viewed superintendents of education as being no longer relevant to the system and to their own professional development (see sections 4.3.1.4.2, 5.3.1.4, and 5.3.1.8).

Caught between these two pressures, superintendents of education responded in two specific ways. First, they showed a general reluctance to adopt a confrontationist posture with teachers: they were unwilling to use their hierarchical authority to insist upon monitoring teachers' work (see section 4.3.1.4.2). The result was that teacher autonomy in Indian schools increasingly became the norm. Second, superintendents of education sought to distance themselves from the Department and establish a new identity of professional autonomy through actions such as 'pens-down' protest and 'sit-ins' with teachers (see section 4.3.1.3).
6.2.1.4 Education department-organised teacher body interaction

The Minister and upper management of the Indian education department reacted in a strongly negative manner to the emergence of a militant, confrontational stance among teachers (see sections 4.3.1.2 and 4.3.1.4). The Minister, for example, expressed deep concern at the militancy of Indian teachers and their defiance of authority. The general feeling among upper management personnel was that 'the current climate appeared to favour the rising militancy', that 'to stem the tide there was need for firm action against offenders,' and that 'the recent acts of TASA tended to undermine the Department and ... adversely impacted on the rank and file teacher' (Management Committee, DEC, 1991d). At another meeting, the Minister reported to the upper management of the Department that there was 'general consensus among all members of Parliament that a firm line of action should be taken against teachers who are guilty of wilfully transgressing the normal codes of ethics, conduct and behaviour' (Management Committee, DEC, 1991e).

One explanation for increase in the conflict between the Department and the organised teacher body may be that they were operating with fundamentally different values and definitions of the education situation. Executive level policymakers in the Department seemed to inhabit - literally and metaphorically - one world with its own assumptions and beliefs and educators in schools and the organised teacher body, another. Consequently, when the Department conceded the need to consult with the teacher organisation on policies relating to evaluation and promotion procedures, supervision of teachers' work, and staffing of schools, the procedure was complicated by the different interpretive and value systems of the policy actors (see sections 4.3.1.2.3 and 4.3.1.4).

Figure 6.1 presents a diagrammatic representation of the interactions. The overall outcomes were structural changes that reflected the altered power dependencies in the education system and the emergence of competing interpretive schemes and value orientations.

6.2.1.5 Education department-parent/community interaction

Hirschman (1970) argues that customers can express their dissatisfaction with any organisation by either leaving it ('exit') or by trying to change it for the better ('voice'). Applied to the situation of Indian parents' loss of confidence in the education department, Hirschman's
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(1970) proposition suggests that parents had two basic options: they could choose to 'exit' from the education system or they could seek satisfaction by giving 'voice' to their grievances. One interviewee, indeed, stated that some parents had become 'so frustrated with the decline in the quality of instruction that they had removed their children and enrolled them in Model C schools at great cost.' Such 'exit' option, however, was available only to relatively affluent parents who could carry the cost of Model C enrolment.

The anger and frustration of parents who could not avail themselves of this costly option turned to strong criticism of the Department and to dependence on the power of the 'voice' option. This took two forms. First, many parents, as Persad (1990) points out, directed their frustrations and complaints to politicians and the Minister who, in turn, used such complaints for party political reasons or to exert pressure on the education department and its officials. Second, parents also lent their support to teachers in the latters' campaign against the Department over specific policy issues (see sections 4.3.1.5, 4.3.1.7, 4.3.1.8, and 5.3.1.9). As a result, parent protests against the Department were particularly vocal and vehement during times of policy crises and school disruptions. Unable to challenge teachers' definition of the situation or exert direct pressure on them for fear of extending the education crisis and exacerbating their own children's loss of education, parents directed their anger at the Department. Commenting on a similar parent trend in the United States of America, Mitchell et al. (1981: 152-153) state that 'political pressure in a strike ... is almost always directed at officials who are blamed and punished for the disruption in public services.'

The relationship between the Department and parent and community groups thus changed significantly through the latters' general rejection of the Department and simultaneous general support of teachers and the teacher union. The dynamics of this interaction are summarised in Figure 6.2.

6.2.1.6 Education department–principal interaction

As a result of the militant stance of teachers against superintendents of education, the education department had to devolve crucial policy control functions to principals (see sections 4.3.1.4.2, 5.3.1.4, and 5.3.1.5). These new responsibilities generated several changes in the existing interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages between the Department and the principal. Structurally, the expanded role of the principal increased the discretionary powers of the principal. Principals, for example, permitted wide variation in the implementation of specific policies at their schools (see sections 5.3.1.5, 5.3.1.7,
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5.3.2.2, and 5.3.3.3). There were two general reasons for this. First, they were reluctant to expose themselves to militant opposition and alienation from their staff. Second, principals in Indian schools generally felt the need to demonstrate to their staff their independence from the Department by an active resistance to policies. For example, in 1991, principals lodged 'strong opposition' to school management courses that were organised by the Department to provide principals with skills required to cope with the changing environment and their new role demands (Moopanar, 1991). Despite this show of resistance, the Indian education department was reluctant to alienate principals at a time when its own authority was under attack from militant teachers and the organised teacher body. Therefore, instead of instituting disciplinary action or issuing letters of reprimand, all 'dissident' principals were asked to attend a meeting with the Chief Executive Director and to 'indicate honestly and in a forthright manner the reason for their decision not to participate [in the management training course]' (Management Committee, DEC, 1991a). Structurally, the overall outcome of this response was an expansion of the discretionary powers of principals as they now grasped that they could challenge the authority of the Department with relative impunity.

Nevertheless, principals, generally had an ambivalent attitude towards the Department. Confronted by the altered situational variables of their immediate context, principals tended to give greater precedence to acceptance by their staff members and the parent community than to approval from distant upper management personnel in the Department (see sections 5.3.1.5 and 5.3.1.7). However, to conceal their identification with the staff members and the general failure to effect close control over the work of teachers, principals tended to give superintendents of education an 'edited' version of school functioning. During the structured interview and in the responses to items on the questionnaire, principals underscored the stress experienced by being caught in the 'crossfire' between the Department and militant teachers (see sections 4.3.1.6, 5.3.1.6, and 5.3.2.7). The possible censure of the Department was a price they were willing to pay to avoid punitive sanctions from their own staff members and the community. Thus at school-level also there were basic changes in power relations.

6.2.1.7 Principal-teacher interaction

The principal is located at the intersection point between two decision-making arenas - that of the education department where political goals and educational values are translated into educational policies and that of the school where these policies are translated into specific programmes of work. This often exposed principals to conflicting
expectations and conflicting pressures. This situation itself seems to stem from the operation of two different images of teachers among senior officials. While policymakers in the Indian education department often viewed teachers as subordinates who were bound by the conditions of their service to respect the authority of senior officers, teachers themselves increasingly rejected this view. The result was a progressive decoupling of significant components of the school system. Under 'normal' circumstances, as Deal and Celotti (cited by Johnson, 1980: 229) point out, loosely coupled systems have advantages in that they can adapt to changing conditions, free the administration from the 'duties of overseer,' lessen the 'strains of negotiation and compromise,' reduce the time and costs of coordination, and provide individuals the autonomy to 'go their own way.' However, in a system where the delivery subsystem generally rejects the policy influence of the management subsystem, these 'advantages' tend to set in motion morphogenic processes of systemic change: the 'old' interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages may be weakened and new patterns may emerge. The reduced power of superintendents of education, in fact, led to the increased autonomy of Indian teachers and the subsequent devolution of instructional supervision and control functions to principals. This had the effect of pushing down to the school level the 'strain of negotiation and compromise' and so creating conditions that gave greater autonomy to schools, principals, and teachers to 'go their own way.'

Not satisfied with this increased control over their own sphere of influence, teachers sought to extend their control to the school management sphere of the principal. In some extreme instances, principals were exposed to 'threats' and 'terror tactics' if they resisted teacher demands (Naidoo, 1993). At other times, principals who resisted staff demands were exposed to 'sit-ins', 'chalkdowns', and mass protest action from parents supportive of teachers (see sections 4.3.1.6 smf 5.3.1.8). Teachers gave legitimacy to this militant rejection of the authority structures of the education system by politicising their actions (see sections 4.3.2.2 and 5.3.2.2).

6.2.1.8 Teacher-parent interaction

Public schools have a virtual monopoly on the provision of education services. Other sources of such services all entail varying degrees of financial costs and are, as Pincus (1974: 113) notes of the American system, 'open primarily to the wealthy or to those who are upwardly mobile.' Other points made by Pincus (1974: 114-115) that impact on teacher-parent interactions are that public schools have very little incentive to be economically competitive; they are nonmarket-oriented; they are self-perpetuating bureaucracies; and generally 'they cannot
select their clients and the client, as a practical matter, accepts the service, whether or not he is satisfied with its quality.' Most parents only have their 'voice' and alliances and partnerships with the education department or its teachers as mechanisms to seek recognition of their demands.

In the Indian education system a structure that parents had to express their 'voice' in the functioning of schools was the parent-teacher association. However, Departmental policy on the establishment of this structure was strongly resisted by educators as being undemocratic because parents were given a larger representation (TASA News, June 1991, p.3). In giving parents the majority 'voice', the Department itself was clearly seeking to balance its diminishing power at school level with increased parent power.

Unlike similar policy changes in England and Wales in the 1980's (Field, 1993: 166), this policy strategy failed in the Indian education system. First, Indian parents' general rejection of the tricameral system of government made them generally negative toward the Indian education department and its policy changes. Second, teachers attack on the legitimacy of the system and their rejection of the policy as being undemocratic silenced parents who may have been inclined to support the policy. Third, accepting the political basis of teacher rejection of the policy, most parents joined teachers in an active protest campaign against the policy. Essentially the emotionalism of the political attack on the tricameral system that formed a significant part of this campaign obscured the fact that parents were being denied decision-making powers by the protest programme of teachers.

From a conflict theory perspective, following Dahrendorf's (1959) analysis of social conflict, teachers may be seen as a technical elite who controlled schools and used this control as an instrument of power to exploit parents, to 'manage' their perception of the education reality, and to create conditions conducive of parent rejection of the education department. Each instance of teacher-parent protest action against the Department thus also became a conflict episode in the larger political struggle against the ruling elite. At the end of each such conflict episode and each education crisis, the Department negotiated a solution to the crisis with teachers and yielded to their demands to restore 'normal' functioning to schools. The exclusion of parents from such negotiations underscores the perception of both the Department and teachers that parents had only a subsidiary role in education policymaking. In the final analysis, teachers, not parents, had the power to veto the authority of the Department. Discussing a similar situation in the United States of America, Lieberman (1981) therefore concludes that public sector bargaining by teachers is 'antidemocratic'. 
6.2.2 Heightening of value conflicts

Many of the policy crises in the Indian education system had, at their core, value conflicts generated by a general weakening of the dominant organisational culture. There were two distinct but interrelated elements in this clash of values - a general rejection of the legitimacy of the Indian education department and an adoption by many policy actors of new values and competing interpretive schemes.

6.2.2.1 Rejection of the legitimacy of the Indian education department

As early as 1984, the organised teacher body rejected the legitimacy of the tricameral system of government and 'own affairs' control of education (see section 4.3.1.4). The linkage between this loss of legitimacy and loss of functional stability is implicit in Nieburg's (1968: 19) definition of the concept:

Legitimacy reflects the vitality of underlying consensus which endows the state and its officers with whatever authority and power they actually possess, not by virtue of legality but by the reality of the respect which citizens pay to the institutions and behaviour norms. Legitimacy is earned by the ability of those who conduct the power of the state to represent and reflect a broad consensus.

In short, when the 'underlying consensus' in the rightness of the political system and its values collapses, then the legitimacy of the system also collapses. This linkage is also evident in Lipset's (1960: 77) definition of the concept:

Legitimacy involves the capacity of the system to engender and maintain the belief that the existing political institutions are the most appropriate ones for the society. The extent to which contemporary democratic political systems are legitimate depends in large measure upon the ways in which key issues which have historically divided the society have been resolved.

The political transition processes in the larger South African society, in fact, threw into sharp relief the 'key issues which had historically divided' South African society.

The actual process by which this occurs is suggested in Easton's (1965) systems approach to the concept of legitimacy. He advances the view that there is a close causal linkage between input into a political system and its output. Input may occur as overt support in the form of actions or covert support which is reflected in positive attitudes towards the
political system. The support itself may be specific or diffuse. While the former refers to support for particular aspects of the political system, the latter flows from a reservoir of favourable attitudes 'that helps members to accept or tolerate outputs to which they are opposed or the effect of which they see as damaging to their wants' (Easton, 1965: 273). Diffuse support is generated by the political system through actions directed at instilling 'a deep sense of legitimacy in members for the regime as a whole and for individuals who act on behalf of it,' through manipulation of symbols of common interest, and through actions and policies directed at promoting and strengthening members identification with the political system. Legitimacy may thus derive 'from underlying ideological principles, from attachment to the structure and norms of the regime as such, or from devotion to the actual, authorities themselves because of their personal qualities' (Easton, 1965: 287).

The Indian education system displayed a legitimacy deficit in all three areas. First, it lacked legitimacy in that the ideological principles on which it rested - the apartheid system and its amplification in the tricameral system of government - were rejected by a large segment of the Indian community. Second, the structural realisation of this ideology in the form of the House of Delegates and the Indian education department was repeatedly attacked by teacher and parent organisations and there were repeated calls for their dissolution (Sunday Times Extra, April 3, 1994, p.3). Third, House of Delegate politicians were often stereotyped as individuals driven by cynical self-interest, upper management education officials as agents of the government, and superintendents of education as bureaucratic, prescriptive, and unprofessional in their interaction with principals and teachers (Sunday Times Extra, April 3, 1994, p.3). The combined outcome of this rejection of the Indian education department, as shown in Chapter 4, was a series of policymaking and policy implementation failures, recurring policy crises, and continuing value conflicts and power struggles among the key policy actors.

Another strand in the general rejection of the legitimacy of the Indian education department was the politicisation of Indian teachers and their 'socio-political conscientisation' (TASA, 1990b: 20). Teachers saw that schools were central agencies in the political processes of domination by the power elite and recognised their own involvement in the socialisation of children into the ideology of the power elite. Perceiving this involvement, many Indian teachers committed themselves to the dismantling of the system and the establishment of a democratic society (Naicker, 1990b: 5-7). The action of militant Indian teachers may thus be perceived as a form of resistance, as a process of constructing a radical pedagogy. Giroux's (1983: 289-293) discussion of resistance is relevant here. The protest actions of many Indian teachers were acts of resistance in that they were, to use Giroux's (1983: 291)
views, part of a process of 'galvanizing collective political struggle among parents, teachers, and students around issues of power and social determination.' By 1990 such teachers had begun to adopt a militant approach; they participated in political protest marches and rallies; they formed linkages with extra-parliamentary organisations and community structures; and they began a concerted attack on the legitimacy of the Indian education department and the tricameral system of government (Persad, 1990).

At the same time, however, many Indian teachers displayed pragmatic self-interest and a general neglect of professional accountability that belied the sincerity of their resistance orientation (see section 5.3.1.8). While engaged in participating in actions directed at the dissolution of the education department, they were also engaged each year - right up to 1994 - in negotiating improved procedures for evaluation and promotion of educators (see section 4.3.1.2.1). There was thus a suggestion that what was being displayed by these teachers when they participated in protest campaigns against the education department and its policies, when they complied with the teacher organisation's call to reject the supervisory control of superintendents of education, and when they acted against principals who sought to implement their newly devolved functions was more a general concern for the removal of educational accountability structures than a concern for the eradication of the ideological domination of the ruling elite (see sections 4.3.4.3 and 5.3.4.3). Theirs was a pragmatic, self-interested attack on the legitimacy of the system rather than a critical, resistance engagement with the historical and relational inequalities embedded in the political reality.

6.2.2.2 New value systems and competing interpretive schemes

Fundamental to the 'new' forms of interaction among policy actors is the fact that action is mediated by the organisational culture in which system members operate. This process is further mediated by personal norms and values that tend to influence behaviour within institutional settings. Together, the group values, the organisational culture, and the individual value orientations provide, to use Dror's (1986: 132) term, the 'cognitive maps and doctrines' that shape the meaning creating process. The value system acts as a perceptual filter in individual, sub-group, and group interactions with a changing reality. Starbuck (1982: 6), in fact, maintains that these perceptual filters not only make it difficult for organisations to work their way out of crises but also strongly affect organisations behaviour in non-crisis situations.
The term 'culture' and 'organisational culture' has been variously defined. Culture has been defined as social glue (Smircich, 1983) and as 'socially shared and transmitted knowledge of what is, and what might be, symbolized in act and artifact' (Wilson, 1971: 90). Firestone and Corbett (1988: 335) maintain that culture 'provides a normative structure for a social group: it is the wellspring from which flow recurrent and predictable behavior patterns.' Applied to organisations, the term denotes 'the emergence of distinct systems of knowledge, beliefs, technology, and norms in a particular organization' (Firestone and Corbett, 1988: 336). Smith and Kleiner (1987: 12) similarly note that 'cultures generate a philosophy that employees use to give meaning to their work' and that they 'serve as an informal control mechanism.' At the core of the various definitions and applications of the concept, as Wirt et al. (1988: 271) point out, are two distinct phenomena: 'social relationships and common values.' They also emphasise the fact that at the core of social relationships lie values and preferences for specific types of action and specific forms of belief. Similarly, Greenfield (1986: 59) sees 'values and sentiment as springs of human action.'

Hodgkinson's (1978; 1981) analysis of values is also relevant here. He (Hodgkinson, 1978: 121) defines a value as 'a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, or the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action.' In another work, Hodgkinson (1981: 149) defines values as 'concepts of the desirable' which tend to act as motivating determinants to behaviour. In organisations the operation of values may result in members at different levels of the system responding to similar situations with different conceptions of what is desirable and what is right.

In a period of rapid change and political transition, the shared values that bind the system together and legitimised the power of some groups over others may become fragmented or collapse, producing fundamental consequences for the system. For example, noting the rapidity of changes in the social, cultural, and economic systems of contemporary Europe, Lithman (1986: 9) concludes that the collective impact of these changes and the changing conditions has been a 'decontextualising of social life.' Lithman (1986: 10) asserts that we are witnessing the emergence of new patterns of thought and action which constitute 'transition to new modes of social life.' Also noting the destabilising impact of change in North America, Murphy and Fletcher (1989: 301) state:

Our contemporary society is characterised by continuous change which is impacting on all aspects of people's lives. Many individuals perceive themselves to be powerless and having minimal control of their future in such a turbulent environment. Past experiences are often of little or no assistance in coping with dynamic issues of the present. ...If progress moves at a rapid rate, many people are overwhelmed by the consequences of continuous change.
In situations such as these, new value systems and competing interpretive systems emerge. As Murphy and Fletcher (1989: 301-302) observe, many people perceive the new social realities and new organisational structures as being 'quite different from the traditional ones of the past.' Each of these changes has important consequences for education policymaking and policy implementation. System participants, for example, are faced with 'splintered realities' as they tackle changing and competing social and cultural definitions of desirable policy directions (Mitchell, 1990: 46).

In the South African context, the cumulative effect of the new value conflicts was a general fragmentation of the system equilibrium of pre-transition years. The reverberations of societal changes in the education system were inevitable if one accepts the fact that education policies are politically driven by the value system of the dominant group. As Glasman (1986: 19) notes, policies are generally 'indicative of how the political system allocates material and symbolic values to individuals and groups.' When political systems and their ancilliary structures are under pressure, then the cleavages in the once stable value system also manifest themselves in the education policy arena and polarise the relationship among the key policy actors. In the Indian education system this type of polarisation in the relationship between the Department and militant teachers produced attacks on the legitimacy of the system and the professional credibility of Departmental officials (see sections 4.3.2 and 5.3.2.2).

The relationship among the various policy actors in the Indian education system thus reflected the dynamics of a pluralistic society where groups were engaged in an enormous struggle for political control. While one group sought to defend the value system and power relationships of the past, the others sought to push for the ascendency of new values, new interpretive schemes, and new power relationships. The diffuse support that had once existed for the system now evaporated into value conflicts and attendant systemic changes in value systems and power relations (see sections 4.3.4.2, 4.3.4.4, 5.3.4.2, and 5.3.4.4).

6.2.3 Influence of perceived self-interest

An aspect of the value conflicts and the emergence of the competing interpretive schemes in the policymaking and policy implementation process relates to the influence of self-interest. Essentially, each policy is invested with multiple meanings and values by the various groups of actors involved in its formulation and implementation. The reason for this is fairly clear if one looks at the situation from a social constructivist perspective: any social or organisational event
is capable of different interpretations by different groups in the system. Thus organisational reality emerges as a set of meanings imputed to policymaking and policy implementation events by the various policy actors in pursuit of individual, group, and organisational aims (see sections 1.3.2.2, 6.3.2.5 and 6.3.2.6).

An important component of this process is the undercurrent of self-interest. Within each group, members tend to place great emphasis on their own values and priorities, on their own cohesiveness as a group. The struggle to retain a sense of group cohesion may be greater in times of societal transition when the larger system is likely to be undergoing fundamental alterations in value systems and power relations. Each group may seek specific states of affairs that involve a maximisation of individual and group priorities. Self-interest then acts as a screening mechanism for organisational goals and policies. In extreme forms, the operation of self-interest may lead to a denial that the interests of others have any moral claim on the relevant policy actors.

In the Indian education system, the influence of self-interest was evident in the actions of all the major policy actors (see sections 4.3.4.1.3 and 5.3.4.1.3). The education department, for example, was more concerned at times about avoiding public criticism and political attack than addressing the challenges of change (see, for example, sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4.1, and 5.3.2.1). Superintendents of education, from 1990 onwards, showed increasing concern about their rejection by teachers and their growing marginalisation in the education system. Thus they tended to be more concerned by establishing a new image of professional autonomy, apart from upper management, than protecting the image of the education department and working for organisational goals (see section 4.3.1.3). Principals tended to be more concerned about avoiding stressful conflict with staff members and securing acceptance by teachers than addressing newly developed functions relating to teacher supervision and control of Departmental policies (see sections 4.3.1.6, 5.3.1.7, and 5.3.1.8). Teachers and the organised teacher body were at times more concerned about the attainment of their own goals than addressing the educational needs of their pupils (see sections 4.3.1.4.1, 4.3.1.6.2, 4.3.2.2, and 5.3.1.8). Finally, parents were more concerned about the uninterrupted education of their children than the substantive aspects of policies or the essential logic of policy conflicts (see sections 4.3.1.6, 4.3.1.7, 4.3.1.8, and 5.3.1.9).

An important factor that influenced decisions of policy actors in their focus on perceived self-interest was their assessment of the legitimacy of the education department. The significance of this variable has been generally noted in policy implementation. Locke et al. (1988: 33), for example, maintain that the legitimacy of authority is a key determinant of commitment to organisational goals. In the Indian education system, this was for most lower level participants a factor missing from the
system, leading them to attack it and to seek its dissolution (see sections 4.2, 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2, and 5.3.2.2). Adding force to this response was a tendency among Indian teachers to show greater loyalty to the values and objectives of the organised teacher body. In this, their actions were similar to a process identified by Gouldner (1957: 281-306), one where professionals in organisations give greater loyalty to the values and priorities of outside referent groups.

Behaviour patterns such as these have led political scientists who have examined the policy implementation process in bureaucracies to treat the process 'in a way that assumes conflict, treats consensus as exceptional, reduces bureaucracy to smaller units of individuals or groups in conflict, and replaces compliance based on legal/rational authority with a political or bargaining model' (Bowen, 1982: 2). From this perspective, policy implementation becomes a bargaining process in which value conflicts, power struggles, and exchange relationships are often key processes.

6.2.4 Alterations in power relations

With the fragmentation of the normative and value structures within the Indian education department, the power relationships that had developed on the basis of these structures also began to fragment and lose their former coherence (see sections 4.3.4.4 and 5.3.4.4). In the sections that follow, the two polarities of this systemic change process - upper management resistance to change and teachers' militant and unionised drive for change - shall be discussed in some depth.

6.2.4.1 Upper management resistance to change

Upper management personnel in the Indian education department were resistant to the pressures for change (see section 5.3.2.1). This response to systemic and environmental turbulence, however, is not unusual or atypical: it has been noted in other contexts and other organisation settings. Lenz and Lyle (1986: 59), for example, note that upper management personnel who are faced by pressures for change often 'feel vulnerable because their organisational tactics and carefully accumulated power and prerogatives are open to challenge by those whom they do not consider their equals.' Moreover, top management personnel tend to 'fear that significant changes might initiate cascades of unforeseen events' (Starbuck, 1983: 97). Other points of relevance noted by Starbuck (1983: 87) are:
Hierarchies detach top managers from the realities that subordinates confront and so produce fundamental discontinuities in the ideologies of top managers and those of low-level personnel.

- Top managers' macroscopic points of view generate a 'secondhand contact' with most events.
- Distance from the organisational realities that their subordinates confront encourages top managers to rationalise the validity of their own ideologies.
- Policy statements of top managers tend to incorporate these distortions and to commit them to policy directions that may be inappropriate or ineffective.

The operation of tendencies such as these among upper management personnel in the Indian education system tended to produce what Dror (1986: 132) refers to as 'dependence on former cognitive maps and doctrines,' which involves approaching problems generated by fundamental alterations in the environment with old mindsets. Policies continue to be formulated on the basis of past trends rather than a direct confrontation of the uncertainties and ambiguities of an altered present (see section 5.3.2.1). In the Indian education system this was evident, for example, in the Chief Executive Director's persistent efforts to reimpose top-down supervisory control of teachers and his struggle to retain decision-making powers in the hands of the Department (see section 4.3.1.4.2).

Commenting on a similar situation among education policymakers in the United States of America, Marshall (1988: 98) states:

> Operating in distinctive organizational cultures, state policymakers are, in the majority of cases, both geographically and psychologically distanced from schools - a distance that makes it difficult for policymakers to be responsive to actual needs and difficult for educators to appreciate policymaking processes. The unfortunate consequences are inappropriate, non-implemented, and conflicting policies and practices.

Expanding on the background to this situation, Marshall (1988: 98) goes on to point out that policy actors have been socialised to understand and work within a special culture of policymaking. Young (1977: 2-3) refers to this cultural context as 'assumptive worlds - policymakers' subjective understanding of the environment in which they work,' an understanding incorporating 'several intermingled elements of belief, perception, evaluation, and intention, as a response to the reality 'out there'. Inability to alter their 'assumptive world' makes policymakers resistant to change pressures.

Approaching the problem of policymakers' resistance to change from a
similar point, Sabatier (1986: 42-43) argues that policymaking is the product of belief systems which consist of 'deep core' elements and 'secondary aspects.' The 'deep core' elements refer to 'fundamental normative and ontological axioms.' Thus all organisations have a set of policies that reflect 'fundamental policy positions concerning the basic strategies for achieving normative axioms of deep core.' In contrast, the 'secondary aspects' refer to 'instrumental decisions and information searches necessary to implement core policy positions.' Sabatier (1986) advances the view that 'deep core' elements of the belief system are not easily susceptible to change and that when change does finally occur it is 'akin to a religious conversion.' Consequently, deep core policy elements do not undergo change easily: such change only occurs 'if experience reveals serious anomalies.' In contrast, change in policies that express the secondary aspects is relatively easy. In the Indian education department policies relating to the supervisory control of teachers seem to belong to the 'deep core' aspects of the system. Hence, the unwillingness of the upper management to accept change in this sphere (see sections 4.3.1.4.2 and 5.3.2.1). In contrast, policies relating to issues such as promotion procedures and the granting of merit awards seem to relate to 'secondary aspects' that do not impact on deeply held beliefs about education (see sections 4.3.1.2.3 and 4.3.3.2).

Though the Indian education department participated in provincial, inter-departmental level strategic planning (Olivier, 1992; Shah, 1994a; 1994b; 1994c), it continued to function in its old policy grooves in its own system despite policy crises because of three possible reasons. First, the upper management team tended to act as a cohesive unit. This not only reinforced their policy belief system but reduced their openness to information that challenged that belief system. Janis's (1972) discussion of 'groupthink' gives credence to this explanation. He argues that group cohesiveness and insularity leads to inferior decision making and restricted perception of viable alternatives. Similarly, Day (1986: 60) maintains that organisational decision makers tend to 'anchor' on a particular policy outcome that they believe will occur to such an extent that it dominates their thinking and blinds them to the possibility of failure. There is also a tendency towards 'selective perception' where past policy success controls the perception of the present despite radically altered systemic conditions. Day (1986: 60) also notes that, despite evidence to the contrary, policymakers cling to the 'illusion' that they can master and control their changing environment. To retain this 'illusion of control' they tend to attribute success to their own efforts and failure to a variety of external factors. In the Indian education system, this was evident in the fact that upper management tended to make superintendents of education and principals scapegoats for policy failures; there was also a general failure to accept the possibility that the fault may lie in the inadequacy of policies and the ineffectiveness of the policymaking process (see section 5.3.2.1).
A second reason for upper management resistance to change relates to the loosely coupled functioning of the education system. Despite the non-implementation of crucial policies, at least superficially, schools continued to function and teachers continued to teach. Upper management personnel were thus able to retain the illusion of being in control. Even when superintendents of education were denied access to teachers' classrooms and even when upper management was forced to grant greater powers to the organised teacher body in the formulation of specific policies, the education department retained the illusion of control as the superficial regularities of the education system continued because of the loose linkage among components.

A third reason for upper management resistance to change rests in the efforts of upper management to retain the 'old' power dominance over the system. The repeated efforts of the Chief Executive Director to reimpose the supervisory control of teachers by superintendents of education was essentially an effort to restore the balance of power. Ironically, each effort ended in policy crises and surrender to the demands of teachers. Nevertheless, after each failure the Chief Executive Director sought new policy avenues and new power strategies to regain lost ground (see section 4.3.1.4.2).

6.2.4.2 Teacher militancy and teacher unionism

A major milestone in the altered value and power relationship between the Department and the organised teacher body was the latter's move from a 'professional association' to a 'teacher union' (Samuel, 1990: 15). Persad (1990) noted that this thrust toward unionism among Indian teachers was partly the result of a general dissatisfaction with the Department's lack of legitimacy and its officials' bureaucratic exercise of power. SADTU itself saw as its fundamental goals a commitment to 'dragging education out of the abyss it has slid into,' contributing to the establishment of 'political legitimacy in schooling in general,' struggling for the establishment of 'a democratic, non-racial system of education, catering on equal basis for all children in the country,' and preparing youth for 'their role as politically accountable citizens in a democratic South Africa' (Van den Heever, 1992: 16). On the issue of the use of industrial-type protest actions such as strikes, SADTU maintained that teachers were 'education workers' who could legitimately use strikes to press home their demands (SADTU, 1993: 12).

The rise of teacher militancy and teacher unionism affected interactions among key policy actors at all levels of the system (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.2, 5.3.1.8, 5.3.2.2, and 5.3.3.3). First, at the upper management level of the Department, despite the general resistance
to change, senior officials were repeatedly forced into making policy compromises and concessions. In their interaction with the teacher body, emphasis was generally placed more on a rapid return of schools to stable functioning to avert political pressure and parent anger than on the educational effects of policy agreements. Often, in fact, there was little or no assessment of the professional and managerial effectiveness of the policy solutions and their implementation impact on the educational services provided to pupils and parents (see sections 4.3.1.2 and 5.3.3.1).

Second, teacher unionism and teacher militancy led to structural and value changes at the level of superintendents of education. From 1990 the control functions of these officials were widely resisted by Indian teachers. Efforts by the Chief Executive Director to restore these functions repeatedly produced policy crises and education breakdowns. Meanwhile, caught in the middle between upper management and educators in schools, superintendents of education sought to redefine their professional identity and to develop a new working relationship with teachers. They distanced themselves from the Minister of Education and Culture and actively dissociated themselves from the values of upper management on many crucial policy issues (see sections 4.3.1.3 and 4.3.3.1). The situation had all the ingredients of what Althusser and Balibar (1970, cited by Ball, 1988: 304) describe as a 'ruptural unity': conditions had developed which weakened the authority and value linkages between upper management and teachers, between upper management and superintendents of education, and between teachers and superintendents of education and set the ground for radical changes in the education system. The situation also had ingredients of what Meyer and Rowan (1978) have called the 'logic of confidence.' By exposing their policy and organisational failures and crises to public scrutiny in the press, policy actors in the Department and in schools contributed to a general erosion in public trust in the Indian education system. Parents who could afford to do so exited from the system, while those who could not, directed their anger at Indian politicians and the Indian education department (see section 4.3.1.5 and 5.3.1.9).

The third level of impact was at the micro-system level of Indian schools. The interaction between principals and teachers took on a strained quality. The problem, of course, was basically structural: principals, like superintendents of education, occupied a boundary spanning position. They acted as a direct link between the education department and the school. As such they were directly accountable to the Department for policy implementation at school level. Indian principals were faced with a serious dilemma. If they sought to implement unpopular policies not only could they lose the trust of their staff but expose themselves to militant resistance from teachers and site committees. This, indeed, did happen (see section 4.3.1.6). On the other hand, if they yielded to staff pressures they could be assessed by the Department
as being weak and lacking in managerial skills. This tension generated several structural adjustments at school level: wide emphasis by principals on teacher accountability for policy implementation, absence of close monitoring, general adoption of participative management styles, and selective reporting to Departmental officials (see sections 5.3.1.7 and 5.3.3.3). Adjustments in the value system of principals included militant assertion of professional autonomy by some principals and a movement towards teachers' interpretive schemes by many others (see sections 4.3.1.6 and 6.2.1.6). For many principals, these changes were changes that had to be concealed from the Department. The result was that principals often acted as screening mechanisms that concealed policy violations at their schools (see sections 5.3.1.5, 5.3.1.6, 5.3.1.7, and 6.2.1.6).

Second, looking closely at the effect of teacher strike action at the school level, Mokae (1993: 20), an executive member of the Azanian Peoples' Organisation (AZAPO), said that teachers who went on strike because 'they protest against monitoring/supervision by inspectors,' 'do not want to write out scheme books daily,' or 'are protesting against "authoritarian" principals who do not want them to go home before two o'clock' are undermining the structural elements of good education. He reminded educators that monitoring of work at all levels is an essential 'cornerstone' of good education. On the issue of the use of teacher strikes as a political weapon to exert pressure on an apartheid government and its apartheid agencies, Mokae (1993:20) said that teachers 'wittingly or unwittingly' denied their pupils education by placing 'party-political programmes' above the needs of their children.

Third, the teacher union call for the abolition of achievement awards for deserving teachers had the effect of undermining emphasis on quality and teaching excellence. The union's proposal was that all teachers should receive 'service awards' after specified years of service irrespective of the standard of their work (Sunday Tribune Herald, May 16, 1993, p.6). One principal argued that this proposal would produce a general decline in education standards if implemented: 'why should a teacher work hard if another who neglects all his professional responsibilities will receive the same "service award" after X number of years ?'

There was thus clearly a suggestion that teacher militancy and teacher unionism were contributing to a general decline in education standards. Teacher resistance sometimes seemed to be more a strategy to avoid professional accountability than genuine professional engagement with the system (see sections 4.3.1.4.2, 4.3.1.6.2, 5.3.1.8 and 5.3.3.2). From this perspective the whole conflict between the Chief Executive Director and the teacher body over supervisory control of teachers' work may be viewed as a conflict relating to professional accountability and 'professional licence.' Nevertheless, the teacher body and teachers were able to deflect attention from their avoidance of professional
accountability by directing attention to the legitimacy and credibility of their political attack on the system (see sections 4.3.2.2, 5.3.2.2, and 5.3.2.3). However, after the 1994 general election, SADTU was often accused of political opportunism and professional irresponsibility ('Brain Not Washed', 1995: 6).

The situation that unfolded in the Indian education system is one that is similar to the evolution of teacher unions in the USA. Kerchner and Mitchell (1988: 33), for example, point out that radical criticism of the education system served to give moral validity to the actions of militant teachers and to win 'converts by painting an idyllic picture of a future characterized by dignity, justice, and an end to conflict.' The associated process of stressing the professional autonomy of teachers and agitating for the removal of external controls, Kerchner and Mitchell (1988: 219-200) observe, leads to a situation where there tends to occur a general erosion of public confidence in education:

By formalising conflict, unionization weakens [the] logic of confidence and renders suspect the dedication of teachers ... unionization has made it more difficult ... for school administrators to create internal cohesion at school site, and to rely on mutual confidence.

Therefore they maintain that teacher unionization in the USA has to come to grips with the task of establishing 'policy decisions necessary to forge unionism into the instrument for bringing about desired changes in teaching work.'

Also touching upon the negative impact of teacher unionisation and collective bargaining on the quality of teaching work and the general displacement of effort from the classroom, Cresswell et al. (1980: 469) observe:

Collective bargaining represents a public expression of the pursuit of self-interest. To the extent that teachers engage in this process, they serve notice to clients, school board members, and others that they are willing to promote their own interests. This has led to more intense questioning of their behavior as professionals because there is confusion as to whether teachers are speaking from a position of professional interest or self-interest and it has left teachers with something of a credibility problem.

What seems to have occurred is that emphasis on securing teacher rights has not been accompanied by a similar emphasis on retaining and enhancing commitment to professional obligations to pupils, parents, and society. As Offe (1976, cited by Boreham, 1983: 711) argues, where policy situations include discretion and room for interpretation, 'subordinates must develop their own complementary goal interpretations and their own independent commitment if the planned result is to be achieved.'

In the Indian education system this necessary balance to professional
autonomy did not generally emerge, leading to general complaints about
decline in educational quality (see section 4.3.1.4.2 and 4.3.1.6.2). However, the increase in teacher power and teachers' freedom from
organisational control allowed the emergence of a situation where professional, autonomy often shaded into 'professional licence' (see
sections 4.3.1.6.2, 5.3.1.8, and 5.3.3.2).

6.2.5 General weakening of system linkages and increase in
loose coupling of system components

Weick (1982: 674) identifies four characteristics that all schools with
tightly coupled structures share - policies and procedures, agreement on
the content and necessity for the policies and procedures, a system of
inspection to assess the level of adherence with policies and procedures,
and feedback designed to improve compliance and quality of outcomes. In
systems that are more loosely coupled, according to Weick (1982), at
least two of these characteristics are missing, with the missing features
generally being either consensus on policies and procedures or inspection
procedures to establish the level of policy compliance. In the Indian
education system there was a general absence of three of the
characteristics identified by Weick (1982: 674). While there were
policies and procedures, the level of general agreement with them was
often low (see section 5.3.3.1). Allied to this general rejection of
policies was a militant resistance by teachers to supervision of their
work by superintendents of education (see sections 4.3.1.4.2 and
5.3.1.4). Militant opposition from teachers also produced a general
absence of teacher supervision by school-level management staff (see
section 5.3.1.7 and 5.3.3.2). Consequently, teachers generally did not
receive any feedback on the effectiveness of their core teaching
responsibilities. The Indian education system thus displayed, in terms
of Weick's (1982) analysis of the concept, a dysfunctional level of loose
coupling and a general weakening of crucial systemic linkages (see
section 4.3.4.5, 5.3.3.4 and 5.3.4.5).

In their discussion of linkages in school systems, Wilson and Corbett
(1983: 88) draw attention to three types of linkages - cultural,
interpersonal, and structural. Cultural linkages refer to shared goals,
shared values, shared patterns of behaviour, and shared definitions of
situations. Interpersonal linkages embrace the human relations core of
the organisation, all the structures of orderly conduct and co-operation
among organisation members. Structural linkages relate to structures
that are responsible for the coordination and control of the organisation
through the formal exercise of authority. The altered interaction among
the key policy actors in the Indian education system, the emergence of
competing value systems and interpretive schemes, the operation of
perceived self-interest, the changes in power relations, and the varying levels of conflict among organisation members all produced, through morphogenetic, structuration, and conflict processes, a general weakening of linkages and increased loosely coupled functioning (see sections 4.3.4 and 5.3.4). As Fennell (1994: 30) points out, fewer and weaker linkages result in much looser coupling, with few common bonds in place to keep the people in the organisation working or thinking together.

Under pressure from transition processes in the larger society, the cultural and value linkages between upper management and those at lower levels of the education hierarchy were also weakened to varying degrees of brittleness. Each group - upper management, superintendents of education, school-based senior management, heads of department, and teachers - generally developed distinctly different values, beliefs, and interpretive schemes. Using Sproull's (1981: 210-218) classification of beliefs in organisations, the differences between upper management value system and those at lower levels of the Indian education hierarchy may be seen broadly to fall into four categories. First, they generally differed on fundamentals relating to general socio-cultural beliefs: the administration, for example, saw itself as a legitimate structure offering a necessary service but educators at lower levels of the system, in varying degrees, saw it as lacking in legitimacy (see sections 4.3.2.3 and 5.3.2.2). Several studies have shown that these cultural differences have a profound impact on policy implementation as new information about specific policies tend to be interpreted in terms of individual and group beliefs and value systems (Sproull, 1981: 212). Second, beliefs and values about work processes and technologies held by upper management and those at lower levels of the Indian education system were often clearly different (see sections 4.3.1.4.2 and 5.3.3.3). While the Chief Executive Director, for example, felt that close supervision of teachers' work was necessary, teachers and their organised body were militantly opposed to any supervisory interaction with superintendents of education and principals. Third, the beliefs about the identity, purpose, and character of an organisation can influence the actions of organisation members. For example, the strong belief among teachers that the Department was lacking in legitimacy because of its rootedness in an apartheid system was a decisive aspect in many of their protest actions against its policies (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, and 5.3.1.4). Finally, beliefs about environmental characteristics are a significant aspect of cultural linking mechanisms in a system (see section 5.2). Sproull (1981: 217) thus notes that the degree of uncertainty in the environment may be perceived differently by organisation members and thus differently affect policymaking and policy implementation processes of the system. An example of this in the Indian education system comes from the fact that while the education department did not perceive the major changes in the larger society as being immediately relevant to its functioning, teachers and parents perceived and responded to the environment turbulence differently (see sections 5.3.2.1, 5.3.2.2, and
While the Indian education department looked at short-term needs (item 24/2), 'ignored altered circumstances' (item 31/2), and did not direct much effort to planning for a unitary system (item 25/2), teachers and parents, with the acceleration of the transition processes in the larger society, accelerated and increased the force of their rejection of the Department and their campaign for the dissolution of the system (see sections 4.3.1.5, 4.3.2.2, 5.3.1.8, and 5.3.2.2).

In the Indian education system these four belief subsystems produced major rifts between the various groups in the system (see sections 4.3.4 and 5.3.4). This adversely affected the interpersonal linkages among policy actors as individuals developed competing interpretive schemes and sought to guide and control their corporate lives in the face of fundamental environmental and systemic changes. Because of the general fragmentation of relations, the interpersonal linkages between Departmental officials and teachers often occurred via third party interactions - generally through the principal and the organised teacher body. This situation, in turn, pressed upwards on the interpersonal linkages between the upper management in the Department and superintendents of education (see sections 4.3.1.3 and 5.3.1.3). Relationship between the two groups became strained as the Chief Executive Director, reacting to complaints about falling standards and anarchic conditions in Indian schools from the Minister, politicians, and parents, sought to reimpose on militant teachers the supervisory control of superintendents of education.

At school level also interpersonal linkages were weakened and altered. Principals, for example, were confronted by militant teachers and site committees who refused to acknowledge their hierarchical authority. As a result they often avoided effecting supervisory control over their staff and turned increasingly to the use of participative and democratic styles of decision making. In fact, principals who sought to effect close control over their staff were often the focus of public protest action and teacher and parent campaign to have them removed from the school (see sections 4.3.1.6 and 4.3.1.7).

The resultant increased loosely coupled, at times anarchic, functioning of the Indian education system impacted recursively on the interaction among policy actors, generating further changes in value systems and power relations and producing further weakening in interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages (see sections 4.3.1.6, 5.3.1.7, 5.3.3.3, and 5.3.3.4). Simultaneously, the increased loosely coupled functioning of the education system affected policymaking and policy implementation processes in a variety of ways.
6.2.6 Policymaking impacts

As Hjern and Hull (1982: 114) point out, it is now a truism of implementation literature that the objectives of public policies are often vague and are defined and redefined during the process of implementation itself. Therefore, to examine policy implementation without looking at the policymaking process itself is to fail in noting how closely the two processes are intertwined. This observation is even more relevant in any examination of policy implementation in a society in transition. Both policymakers and policy implementers are influenced by political and social changes in the larger society. In the Indian education system this, in fact, was the case (see section 5.2). The more important of these impacts are discussed below.

6.2.6.1 Absence of effective strategic planning

With the weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages of the past, the Indian education department was faced with several levels of uncertainty. The turbulence of the environment also generated fundamental uncertainties about the future and acted as a source of repeated threats to the stability of the system (see section 5.2). As already suggested in the discussion of upper management resistance to change (section 6.2.3.1), executive level officials viewed these changes as major threats to system stability and the retention of old hierarchical power relations. They formulated policies that sought to hold back change and insulate the education system from the environment (see sections 4.3.1.4.2 and 5.3.2.1). Associated with this process was a general failure of strategic management and leadership (see section 5.3.2.1).

According to Mintzberg et al. (1976: 246) 'strategic simply means important, in terms of the actions taken, the resources committed, or the precedents set.' They are decisions 'that utilize the organisation's (internal and external) threats and opportunities to enhance the long-term success of the organization' (Schilit and Paine, 1987: 162). Therefore, as Lyles and Thomas (1988: 131) maintain:

A critical task of upper-level management involves the identification and structuring of the most important problems threatening the organization's ability to survive and adapt in the future ... These are not the everyday routine problems but the problems and issues that are unique, important, and frequently ambiguous ... They impact the ability to survive and prosper.

The upper management in the Indian education department did display a
recognition of the need for strategic planning at the provincial level. They, for example, were involved in the provincial, inter-departmental planning for a unitary provincial education department (Olivier, 1992; Shah, 1994a; 1994b; 1994c). However, a similar 'think-tank' strategy was not undertaken internally to anticipate and plan for changes within the Indian education system itself. There was a general tendency to continue thinking in terms of old policy paradigms and old policy solutions as, for example, was evident in the Chief Executive Director's repeated efforts to reimpose external supervisory control over teachers (see section 5.3.2.1).

Yet, as Hanson (1990: 56) observes, education policy must be carried out by educational planning that is directed at making education responsive to the changing needs and goals of pupils and society. An essential component of this process is strategic planning that entails the perception of long-term trends and the development of strategies to anticipate and to respond to significant political, social, and economic changes. In a period of rapid, societal transitions and environment turbulence, the task of strategic planning acquires pivotal importance in an organisation as its continuing stability and responsiveness are dependent on the ability to sense the significance of sudden discontinuities with the past, to perceive the relevance of unanticipated environmental events, and to identify strategic problems. Clearly, as the environment becomes more uncertain and more complex, this process becomes more difficult. Nevertheless, upper management still has the responsibility to identify patterns in the turbulence, define strategic problems, and assign meaning to them, if they are to fulfil effectively their leadership functions.

The general absence of effective strategic planning in the Indian education system contributed to a general rigidity on the part of policymakers in the Department when confronted by environmental threats and opportunities (see section 5.3.2.1). Allied to this dysfunctional response was a general tendency among upper level personnel to attribute the failure of resultant policies to superintendents of education and other Departmental personnel. This had the effect of weakening the interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages between upper management and superintendents of education and upper management and principals, and so affecting the policy implementation process (see sections 4.3.1.4, 4.3.3.1, 5.3.1.3, 5.3.2.7, and 5.3.3.2).

6.2.6.2 Policy entrapment

Despite changed conditions, education policymakers in the Indian education Department often remained stuck in old policy grooves, unable
or unwilling to forge new policy paths (see sections 5.3.1.1 and 5.3.2.1). This form of continued commitment to old policy directions and old policymaking paradigms, despite policy crises and policy failures, has been labelled by Staw (1976) as 'Knee-Deep in the Big Muddy.' Staw (1976) found that decision makers often tended to increase their commitment to a policy that produced negative responses, especially if they were personally responsible for its adoption. Staw explains this response in terms of self-justification: policymakers commit more resources to a policy after initial difficulties in an effort to prove that they were justified in their initial decision and to avoid losing face with subordinates. Staw and Ross (1978) expanded on this explanation in suggesting that, in addition to self-justification effects, the response is due to reinforcement effects, expectancy effects, reactance effects, learned helplessness effects, and invulnerability effects. Figure 6.3 schematically summarises their argument.

Day (1986: 60) offers other explanations for the failure to move out of old policy grooves, reasons which are deeply rooted in the way policymakers and administrators seek to cope with environmental turbulence and ambiguity. He identifies the three sources of policy entrapment as being 'anchoring', 'selective perception', and 'illusion of control.' Anchoring refers to policymakers' tendency to fixate on a particular outcome that they believe will flow from their policy decisions. This outcome dominates their thinking to such an extent that it blocks the critical contemplation of the problem and the possibility of alternate policy routes to success. As a result, the possibility of policy failure or organisation crises is swept aside. In selective perception, there is a tendency to perceive the problem through the lens of past experience and past policy successes. Consequently, evidence that casts doubt on the accuracy and validity of conclusions and policy decisions is, consciously or unconsciously, screened out. Finally, the illusion of control refers to the fact that policymakers' faith in their hierarchical power may lead them to believe that they can exercise control over their environment. To retain this illusion of control there is the concurrent tendency to attribute policy success to their own leadership and policy failures to a variety of external agents.

The operation of the processes identified by Staw (1976), Staw and Ross (1978), and Day (1986) was evident in the Indian education system. The operation of 'reactance' effect (Staw and Ross, 1978) and 'anchoring' and 'selective perception' (Day, 1986), for example, may be observed in the Chief Executive Director's repeated efforts to enforce close supervision of teachers' work to address the perceived decline in education standards (see section 4.3.1.4.2). Similarly, the 'self-justification' effect (Staw, 1976; Staw and Ross, 1978) and the 'illusion of control' (Day, 1978) may be noted in upper management tendency to attribute policy failures to managerial inadequacy on the part of superintendents of
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6.2.6.3 Hyperrationalisation tendency

The general response of upper management in the Indian education Department to repeated policy failures and crises was one of seeking to tighten the bureaucratic linkages in the system and to reimpose firmer control on teachers. This was particularly evident in policies relating to supervisory control of teachers, staffing of schools, and the promotion of educators. As each policy effort failed, the policymaking trend moved towards what Wise (1977: 43), in a discussion of American education policies, has referred to as the 'hyperrationalisation of education.' This basically involves the formulation of policies and procedures designed to make schools more rational in an effort to improve their functioning (see section 2.2.3.2.1). In short, it involves an effort to reduce the loosely coupled functioning of schools through increased centralisation, more formalisation, and greater thrust towards standardisation.

The general thinking among upper management personnel in the Indian education department, indeed, was that 'the Department's endeavour to act tolerantly of the current attitude among educators was being interpreted as weakness' (Management Committee, DEC, 1991b). The consensus among upper management was that the Department had to reassert its authority and ensure that schools were run on a firm, efficient, rational basis (see sections 4.3.1.4 and 5.3.1.1). Policies that sought to achieve this goal often displayed a hyperrationalisation tendency. The Chief Executive Director, for example, made repeated efforts to enforce tight control of teachers' work. Each failure was followed by a strategy more firmly rooted in rational-bureaucratic principles and values, progressively leading to one that was extremely prescriptive, procedurally complex, and unrealistic given the militancy of teachers and the general ambivalence of superintendents of education and principals: the Chief Executive Director finally issued E.C. Circular Minute No. 7 of 1994 which required principals to monitor the work of teachers and to submit certificates of satisfactory performance in terms of industry, discipline, punctuality, efficiency, and conduct for them to qualify for their annual salary increment. The primary goal of this policy was to tighten the authority linkages in the system and to make teachers more performance oriented and schools more accountable (see section 4.3.1.4.2). The hyperrational elements in the policy, however, failed to come to grips with the reality in Indian schools.

Wise's (1977) discussion of hyperrationalisation and 'why educational policies often fail' is pertinent here. Discussing the hyper-
rationalisation tendency in the USA, Wise (1977: 44-45) outlines the features of educational policies that display this characteristic. First, he notes that educational policies reflect 'excessive prescription' without reference to whether the stipulated procedures and expected outcomes are possible given situational and resource constraints. Second, these policies involve 'procedural complexity' where the focus falls more on procedures to achieve standardisation and control rather than on substantive changes. Often these new procedures are not adjusted to be consistent with procedures in other policy spheres. Third, these policies tend to provide 'inappropriate solutions' which are frequently the result of ignorance or a general failure to deal with root problems. Fourth, these policies tend to present what Wise (1977: 45) calls 'first-order solutions,' where the initial definition of the problem also acts as the source of policy solutions. For example, if superintendents of education and principals are not supervising the work of teachers, then the solution becomes the development of a supervision system without any examination of underlying causes (see section 4.3.1.4.2). Finally, Wise (1977: 45) maintains that hyperrationalisation is evident in policies that often reflect 'wishful thinking' in that they are directed at the achievement of goals which schools had failed to achieve in the past.

Often hyperrationalisation in policymaking occurs in systems where there is a crisis of performance and general instability in schools. In conditions such as these, in 'apparent frustration and desperation, policymakers prescribe excessive controls, introduce complicated procedures, offer inappropriate solutions, devise simplistic solutions, and engage in wishful thinking' (Wise, 1977: 45). Disruptions in the Indian education system and the general crisis of legitimacy often pushed policymakers in the Department to similar policy responses. This was evident, for example, in policies relating to staffing of schools and devolution of control functions to principals (see section 4.3.1.4). What policymakers in the Indian education system often failed to recognise was that hyperrationalisation in policymaking was essentially an increased dependence on 'old' bureaucratic solutions in a situation that demanded a break with the past (see sections 5.3.2.1 and 5.3.3.1).

6.2.7 Policy implementation impacts

The alterations in patterns of interaction among key policy actors, the emergence of value conflicts and competing interpretive schemes, the influence of self-interest, the alterations in power relations, the general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages in the Indian education system, and policymaking inadequacies such as those relating to ineffective strategic planning, policy entrapment, and
hyperrationalisation all contributed to the configurations of the policy implementation process in the Indian education system during the transition years. In the sections that follow some of the more significant aspects of this impact shall be examined.

6.2.7.1 Ineffective communication of policies

Nakamura and Smallwood (1980: 59) underscore the importance of communication in the policy implementation process by drawing attention to the multiplicity of policy actors and policy arenas. Similarly, stressing the centrality of effective communication, Katz and Kahn (1966: 223) maintain that 'communication - the exchange of information and the transmission of meaning - is the very essence of a social system or an organization.' Even more emphatic on this issue, Hawes (1974: 500) states that 'a social collectivity is patterned communicative behavior; communicative behavior does not occur within a network of relationships but is that network.'

In the Indian education system the network of relationships among the various policy actors had, under pressure from external and internal change processes, become fragmented through alterations in value systems and power relations (see sections 4.3.4 and 5.3.4). With the resultant weakening in interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages, the nature of the social collectivity altered. As Hambleton (1983: 407) notes, under conditions such as this, policy implementation is likely to be faulty for 'ambiguity in communications from central government creates doubts and probably weakens their impact.' In the Indian education system, the general communication process was further weakened by a general denial of the legitimacy of the education department and a general defiance of policies emerging from its policymaking structures (see sections 4.3.2.3 and 5.3.2.2). As Gunn (1978, cited by Hambleton, 1983: 407) points out, 'perfect' implementation requires not only 'complete understanding' of the policy message, but also 'agreement upon' the objectives to be achieved. Both these qualities were often lacking in the Indian education system: policy circulars were often ambiguous and, when grasped, they often evoked strong disagreement (see sections 5.3.1.2 and 5.3.3.1).

6.2.7.2 Resistance to specific types of policies

Even if communication about policies were clearly understood, resistance to policies may be influenced by their content (see sections 4.3.4.2.2 and 5.3.4.2.1). The empirical data in this study suggests that policies
that touch on the core activities of the teaching situation are more likely to evoke strongly negative responses from teachers than those relating to general school administration matters (see sections 5.3.3.1 and 5.3.3.2). This finding is not unusual in implementation literature touching on this issue. Beyer et al. (1983: 232-233), for example, identify 'four separate dimensions along which the amount of change implied by the prescription embodied in a policy can vary.' The first dimension they identify is 'pervasiveness' which refers to the 'proportion of total behaviors occurring within an organisation that will be affected by implementing the policy.' The second dimension, 'magnitude', refers to 'the amount of displacement of existing organizational states that implementing the policy will entail.' The third dimension is 'innovativeness', which relates to 'the degree to which past experience provides routines or programs in implementing the policy.' The fourth dimension is 'duration' which relates to the time for which the policy is applicable. Findings in this study on the relationship among policy variables actually replicate a finding of Beyer et al. (1983: 233), namely that policies that have undergone greatest change are likely to elicit highest levels of disagreement and resistance (see section 5.3.3.1 and 5.3.3.2).

Allied to this response is the issue of perceived self-interest (see sections 4.3.4.1.3 and 5.3.4.1.3). In short, if policy implementers perceive significant advantages and benefits in policies, then they are likely to be more willing to accept such policies and be more compliant during the implementation phase. The policy of the organised teacher body urging all teachers to resist external supervision, for example, was implemented by most teachers at most Indian schools. An important factor here was the removal of supervision and the encouragement of teacher autonomy. In contrast, Departmental policies that sought to curb this autonomy were widely resisted. Similarly, staffing policies that sought to introduce more stringent staffing norms were vigorously resisted because of their perceived disadvantageous consequences for teachers (see section 4.3.1.4.1). Beyer et al. (1983: 235) maintain that policies of this sort, which involve pervasive changes, 'require relatively concerted or co-operative actions from many parts of the implementing organisation.' They therefore advance the view that 'a tightly coupled organization is in a distinctly better position to implement a pervasive change than is a loosely coupled organization.'

6.2.7.3 Power struggles and conflict

During periods of fundamental societal change, the power dynamics of a system also tend to undergo radical change. As Lukes (1974: 47) observes, in periods of social upheaval or what he calls 'abnormal
times', power struggles and conflict are likely to occur with greater frequency and greater intensity. Kelly (1967: 69) defines this dynamic as follows:

Conflict and change are inevitably interlocked as any redistribution of power and privilege will be sought by some and resisted by others.

Conflict increases as key policy actors strive for the ascendancy of their values, for the entrenchment of new power dependencies, and for the achievement of specific group interests.

As the transition processes unfolded in the larger society, policy actors in the Indian education system grouped themselves on an ideological basis into three clearly defined groups. At one extreme there were those, often in managerial positions, who were generally supportive of the education system and the political status quo (see section 4.3.1.3 and 4.3.1.4). At the other extreme were those, often located at lower levels in the educational hierarchy, who were hostile to the continuation of the tricameral system and its service agencies (see sections 4.3.1.3 and 4.3.2). In between were those who saw themselves as apolitical educators, people who were often emotionally stressed by the power struggles and conflict flowing from the interaction between the two groups at either ends of the continuum. As the political transition processes gained momentum in the larger society and as the legitimacy of apartheid structures came under increasing attack, increasing conflict became a distinctive feature of the Indian education system with policy failures and systemic adjustments the frequent outcomes (see section 4.3.3, 5.3.1.8, 5.3.2, and 5.3.3.2).

With the emergence of teacher militancy and teacher unionism, the process was accelerated: the Department was no longer able to administer education in an authoritarian, top-down fashion (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.2, 5.3.1.8, and 5.3.2.3). This, in fact, was also the experience in other countries where the organised teacher body adopted a militant, unionised stance. Describing the situation in the United States of America, for example, Wirt and Kirst (1989: 207) point out that by 1986 thirty two states in the country had some form of collective bargaining statute covering teachers. As this process gained pace in the 1980's, teacher strikes became a regular occurrence even in small communities which had hitherto been untouched by this phenomenon. The result was a 'dramatical' rearrangement of 'traditional power within the school system.' Cresswell et al. (1980: 381) also reach a similar conclusion. They note a state of 'continuous conflict' between management and teachers, a condition that produces 'relatively porous organizational structures that are subject to either direct intervention or external influence at multiple points.'

This trend was evident in the Indian education system in the teacher
organisation's defiance of the policymaking authority of the Chief Executive Director and its resolution binding teachers to defy the authority of superintendents of education. Principals in Indian schools also found their authority reduced by the emergence of teacher union structures such as 'site committees.' This process was facilitated by the increased loosely coupled functioning of schools and the general reduction in the control function of superintendents of education (see sections 4.3.1.4.2, 5.3.1.8, 5.3.3.2, and 5.3.3.4).

6.2.7.4 Failure of control systems

Effective education policy implementation requires the co-operation and compliance of thousands of officials and educators located at various levels of the hierarchy in institutions situation over a vast geographical space. Also essential is some form of control and coordination of this compliance process. Absence of this requirement, for example, may produce extremely different interpretations of policies, wide variations in the level of compliance, and a wide range of deviations from anticipated policy outcomes (see sections 4.3.1.3, 4.3.1.4 and 5.3.3.2).

Control, according to Hannaway and Sproull (1978: 1), subsumes all 'those mechanisms that operate within the organization to assure that individual participants perform some defined subset of tasks and those tasks co-ordinated with the work of others, produce the intended organizational output.' Thus, as Elmore (1983: 343) points out, control is basically concerned with 'bringing administrative actions into line with the expectations of policymakers and citizens.' Child (1985, cited by Oliver, 1993: 42), expands this concept: he has a four-fold scheme to classify control strategies in organisations. These are:

- personalised centralised control which involves emphasis on monitoring and control by supervisors with rewards and punishments being the means to elicit obedience to hierarchical authority
- bureaucratic control which entails the specification of procedures, detailed job descriptions, and formal division of labour
- output control which involves detailed specification of output, measurement of output, and rewards and punishment being linked to performance
- cultural control which occurs when members accept as legitimate the norms, values, and goals of the organisation. Policy-directed action is thus the result of an internalisation of norms as to what
Allied to the concept, control, coordination refers to the process of 'ensuring all efforts are bent toward a common objective and that there is no duplication of work that results in wasted effort' (Dale, 1973: 302). Discussing this concept in the context of policy implementation, Pressman and Wildavsky (1973: 133-134) observe that coordination requires that policies should be 'mutually supportive rather than contradictory,' that people should 'not work at cross-purposes.'

The findings in this study suggest that both control and coordination systems in the Indian education system had begun to fail under the impact of environmental turbulence and the general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages (see sections 4.3.1.4, 4.3.1.6, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 5.3.1.4, 5.3.1.8, 5.3.2, and 5.3.3.2). Personalised centralised control had become considerably weakened with teachers' rejection of superintendents of education; bureaucratic control was weakened by the weakening of the structural linkages; output control was weakened by teachers' and schools' resistance to any evaluation of their performance; and cultural control was made impossible by widespread rejection of the legitimacy of the Department and the emergence of alternate value systems and competing interpretive schemes.

As a result, the Department was regularly involved in power struggles with lower level participants as it sought to achieve compliance with its policies (see sections 4.3.1.4.2 and 5.3.1.4). These efforts, however, ended in repeated policy failures. After each such policy failure, to restore a semblance of 'normal' system operation, the Department had to renegotiate policies with the teacher body (see sections 4.3.1.2.3, 4.3.2.2, 4.3.3.2, 5.3.1.8, and 5.3.3.1). This, in turn, meant that functional arrangements in the system were continually renegotiated at all levels of the system and power dependencies continually altered in the process. This pattern of events is well documented in the literature on organisational change and transitions. Benson (1977: 12) and Ball (1987: 20), for example, point out that arrangements reached through negotiations in a situation of environmental turbulence are seldom stable as they often represent merely surface agreements on specific issues. Conflicts and value differences are temporarily pushed down to a subterranean level but erupt into full view when the next policy conflict arises.

In the Indian education system, with each such renegotiation of system stability, the substantive power position of the Department was steadily weakened as it succumbed to the demands of militant teachers and their organised teacher body (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, and 5.3.1.8). This process of power adjustment, however, also may be seen as a product of the system's lack of legitimacy. Keenly aware of the general rejection of its ideological and political foundations, the Department
seems to have sought to control, if not reverse, the erosion of its authority through negotiation, compromise, concession, adaptation, and acceptance of teacher body participation in the formulation of critical policies (see sections 4.3.1.2.3, 4.3.1.6.2, 4.3.2.2, and 5.2).

Concurrent with this process was a general reduction in the control function of superintendents of education. Even purely advisory and professional support functions of these officials were resisted by most teachers. Faced by this marginalisation of their role and the attendant reduction of their power to influence the policy implementation process at school level, superintendents of education in Indian schools evolved several survival strategies (see sections 4.3.1.3, 4.3.3.1, 5.3.1.3, 6.2.1.2, and 6.2.1.3). First, they attempted to distance themselves from upper management and to locate themselves in a middle ground where they could re-establish their professional image as was evident in actions such as 'pens-down' protests and 'sit-ins' with teachers. Second, there was an effort by the staff association of superintendents of education to form a working alliance with the organised teacher body in an effort to resolve the impasse between themselves and teachers. Third, there was an ingratiating response when it came to their evaluation of applicants for promotion. Approximately 90.00 percent of promotion applicants in 1993, for example, received exceptionally high assessments, suggesting that they were performing at high levels of effectiveness despite the perception of upper management that standards were dropping in Indian schools (Chief Superintendent of Education, DEC, 1993). Fourth, they coped with their circumscribed role by diverting their attention from supervisory control and individual guidance functions to activities such as conducting in-service courses, holding orientation seminars, conducting investigations into alleged misconduct, conducting moderation of practical and oral marks of senior certificate candidates, and so on. This response represented what Burlingame (1981: 439), in his discussion of American superintendents' efforts at 'power retention', refers to as playing roles that make them appear 'learned', 'judicious', 'honest', and 'reasonable' in their interaction with educators.

At school level also there was a general failure of control systems. To cope with its reduced hierarchical power and the reduced role of superintendents of education, the Department delegated increased teacher control responsibilities to principals. The emergence of this new structural relationship between principals and teachers, however, produced ambivalent responses from principals. As men-in-the-middle, caught in the crossfire between the Department on the one hand and militant teachers and the organised teacher body on the other, Indian principals were generally faced with three basic choices: they could look upward to the Department for direction and support, they could look downward and yield to teacher pressures, or they could perform delegated control functions as they deemed proper (see sections 4.3.1.6, 5.3.1.5, 5.3.1.7, 5.3.3.3, 6.2.1.6, and 6.2.1.7). Frequently, however, most
principals, reluctant to antagonise staff members, failed to implement their control functions and looked more towards their staff for directions than to the Department. The general pattern was one of avoidance of supervisory control of teachers, staff accommodation and appeasement, fear of conflict, concentration on staff cohesion, and general avoidance of performance evaluation (see sections 4.3.1.7, 4.3.1.8, 5.3.1.7, and 5.3.3.3). Principals who sought to comply with Departmental expectations were often confronted by militant opposition from teachers and, in many cases, a concerted programme of protest to seek their removal from the school (see sections 4.3.1.6.2, 5.3.1.8, and 6.2.1.7). Essentially, the relationship that evolved had an exchange basis - school stability in return for general freedom from any form of control from the education department and the principal.

6.2.7.5 Decline in job satisfaction and morale

Many interviewees in this study perceived a causal linkage between the environmental turbulence generated by transitional processes in the larger society and their loss of commitment to organisational and professional tasks, their loss of job satisfaction, and, in some cases, their sense of general school-related alienation (see sections 5.3.2.5, 5.3.2.6, and 5.3.2.7). The change processes in the larger system seem to have produced a specific chain of events that affected the policy implementation process: environmental turmoil produced systemic tensions; these brought to surface political and professional tensions in schools; these tensions affected work relations, altered the affective climate experienced by policy actors, lowered their job satisfaction, and eroded a sense of purposeful, collective engagement; this fragmentation of interpersonal, cultural, and organisational linkages, in turn, seems to have generated a sense of isolation, meaninglessness, normlessness, and powerlessness among many policy actors. Collectively, these responses seem to have produced in many educators in Indian schools a sense of helplessness and inability to cope with the alterations in the system, leading to alcoholism, depression, sickness, and a general avoidance response (Pillay, 1995). This perception of the situation is generally consistent with findings reported in the literature on the subject. Locke (1983: 1335), for example, notes:

Job satisfaction, itself or in combination with the conditions (both in the individual and the job environment) which bring it about, has a variety of consequences for the individual. It can affect his attitude toward life, toward his family, and toward himself. It can affect his physical health and possibly how long he lives. It may be related (indirectly) to mental health and adjustment, and plays a causal role in absenteeism and turnover. Under certain conditions, it may affect other types of on-the-job behavior as well.
In this study, several interviewees also perceived a similar ordering of causal variables: low job satisfaction weakened commitment to organisational policies and goals and also acted as a determinant of motivation to attend, which, in turn, influenced the rate of absenteeism (see section 5.3.2.6). Again this linkage is consistent with findings often reported in the literature on the subject. Steers and Rhodes (1978), for instance, maintained that job satisfaction and commitment influenced attendance though they note that the linkage is not simple and direct. Bridges (1980) also found a significant relationship between the level of job satisfaction and absenteeism but he, too, notes that this relationship is complex and influenced by moderating variables.

In the Indian education system, many educators linked low job satisfaction with diminished commitment to organisational goals, alienation, loss of morale, teacher burnout, and increased desire to flee from the stresses generated by alterations in the operation of system components (see sections 5.3.2.5, 5.3.2.6, and 5.3.2.7). All this had an impact on the policy implementation process and contributed to the level of policy failures through processes such as loss of commitment, loss of motivation, and alienation from the organisation.

6.2.8 Structural changes and legitimation processes

Despite everything, the Indian education system continued to function with relative efficiency. In addition to general concern for education in the community (see sections 4.3.1.5 and 5.3.1.9), three separate factors seem to have been responsible for this. These relate to the increased loosely coupled functioning of the education system, an explicit or implicit negotiation of order among policy actors during each policy crisis, and a general operation of legitimation processes.

6.2.8.1 Increased loosely coupled functioning of the system

Despite the increased polarisation of value differences and changes in power dependencies with each policy confrontation, the increased decoupling of system components allowed upper management, superintendents of education, principals, management staff in schools, and educators to continue functioning with varying levels of adaptation to fundamental changes in the larger society and to interpersonal, cultural, and structural changes in the system itself (see sections 4.3.4.5, 5.3.3.4, and 5.3.4.5). The validity of an observation of Meyer and Rowan (1978: 100) about the structure of educational organisations is noteworthy here. They maintain that de-coupling of system components is one way to
manage the uncertainty, conflict, and inconsistency' created by pluralistic and turbulent environments. The increased isolation and relative autonomy of subunits then have the effect of reducing disruptive conflicts and preventing incompatibilities from destabilising and endangering the whole system. Increased de-coupling of subunits also creates the illusion of relative stability as 'administrators are presented with little evidence of ineffectiveness, conflict, and inconsistency' (Meyer and Rowan, 1978: 100).

In the Indian education system the increased de-coupling of system components allowed upper management, superintendents of education, principals, deputy principals, heads of department, and teachers relative autonomy to develop their own specific modes of coping with environmental and system turbulence (see sections 4.3.1.2.3, 4.3.1.3, 5.3.1.5, 5.3.1.7, and 5.3.3.3). As Heydebrand (1983: 106) notes, the utility of loose coupling lies in its ability to increase 'the flexibility, adaptability, and stability of organisations in the face of external turbulence, threat, and overload.'

The general weakening of systemic linkages, however, tended to affect the overall quality of teacher performance in Indian schools, an outcome of the possible disintegration of professional autonomy into licence among many teachers through an absence of strong, internal controls and commitment to pupils (see sections 4.3.1.6.2 and 5.3.1.8). Consequently the Chief Executive Director repeatedly tried to enforce closer control of teachers and, in the process, generated more policy crises (see section 4.3.1.4.2). The increased loosely coupled functioning of the system thus operated in a recursive manner: it exerted pressure on the interactions among policy actors, affected policymaking and policy implementation outcomes, and then these outcomes fed back into the interpersonal milieu of policy actors. With each cycle of structural consequences there was an increased de-coupling of system components to reduce the stagnating effect of policy crises, value differences, power struggles, and repeated conflict episodes.

6.2.8.2 Negotiated order

The second explanation for the relatively stable functioning of Indian schools, despite the policy and operational turbulence within, lies in the sphere of 'negotiated order' theory which maintains that the continued functioning of any organisation is the product of continuous formal or informal, explicit or implicit negotiations among organisation members (Ball, 1987: 20; Day and Day, 1977: 128-129). In the Indian education system, the continued functioning of schools, despite the weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages, was the
result of ongoing negotiations among the education department, the organised teacher body, and parent groups and organisations. Some key elements in this 'negotiated order' process were:

- upper management reluctance to use of power-coercive means to enforce policies for fear of widespread protest action and school disruptions
- upper management acknowledgement of the need to enter into collective bargaining and negotiations with the organised teacher body on all teacher-sensitive policies
- an implicit acceptance that the Department would overlook policy violations and not rigorously seek to impose disciplinary action for such violations of Departmental policies
- an absence of supervisory control of teachers and schools.

Contested policies were constantly negotiated and re-negotiated to keep the system operative (see sections 4.3.1.2.3, 4.3.1.4.1, 4.3.1.6.1, 4.3.3.2, 5.3.1.8, 5.3.2.3, and 5.3.3.1). Usually the agreements reached were temporary and fragile, subject to further negotiations as situations altered under pressure of changes generated by transition processes in the larger society (see section 4.3.1.2.1 and 5.3.3.1.2).

Commenting on the processes of 'negotiated order' in the American education system, Corwin (1981: 261-291) makes a point that seems relevant to this study. He argues that school administrators often concentrate their control activities in the administrative sphere but remain muted in control over policies relating to technical-professional spheres. He further contends (Corwin, 1981: 269):

Co-ordination is achieved through a process of exchange within organisations and with the environment. Decisions are the outcome of compromise and adaptation among competing groups.

In this process, power, coalition formation, and symbol management play a key role. The weaker group, fearing the consequences of damaging conflict, submits to negotiated order, even if this implies further loss of power. The Indian education department, for example, from as early as 1990, entered into an implicit exchange relationship with the organised teacher body in its negotiations - reluctant withdrawal of unpopular policies and overlooking of open policy violations by individual teachers in return for stability in the system.
6.2.8.3 General legitimation processes

Both the Indian education department and principals were generally reluctant to expose themselves to parent anger and public protest action against education policies and education management. Therefore, both were anxious, for different reasons, to produce an image of regularity, to maintain the appearance, if not the reality, of effective education services. The community had to be kept assured that schools were engaged in the task of providing sound instruction to children despite repeated policy crises and work stoppages. In other words, both the Department and principals were concerned about retaining, and rapidly restoring when periodically eroded, what Meyer and Rowan (1978: 101-103) have called the 'logic of confidence,' a general tendency among external system participants to believe that the technical core activities of schools were operating effectively, if the external, surface aspects of schools displayed normality and orderliness.

De-coupling of system components, in fact, facilitated the maintenance of the belief that the Indian education system was generally goal-oriented in its service to the client population despite general policy crises that were regularly reported in the press. It reduced the visibility of substantive policy implementation failures. Educational managers tended to justify the increasing autonomy of lower level policy actors by underscoring their professional discretion (see sections 4.3.1.3, 5.3.1.7, and 5.3.3.3). The view that then prevailed in the system was that absence of supervision was also a product of teachers' professionalism. Allied to this was a general tendency to 'overlook' extreme policy violations as uncharacteristic of organisation members (see sections 4.3.1.6.2 and 5.3.3.2). The overall effect of organisation behaviour of this sort was that both organisation members and the external public came to accept the illusion of order, stability, and effectiveness (see sections 4.3.1.5, 4.3.1.7, 4.3.1.8, and 5.3.1.9). The 'myth and ceremony' associated with this facade of order hid from public view the diminished functioning of the technical core.

The relevance of Meyer and Rowan's (1977; 1978) thesis to the general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages in the Indian education system is evident in the attitude of Indian parents to policy crises and school disruptions in the early 1990's. They were primarily concerned about the restoration of the 'normal' functioning of schools. Therefore they regularly exerted pressure on the Department during policy crises to yield to teacher demands so that schools could return to normal functioning (see sections 4.3.1.5 and 5.3.1.9). The assumption was that the surface normality of schools was reflective of their technical effectiveness. In contrast, the Chief Executive Director had begun to doubt the effectiveness of Indian schools and sought to
establish tighter control linkages between the Department and its schools. This attempt itself was directed at restoring the Department's own managerial credibility because it was perceived to be ineffective in the eyes of the public (see sections 4.3.1.5 and 5.3.2.2). The paradoxical effect of this policy, had it been implemented, would have been to expose weaknesses in schools and thus confirm the public's lack of confidence in schools and the Department. Teachers, however, resisted these policy initiatives and threatened various forms of protest action should the Department press ahead (see sections 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.2, and 5.3.1.8). Thus, ironically, policies directed at restoring public confidence in the Department were actually reinforcing public lack of confidence in the Department because of policy implementation crises and failures (see sections 4.3.1.6 and 5.3.1.9). To halt this process, the Department returned to the practice of overlooking policy violations and succumbing to the general loss of power (see section 5.3.3.2). Superintendents of education accepted principal's assurances that all was well at their schools (see sections 5.3.1.5, 5.3.1.6, and 5.3.3.3). Similarly, upper management did not probe too deeply when superintendents of education transmitted this 'filtered' information up to them (see section 6.2.1.3).

6.3 THEORETICAL MODEL

As noted in Chapter 3 (see section 3.3), the research model presented there identifies the variables that are likely to interact in the education policy implementation process in a system in transition. The primary purpose at that point was to identify the possible variables and locate them in the larger policy process and the larger environmental context. In this section, the model and the variables it presents are re-conceptualised to uncover the dynamic interaction among the variables in the light of the findings presented in Chapters 4 and 5 (see sections 4.3.4 and 5.3.4) and relevant literature. The themes discussed above, in fact, provide the basic process components for this re-conceptualisation.

6.3.1 Overview of the model

The policy implementation process in 'normal' circumstances is often rendered a difficult and fragile process by the fact that it requires a high level of consensus and coordinated activity among policy actors at various levels of the education system. At the best of times, blockages can occur anywhere in the system. The possibilities of policy failures are thus greatly multiplied when the system environment is also turbulent
and densely textured as a result of political struggles directed at transition to democracy and regime change (see section 5.2). Because of different ideological responses to these processes of change in the larger society, interactions among policy actors at all levels of the system may be thrown out of their stable pathways and familiar routes (see 6.2.1). Three underlying factors may contribute to the disruption of the relative cohesion among key policy actors: polarisation in value systems, the operation of self-interest, and changes in power relationships (see sections 4.3.4, 5.3.4, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, and 6.2.4).

The competing value systems and ideologies at the core of the political transition processes in the larger society also impact on the education system. Thus ideological debates at the macro-level are likely to be replicated at the education system level among policy actors in the education department and its schools. Value differences that had long remained latent and suppressed may begin to surface and solidify into distinct, and often competing, provinces of meaning. Distinct subcultures may develop with upper management generally remaining loyal to the political and educational values of the past and teachers at school-level tending to swing towards anti-establishment values (see section 6.2.2). In this study, all four groups in the sample developed their own intersubjective 'realities', accommodating their own circumstances and interests.

Embedded in the value conflicts are likely to be two clearly defined but overlapping value processes. First, there may be general rejection of the legitimacy of the education department by educators and parents who support opposition forces engaged in negotiations at macro-societal level with the ruling regime for transition towards democracy (see section 6.2.2.1). Second, there is likely to be a polarisation in value differences and the emergence of distinct sub-cultures among policy actors at various levels of the education hierarchy (see section 6.2.2.2).

Concurrent with these changes in value systems and provinces of meaning there may occur undercurrents of self-interest and changes in the power relationships among policy actors in the education system (see sections 6.2.3 and 6.2.4). Conflict and power struggles may occur at various levels of the education hierarchy, undermining the established bureaucratic authority relationships. At the macro-level, the relation between the Minister of Education and Culture and the Chief Executive Director of the education department, for example, may be pushed out of its traditional pattern by role and power clashes between the two. At the micro-level, teachers may reject the authority of senior officials and act with relative autonomy. Consequently, the Department may be repeatedly forced into retreating from its policy positions, in the process tacitly accepting the altered formal and informal power relations.
The discussion in the earlier section of this chapter suggests that changes in the value system, the operation of self-interest, and alterations in the power relationships may produce a cascade of policy events that may exceed an education department's ability to cope with them. More specifically, they generate a general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages that hold the system together. In the Indian education system, this was evident, for example, in the widespread rejection of Departmental policies and the exclusion of superintendents of education from the classrooms of teachers (see sections 4.3.1.4.2, 5.3.1.4, and 5.3.3.1). At school level, principals, too, were cut off from the classroom and so were unable to effect the supervisory functions that had been delegated to them to compensate for the reduced monitoring function of superintendents of education (see sections 4.3.1.6, 5.3.1.7, and 5.3.3.3). Key components of the system thus functioned in relative isolation - with physical proximity but lack of functional cohesion.

The empirical data presented in this study also suggest that the weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages impacts both on policymaking and policy implementation processes. Policymaking impacts may include strategic planning failures, entrapment to policies and policy practices of the past, and a tendency towards policy hyperrationalisation to cope with the weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages in the system and the general increase in policy crises (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, 5.3.2.1, and 6.2.6). Policy implementation impacts may include ineffective communication of policies, policy resistance, power struggles and conflict, failure of control systems, and a general decline in job satisfaction and staff morale (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.3, 5.3.1.2, 5.3.1.4, 5.3.1.8, 5.3.2, and 6.2.7).

The policy crises and policy failures that result from this sequence of events are likely to impact back on the interaction among policy actors, polarise yet further the value differences and ideological conflicts, push to the fore more visibly the influence of self-interest, deepen yet further the power struggles in the system, and make more conspicuous the dominance of teachers and the teacher organisation. These positive feedback loops, in turn, may weaken yet further the interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages of the education system, affecting once more the policymaking and policy implementation processes.

Despite the multiplying feedback effect of this recursive sequence of events and processes, in a community strongly supportive of education, the education system may continue functioning with relative stability because of processes such as increased de-coupling of system components, negotiated-order interactions among policy actors, and legitimation
activities in the system (see section 6.2.8).

Nevertheless, some policy crises such as those emerging from staffing disputes, contested promotion procedures, and the granting of 'merit awards' may be so intense and so disruptive that parent confidence in the system may become deeply eroded. These significant failures and moments of weakened public confidence are likely to feed back into the system and affect anew the relationships among the various policy actors, generate yet further value differences, self-interested action, and power struggles, weaken still more the interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages, and produce yet another sequence of policymaking and policy implementation impacts.

The process outlined above is diagrammed in Figure 6.4 as a theoretical model to explain education policy implementation in a society in transition. As noted above, the theoretical model seeks to define the possible processes among variables presented in the research model in Chapter 3.

6.3.2 Theoretical background to the model

The model outlined above has drawn on literature relating to:

- Environment-system relationship
- Modern social systems theory
- Chaos/complexity theory
- Conflict theory
- Structuration theory
- Organisation change theory
- Loosely coupled systems theory

Each of these fields of theoretical endeavour contributed strands to analysis of the findings in this chapter and to the conceptualisation of the model presented above. The discussion that follows shall touch upon each of the theoretical fields noted above, briefly describing the theory and explaining its relevance to the model.
Figure 6.4 Policy implementation in a society in transition

- Competing value systems
- Attack on legitimacy of system

- Elevation of self interest above quality of policy and organisational goals

- Senior management resistance
- Teacher militancy and teacher unionism

- Ineffective strategic planning
- Policy entrapment
- Policy hyperrationalisation

- Weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages

- Ineffective communication
- Policy quality and policy resistance
- Power struggles and conflict
- Failure of control systems
- Loss of morale
6.3.2.1 Environment-system relationship

Internationally there has developed a strong perception that the world is undergoing radical change. In his examination of the fragmentation of the once stable world in which we lived, Toffler (1981) has isolated five forms of change that have contributed to the emergence of a turbulent, densely textured environment. These may be summarised as:

- changes in the physical environment evident in a growing world population, depletion of resources, and general increase in all forms of pollution

- changes in the social environment evident in the growing chasm between the 'haves' and 'have-nots', the educated and uneducated, and the socially advantaged and the socially disadvantaged

- changes in the information environment evident in revolutionary developments in information technology, the volume of information available, and the control of access to information

- changes in the political environment evident in conflict among various groups in society and the struggle for political power among excluded groups throughout the world

- changes in the moral environment evident in greater public scrutiny of ethical questions relating to political and economic decision making and conduct.

This turbulent environment, it is generally accepted, impacts significantly on all organisations and systems in society. However, as Boyan (1988: 93) points out, just how environmental influences 'enter the system' and produce their impacts 'still remains uncertain.' The problem, as Levin (1993: 10) notes, has been given an added twist by revelations emerging from the science of chaos: while systems display certain stabilities and patterns when studied from a macro-level perspective, they are completely unpredictable at the micro-level (see sections 1.3.2.2.4 and 6.3.2.3).

Nevertheless, several efforts have been made to understand the exact dynamics of the environment-system relationship. Writers adopting a contingency theory perspective maintain that the structural characteristics of organisations and systems are influenced by situational factors. Child (1973: 237), for example, draws attention to this relationship when he notes that contingency theory:

... regards the design of an effective organisation as necessarily having to be adapted
to cope with the "contingencies" which derive from the circumstances of the environment, technology, scale, resources and other factors.

The structure-contingency perspective to the environment-system relationship, however, as Ford and Hegarty (1984: 271) cogently point out, is 'essentially a direct stimulus-response model' where the environmental context is the stimulus and the structure is the response. It is basically a mechanistic connection that fails to take into account system participants who have formal and informal power to influence the direction of the structural modification and elaboration process. The structure-contingency perspective also fails to shed light on the system dynamics through which environmental pressures influence structural configurations.

To address this criticism, some writers have argued that the connection between the environment and the system occurs through decision makers and decision-making processes in the organisation. Daft and Weick (1984), for example, maintain that organisations take their form from managers' interpretation of inputs from the environment. They also assert that managers differ in their modes of processing and interpreting information from the environment. In their study of this linkage, Ford and Hegarty (1984: 288) also found that people-related factors acted as critical mediating variables between the environment and the organisation's structural accommodation.

The theoretical model developed in this chapter draws upon this linkage in suggesting that the turbulent environment generated by socio-political transition processes acts upon the people in the organisation. As a result, the ideological and political struggles in the larger society are re-enacted within the organisation. The critical balances among contending forces, however, will vary from organisation to organisation and from time to time because the process is neither uniform nor static. As the alterations occur, policymakers in the system are confronted with the challenge of responding to them. This study, however, views the notion of leader behaviour as the critical linkage between environment and system as being only partly correct. The dynamic, complex, and loosely coupled nature of education systems, in fact, produces a situation where power is dispersed throughout the system. Sometimes, school-level decision making may exercise greater impact on policymaking and policy implementation processes than that of officials at the apex of the education hierarchy. The Indian education system saw repeated examples of this. Militant teachers at the base of the system, for example, forced the Indian education department to make structural changes to accommodate their opposition to specific policies, a process which was often influenced by the former's commitment to the values of extra-parliamentary groups involved in the larger processes of transition to democracy (see sections 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.2, 5.3.2.2, and 5.3.2.3).
6.3.2.2 Modern social systems theory

One of the major criticisms of systems theory has been that systems models display a static quality (Hall and Eagen, 1956: 18-28; Smith, 1973: 200; Archer, 1981: 272). To address this shortcoming, Buckley (1967: 58), for example, centred attention on change in social systems by focusing on the concept 'morphogenesis' which he defines as those processes that elaborate or change a system's given form or structure. In her discussion of education systems, Archer (1981: 274) also identifies this as the most distinctive feature of modern systems theory, defining the concept as a social system's elaboration of its 'own structure over time in a way alien to mechanical or organic systems.' She maintains that this development means that 'more theoretical attention' may be given to 'positive feedback chains, which amplify deviations from the existing structure, elaborating more complex forms of restructuration.'

Buckley (1967: 129) identifies the root cause of morphogenic change as 'the continuous generation of varying degrees of tension, "stress," or "strain" within and between the interacting components.' Also drawing on this view of systemic change, Archer (1984: 5-9) notes that 'strains' develop at points of potential change. Where structural components, for example, are perceived to be sources of frustration to a group's goals and values, then action may be directed to the removal of such obstacles, leading, in time, to structural accommodation and change.

Archer (1984: 5-9), however, emphasises that this is not a mechanical process as individual action in systems is both structurally conditioned as well as being independent of such influences. Structurally, the specific locatedness of individuals, because of the positions they occupy in the system, influences their interpretation of given situations, their perception of specific exigencies in the system, and their postulation of goals and action for their removal and prevention. At the same time, their interpretation of situations is mediated by their personal values and goal orientation, by personal costs and personal opportunities. Also in groups, some individuals may be more inclined to pay the price involved in direct action to remove obstacles to the attainment of individual and group goals than others whose frustrations at strains in the system may still be below the action threshold. Archer (1984: 7) thus advances the view that there is both structural conditioning on action and independent influences.

Applying these views to the origin and elaboration of state education systems, Archer (1984) maintains that some groups in society assume dominant role and control education services through their political and ideological ascendancy. In time, however, the excluded groups begin to experience deprivation and frustration. This finally leads them to
challenge the control of the dominant group. The success of this assertion of the right to education services depends on several factors. First, the excluded group must have the ability to evade the structural constraints and blocking mechanisms developed by the dominant group to protect its monopoly. Second, the excluded group must be able to reject the ideology of the dominant group. Third, the excluded group must develop oppositional strength and bargaining power through wide numerical support and organisational strength. Fourth, the excluded group must develop a counter ideology to inform its members of its goals and to canvass for support from and alliance with other excluded groups. The conflict between the dominant and excluded groups finally leads to the emergence of a new education system. The cycle of structural conditioning, political and educational interaction, and structural elaboration then continues with further processes of negotiation and pressure from new excluded groups, leading to further changes in the education system. The process continues in a cyclic manner with time and societal change.

The relevance of Archer's (1979; 1981; 1984) model to the present study lies in the fact that it points to the internal dynamics of how education systems undergo change as a result of environmental turbulence, ideological and value conflicts among system participants, the operation of self-interest, power struggles between dominant and hitherto subordinate, excluded groups, weakening of existing structures, failure of control systems, and transition to new structures that institutionalise the compromises between former power holders and once excluded groups. In the Indian education system, the pre-transition structures were exposed to all these pressures once transition processes gained momentum in the larger society, producing ideological conflicts, power struggles, structural accommodations, and systemic changes (see sections 4.3.4 and 5.3.4).

6.3.2.3 Chaos/complexity theory

The concept of chaos has already been introduced as one of the components of the epistemological framework of this study (see section 1.3.2.2.4). Here the concept is further developed as one of the theoretical fields that contributed to the development of the model presented in this chapter.

In summarising the epistemological characteristics of the science of chaos, Reavis (1990: 70) points to the fact that it is concerned with tracing regularities in seemingly unstable phenomena and with grasping the magnifying and ramifying consequences over time of seemingly minor, insignificant irregularities. Another feature of the chaos theory is the
nonlinearity of causal relationships and the multiple interactivity among forces at work in natural and social phenomena (Marion, 1994: 31). Drawing upon the work of Hayles (1991) and Stavenga (1993), Badenhorst and Claasen (1995: 6) point to other aspects of chaos/complexity theory that contributed to the theoretical model proposed in this chapter:

- Complex systems contain both order and chaos and are 'rich in information rather than poor in order.'

- Chaos theory is concerned both 'with the hidden order within chaotic systems' and the emergence of order 'out of chaotic systems in accordance with a process of self-organisation.'

- Complex, chaotic systems are 'very sensitive to initial conditions' and emerge not so much because of a complex design but 'as a result of the interaction between simple initial conditions.'

- In complex, chaotic systems 'patterns eventually emerge because of some in-built attraction' among particular variables and forces.

The general fragmentation of system coherence under the pressure of environmental turbulence and rapid socio-political change thus becomes part of the initial conditions that generate unpredictable and massive consequences through the creation of new attractors in the system. The operation of chaos processes may be noted in many of the policy crises faced by the Indian education department during the transition years. A good example is the 'pens-down' protest by superintendents of education in May 1993 (see section 4.3.1.3.1). During the extended chalkdown protest by teachers in May 1993, the Indian education department and the Minister of Education and Culture in the HOD were under pressure from parents and the organised teacher body and exposed to repeated political attacks in Parliament and the press (see section 4.3.1.2.3). Both sought to deflect responsibility for the crisis from themselves and sought to 'prove' through half-page newspaper advertisements that they had acted correctly. Meanwhile, the process of negotiation to resolve the crisis was in progress. In the midst of this process, the chief director responsible for policy control was asked by the press to explain the dynamics of the crisis and to comment on the action of protesting teachers. In the article that was published, among various points made by her, she was quoted as saying that superintendents of education should have explained to applicants for the merit award the true quality of their work. Superintendents of education perceived this statement as implying that they had not implemented the policy correctly, this at a time when they were struggling against their own marginalisation in the system and seeking to establish an image of professionalism (see sections 4.3.1.4.2, 4.3.3.1, 5.3.1.4, and 5.3.1.8). They immediately engaged in a 'pens-down' protest and only returned to normal functioning when the Chief Executive Director published a formal retraction of the allegation.
Several significant outcomes followed. An immediate result of the protest, which began from a minor remark made by an upper management official, one she actually denied making, was increased pressure on the education department to comply with the demands of the organised teacher body. Second, upper management and the Minister were isolated and exposed to public ridicule and political pressure in that they were perceived as not enjoying the support of their own immediate management staff. Third, it produced an increasingly strained relationship between upper management and superintendents of education (see sections 4.3.1.3.2 and 5.3.1.3).

Flowing from these developments, at the beginning of 1994 upper management insisted that superintendents of education should, with immediate effect, return to a system of close supervision of educators. Superintendents of education responded by insisting that this reactivation of a policy which had remained largely inoperative from 1990 (see section 4.3.1.4.2) should be negotiated with the organised teacher body. Instead of doing so, upper management released E.C. Circular No. 7 of 1994 (DEC, 1994a) which turned to principals for the close control of educators on their staff, a policy decision which, in turn, led to a 'sit-in' protest by teachers and superintendents of education (see section 4.3.1.3.2). Accompanying this extended policy conflict was increased fragmentation of the system through intensifying value conflicts and power struggles and a general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages.

From a chaos theory point of view, we note the magnifying, ramifying consequences of a statement alleged to have been made by a member of upper management in the education department. As Marion (1994: 31) points out, 'Nonlinear, interactive systems... tend to magnify minor inaccuracies and the results are anything but trivial.'

Chaos theory has also led to the development of complexity theory, which is a variant of chaos theory but is distinguished by the fact that it functions at the 'edge of chaos,' where 'the system possessed enough stability to persist and carry information about itself, but enough fluidity to transmit and transmute that information' (Marion, 1994: 32). Applied to organisations, this touches upon the dynamic processes of system stability, dissolution, and reconstruction where new components of the system may act as attractors, an attractor being 'any point in a system's cycle that seems to attract the system to it' (Hayles, 1991, cited by Badenhorst and Claasens, 1995: 6). In the Indian education system, teacher militancy and teacher unionism may be viewed as attractors that pulled the whole system towards dissolution and a reconstitution reflective of new values and new priorities (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.2, 5.3.1.8, 5.3.2.2, and 5.3.2.3). As Marion (1994: 32) points out, the behaviour of complex systems are 'emergent, teleological, and stable yet changing.' They 'act on the basis of
anticipated outcomes, thus change is driven by "telic waves" or elaboration through learning rather than survival.' In the Indian education system, this was evident in the fact that while the system was disrupted by recurrent policy crises, it was, nevertheless, driven by the emergent values of militant teachers and the organised teacher body and parent and community organisations, all united in their rejection of the tricameral system of government and its ideological expression in the Indian education system.

6.3.2.4 Conflict theory

The literature of conflict theory, especially Turner's (1982: 175-193) synthesis of the dialectical and functional variations of the theory also proved useful to the researcher in conceptualising the processes that accompany education policy implementation in a society in transition. Turner (1982: 180-181), points to the fact that conflict theory identifies social and political inequality as the ultimate source of conflict which under differing conditions leads to a restructuring of the system. Figure 6.5 diagrams the basic causal elements in the theory: the feedback loop in the figure underscores the dialectical assumption that conflict is both a result of inequalities in society as well as the process which causes structural changes that produce new inequalities, setting in motion the conflict cycle anew.

Figure 6.5 Basic components of conflict theory

Withdrawal of legitimacy with respect to inequality marks the first stage of the conflict process (Turner, 1982: 186). Several factors may be responsible for initiating this process. First, there may be structural barriers to the upward mobility of deprived segments of the population. Second, channels for addressing grievances against the system may be limited, inadequate, and ineffective. Third, inequalities may be superimposed on each other so that exclusion from one resource may be correlated with similar exclusion from other resources of the system.

Recognition of the system's lack of legitimacy and the resultant pressure for a reorganisation of the system are also influenced by the emergence
of altered political and social conditions. Changes in the political environment may facilitate the emergence of political leaders with the skill to organise resistance and formulate alternate ideologies. Social conditions may change to enable relatively free communication of perceptions of inequality and recruitment of members into opposition structures. The more changes such as these emerge, the more likely are the deprived segments of the population to become aware of the need for collective action to redress their grievances and to alter the present system of resource allocation.

Another important component in the emergence of concerted action directed at the restructuring of the system is the rejection of the internal cultural controls established through social and cultural reproduction activities of the dominant group. Turner (1982: 187) summarises this requirement as follows: 'the greater the internal psychological constraints and the more effective the external social control, the less likely is overt emotional arousal among the deprived.' However, increased rejection of internal psychological constraints and cultural controls, increased rejection of legitimacy of the system, and increased awareness of exclusion from the resources of the system intensify emotions in the deprived groups to the level where 'collective outbursts' are more likely. As the process gains momentum with deprived groups becoming more organised and more articulate in the pursuit of their objective interests, the phase of negotiation with current superordinates over resource redistribution and system restructuring is reached. With time, the actions of disadvantaged groups becomes more sophisticated and more politically practised in pursuing their goals.

The relevance of conflict theory is apparent when one notes the progression of events both in the larger society and the Indian education system after 2 February 1990. Indian teachers and their teacher organisation, for example, increasingly attacked the legitimacy of the tricameral system of government and 'own affairs' control of education; they identified themselves with anti-government groups in the larger struggle for regime change and a redistribution of economic, social, and educational resources. At the micro-level of the Indian school, the active rejection of the legitimacy of the system found expression in actions such as the refusal to comply with key education policies, the rejection of the authority of superintendents of education, and the defiance of the education department. The overall outcome was a general fragmentation of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages in the Indian education system against a background of policy conflicts, policy failures, and policy changes.
6.3.2.5 Structuration theory

Structuration theory, as developed by Giddens (1976; 1979), is primarily concerned with exploring the connection between human action and social structures. At the centre of Giddens' work, in fact, as Knights and Roberts (1982: 49) point out, is a concern to replace the traditional dualisms of agency and structure with a theory of what he calls 'the duality of structure.' For him, 'social structures are both constituted by human agency, and yet, at the same time, are the very medium of this constitution' (Giddens, 1976: 121). Structures are the medium because they provide the rules and resources individuals must draw upon to interact meaningfully. At the same time, they are the outcome because they are only actualised, confirmed, or transformed in the course of human action: they have no reality independent of human action. In this sense, all social systems are essentially the medium and outcome of human interactions. Giddens (1979: 65) expresses this view as follows:

A social system is thus a "structured totality". Structures do not exist in time-space except in the moments of constitution of social systems.

The relevance of this concept to the theoretical model presented here lies in the fact that it suggests a possible explanation of how systems change with environmental turbulence. With rapid changes in the environment, existing structures no longer provide adequate rules and procedures for meaningful interactions. System participants thus, in their interactions, begin to constitute new structures to serve as new medium for further interactions.

Three analytically separable dimensions of structures (signification, domination, and legitimation) and three equivalent dimensions of interaction (communication, power, and morality/sanction) provide the broad conceptual framework of structuration theory and its view of system change. Signification relates to the communicative aspect of social interactions and social systems. Every act of signification thus presupposes the prior existence of a signification system, of mutually agreed denotations and connotations in words, and mutually accepted language conventions. With changes in the situational context and social and political transitions in the larger society, new codes of communication may evolve and new provinces of meaning may develop, thus affecting interactions among system members. For example, in the Indian education system words such as 'legitimacy', 'tricameral system', 'negotiation', and 'unionism' acquired new and powerful meanings that were capable of polarising system participants into opposing camps.

Domination refers to capabilities of control over human interaction and the allocation of human resources. Thus, for Giddens (1976: 111), power
essentially relates to the transformative capacity of human action: 'it is the "can" which mediates between intentions or wants and the actual realisation of the outcomes sought after.' In another formulation of this concept, Giddens (1979: 93) states that power concerns 'the capability of actions to secure outcomes where the realization of these outcomes depends upon the agency of others.'

Legitimation is the third major theoretical component of structuration theory. Legitimacy of control, in the system, for example, must be accepted by a relatively large proportion of system members as being the natural consequences of structural conditions of action. Therefore organisational sanctions depend on the application of norms that are institutionally legitimate. Giddens (1979: 103), however, suggests that system stability is not necessarily a product of common values. It is more a consequence of the level of normative integration of dominant groups within social systems. Nevertheless, the existence of different groups in the system could lead to the emergence of different subcultures and different value systems that may, under given conditions, produce new patterns of interaction and alter the power relationships.

These three basic structuration concepts - signification, domination, and legitimation - do not operate in isolation. They are interactively linked. For example, alterations in the signification system of lower level participants, access by them to penetrative knowledge about system functioning, and a consolidated rejection of the values of dominant groups may lead finally to changes in the structure of the system. Moreover, because of the dialectical relationship between structure and agency, lower participants are likely to seek control over their work and environment through the use of their discursive facility, through manipulation of new knowledge and new signification codes, and through the strategic deployment of any positive and negative sanctions at their disposal. Similarly, those in leadership positions may use their power resources, their penetrative knowledge of organisation structures, and their mastery of the communication codes in the system to strengthen existing structures and resist threats to their dominance.

The events in the Indian education system provide repeated examples of these processes. Teachers and the teacher organisation acquired knowledge of the functioning of the education system and of transition processes in the larger political system, developed new signification codes and alternative value systems, developed concepts such as 'legitimacy', 'professionalism', and 'militancy', and challenged the education department through a discursive capacity in presentation, argumentation, and debate in support of their resistance to Departmental policies and Departmental control. Moreover, penetrative knowledge about the system and rejection of the value system of the education department guided the teacher organisation's alliances in agency building. The Indian teacher organisation, for example, perceiving the momentum of
transition in the larger society, dissolved itself as an 'Indian' body in becoming a founder member in the teacher unity talks that led to the formation of SADTU. Such an act not only legitimated the teacher organisation as a non-racial structure but gave it access to numerical and political support from powerful extra-parliamentary political organisations in its militant interaction with the Department (Naicker, 1991: 6; Samuel, 1991: 25-29).

6.3.2.6 Organisation change theory

Several organisation theorists have centred attention on the processes relating to incremental and transformative types of organisational change. The discussion here draws mainly on the work of Ranson et al. (1980) and Greenwood and Hinings (1988). Ranson et al. (1980) maintain that three abstract and interdependent conceptual categories underpin the process of change in organisation structures: organisation members' interpretive schemes, the dependencies of power in the organisation, and various contextual constraints. The interpretive schemes of organisation members may be the source of both consensus and conflict. As Ranson et al. (1980: 4) point out, organisations may be 'composed of alternative interpretive schemes, value preferences, and sectional interests, the resolution of which is determined by dependencies of power and domination.' The interaction between these conceptual categories, in turn, must accommodate the contextual constraints generated by characteristics of the organisation and the environment.

Drawing upon the theoretical interrelationships among these three conceptual categories, Ranson et al. (12-13) formulate five analytical propositions which define the processual dynamics of restructuring of organisations in the face of environmental and contextual pressures:

- There will be change in structuring if organisation members revise the provinces of meaning and the interpretive schemes which underpin their constitutive structuring of organisations.

- Structural change can result from inconsistencies and contradictions between purposive values and the interests that lie behind the political processes within the organisation.

- Significant changes in resource availability and the emergence of organisational uncertainty can weaken the bases of dominant coalitions and lead to the creation of new power dependencies, alterations in interpretive schemes, and the emergence of new organisational structures.
• Major changes in situational factors can constrain organisation members to adapt their structural arrangements to new contingencies.

• Contradictory demands flowing from situational constraints will lead to changes in organisation structures.

These propositions suggest that environmental turbulence will produce changes in the interpretive schemes of organisation members, that this is likely to lead to conflict in the system, that this conflict of values will, in time, undermine the bases of dominant coalitions in the system and enable the emergence of new power dependencies, and that this process of value changes and power struggles may lead to revisions both in the dominant interpretive scheme and in the existing power dependencies in the system.

The relevance of the organisation change model advanced by Ranson et al. (1980) to the theoretical model developed in this chapter is evident. The more radical the changes in the environment, the more fundamentally are the interactions among organisation members likely to be affected, producing transformations in interpretive schemes and generating power conflicts and the emergence of new power dependencies.

Greenwood and Hinings (1988) centre attention on the actual processes of inertia and change when organisations are faced by significant environmental and organisation pressures. Labelling the stable identity of organisations as 'archetypes' and the movement or absence of movement from the archetype as 'tracks', Greenwood and Hinings (1988: 303) state that change away from an organisation archetype is the result of progressive de-coupling of system components from interpretive schemes of system actors while the progressive consolidation of a new organisation archetype is the result of progressive re-coupling of new system components to new suffusing ideas and values. While the possible variations in organisation changes between these two poles are considerable, Greenwood and Hinings (1988: 407-409) limit their discussion to four principal 'prototypical' tracks. These are identified as tracks reflecting 'inertia', 'aborted excursion', 'reorientations' or 'transformations', and 'unresolved excursions'.

Inertia reflects a situation where there is structural stability and organisational coherence as the dominant interpretive scheme remains unchallenged despite fundamental environmental and contextual changes. Structural changes do not occur as the logic of the existing interpretive scheme remains unaltered.

In aborted excursions isolated components of the system become de-coupled from the underlying interpretive scheme. However, for various reasons the de-coupled components revert to their original coherent relationship with other system components and the interpretive scheme regains its
Re-orientations or transformations occur when an organisation moves from its original coherent archetype to another coherent archetype. Under pressure from changes in the environment, the prevailing interpretive scheme loses its legitimacy, becomes discredited, and no longer exercises a constituting force. The erosion of prevailing values and power dependencies produces a de-coupling of structures from 'old' legitimating interpretive schemes. Then, the reverse process of re-coupling of a new, emergent interpretive scheme and new power structures occurs until the movement to a new 'archetype' is completed. This process of dissolution and resolution may involve temporary reversals and oscillations involving varying amounts of time until the process of re-orientation and transformation is completed.

Finally, unresolved excursions refer to tracks where the movement from the initial state of organisation coherence fails to regain a new state of coherence. There is incomplete de-coupling without re-coupling. The situation in the Indian education system may be considered an example of unresolved excursion. The education department control structures, from 1990, experienced a progressive de-coupling from the policy delivery component of the classroom because of teachers' acquisition of a new interpretive scheme as a result of transition processes in the larger society. The education department failed to alter its interpretive scheme and persisted in devising policies directed at a re-coupling of the fragmented components in terms of the 'old' interpretive scheme. Each effort, however, ended in failure and the system continued to function with unresolved conflicts and polarised interpretive schemes and with teachers insulated from the supervisory control of principals and superintendents of education (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.3, 5.3.1.8, and 5.3.2.2).

Greenwood and Hinings (1988: 310-312) maintain that the actual form which the organisation change process takes when confronted by change pressures is influenced by three dynamics. The first relates to the level of compatibility among the three major categories of variables - situational contingencies such as the environment, interpretive schemes operative in the system, and power dependencies. The higher the level of dissonance among these three categories of variables, the more likely is the pressure for change. In a situation of severe contradictions, the restructuring processes may finally lead to a complete reorientation or transformation in the organisation archetype. The second dynamic relates to the pattern of commitment among system members to the dominant and the alternative interpretive schemes operative in the system. The level and strength of commitment to the prevailing and the emergent interpretive schemes will affect the process, the pace, and the direction of the system change. The third dynamic relates to the structure of power dependencies in the system. Changes can be pushed through or resisted
to the extent to which groups have power resources to express their demands and protect their interests in structural and processual terms. For example, a dispersed power structure and the existence of competing interpretive schemes can generate organisation change processes that become locked in 'unresolved excursions'.

The model in this chapter draws upon Greenwood and Hinings' (1988) suggestion that turbulent environments affect the interaction among system members and generate alterations in value schemes and power relations and that this, depending on the strength of the dissonance among the environmental and organisational contingencies, leads to decoupling of structural components and finally to organisation change. The theoretical model in this chapter suggests that social and political transition processes in the larger society impinge on the stable relationship among key policy actors and alter the existing interaction patterns by producing sharp value conflicts and attacks on the legitimacy of the system on the one hand and by generating power struggles on the other. It also advances the view that these changes in interpretive schemes and power relationships produce a general weakening of interpersonal, cultural, and structural linkages in the system through various levels of de-coupling among structural and processual system elements. Moreover, the model suggests that these developments may affect the policymaking and policy implementation processes and may, in turn, be affected by them in a nonlinear, non-standardised manner.

6.3.2.7 Loosely coupled systems theory

Education systems are generally accepted to be a composite of loosely linked subsystems, each having limited control over other, proximate units. Weick (1976: 4) maintains that loose coupling may actually be functional to education systems. However, from a policy implementation point of view, the loosely coupled nature of the education system limits the education department's ability to act with assurance about the execution of its policies at lower levels of the system. As Gordon (1989: 443) points out:

In a large organisation with numerous 'levels' of service, strong central/regional boundaries and widely differing social and political contexts, failure to agree with policy directions, or even to agree what the problems are, can act as limiting factors. This is particularly true in education agencies where the only contact between central and regional, upper and lower levels may be through an Inspectorate, which has a coercive rather than a consensual basis.

During a period of transition and organisation change as a result of changes in the prevailing interpretive schemes in the system and emergence of power conflicts, the looseness among components of the
education system may become magnified and impact adversely on the stability of policymaking and policy implementation processes (see sections 4.3.4.5, 5.3.3.4, and 5.3.4.5). This, in turn, may affect anew the interactions among policy actors and produce further loosening of the system components. For example, the sustained rejection of the tricameral system by TASA and their constant criticism of political interference in Indian education produced a clash of values and power struggle between the education department and the organised teacher body. This had the effect of damaging the stable relationship that had once existed between the two with serious impacts both on policymaking and policy implementation processes (see sections 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2.2, 4.3.2.3, 5.3.1.8, 5.3.2.2, 5.3.2.3, and 6.2.4.2). Moreover, Indian teachers' collective refusal to allow any monitoring of their work by superintendents of education had the effect of severing the human linkage between the education department and its schools (see sections 4.3.1.4.2 and 5.3.1.4). The sustained rejection of these officials' authority also weakened their control functions and increased the structural separation of teachers from the education department (see sections 4.3.2.3 and 5.3.1.8).

6.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter has devoted itself to a discussion of the findings in Chapters 4 and 5. In doing so, it has expanded the research model presented in Chapter 3 by suggesting the underlying dynamics among the variables.

What emerges when viewed from the microsystem of the school is that policies are subject to failure because of a variety of unforeseen factors, producing unforeseen consequences. Viewed from a macrosystem level, policy implementation in a society in transition also reveals that policies are subject to collapse and failure because of unforeseen and, at times, uncontrollable factors, producing ramifying and swelling consequences. At the same time, however, below the surface chaos, a pattern of underlying processes may be discerned. Focussing on this pattern, the theoretical position advanced in this chapter is that the interactions among key policy actors begins to display varying levels of alterations from established patterns as a result of fundamental changes in the larger society leading to increased loosely coupled functioning of the system. The sequence of systemic processes, however, is not fixed: they mutually affect and re-affect one another in a nonstandardised manner. This not only recursively influences interaction among policy actors but produces significant policymaking and policy implementation impacts. Nevertheless, the system continues to display some surface cohesion because of the functionality of loose coupling in
a period of turbulence, the negotiation of order, and the operation of general legitimation processes.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 Policy implementation in a system in transition

The policy crises of the transition years underscored the fact that the social and political environment constituted a significant factor in both policymaking and policy implementation. In the Indian education system fundamental changes in the larger society produced alterations in the interactions among key policy actors, which increased the loosely coupled functioning of the system, which affected both policymaking and policy implementation processes. In the process, interpersonal, cultural, and structural changes occurred in the system as a result of morphogenic processes, chaos processes, structuration dynamics, conflict processes, and system-environment adjustments. The interaction between the various phenomena were neither linear nor standardised. Figure 7.1 diagrammatically summarises the complexity of the process.

7.1.2 Summary of conclusions

Listed below is a summary of the argument advanced in Chapter 6 to explain the policy implementation processes in the Indian education system during 1990 to 1994, the period which has come to be referred to as the period of transition to a post-apartheid South Africa. The key elements of the argument are presented below as general propositions.

7.1.2.1 Environmental turbulence

Environmental turbulence generated by social and political changes in the larger society are likely to influence cultural, interpersonal, and
Figure 7.1 Impact of transition on policymaking and policy implementation in the Indian education system
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Alterations in former stable, hierarchical relations in the Indian education system.
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structural arrangements in the system through alterations in the stable interactions among key system participants (see sections 4.3.4, 5.3.4 and 6.2.5). Policy implementation in a society in transition thus reflects a fragmentation of the pre-transition coherence among policy actors through emergent conflicts, a heightening of value conflicts, an undercurrent of perceived self-interest of policy actors, and changing power relations. The general state of conflict among policy actors and rapid policy oscillations in the system, in turn, produce a positive feedback loop into the environmental turbulence (see sections 4.3.4.1 and 5.3.4.1).

7.1.2.2 Value conflicts

Value conflicts which had remained subterranean or non-existent during an earlier period rise to the surface and influence the emergence of competing interpretive schemes and fundamental power struggles over goals and policies (see sections 4.3.2, 5.3.2, and 6.2.2).

7.1.2.3 Lack of legitimacy

When an education department and its authority structures lack legitimacy for a significant portion of its members and the community it serves, its policies will also tend to lack moral and professional persuasiveness (see sections 4.3.1.4, 5.3.2.2, and 6.2.2.1).

7.1.2.4 Alterations in power dependencies

The emergence of value conflicts and competing interpretive schemes and the general rejection of the legitimacy of authority structures in an education system are likely to produce alterations in power dependencies in a climate of conflict among various hierarchically grouped participants (see sections 4.3.1.4, 5.3.1.4, 5.3.1.8, 5.3.3.3, and 6.2.4).

7.1.2.5 De-coupling of system components

With the emergence of value conflicts which had hitherto remained
subterranean or unformed, the polarisation among policy actors as a result of the operation of competing interpretive schemes, and the alterations in the power dependencies as a result of morphogenic, structuration, and conflict processes, the system is likely to display increased loosely coupled functioning with the general de-coupling of components (see sections 4.3.3.3, 4.3.4., 5.3.3.4, 5.3.4 and 6.2.5).

7.1.2.6 Interactions among policy actors

The interactions among policy actors are not only affected by changes in the larger society but, in a recursive fashion, by changes in value and power relationships and by a general increase in the de-coupling of system components (see sections 4.3.1, 5.3.1, 6.2.1, and 6.2.5).

7.1.2.7 Impact on policymaking and policy implementation

Environmental turbulence and the resultant interpersonal, cultural, and structural changes influence and are influenced by the policymaking and policy implementation processes in a variety of ways (see sections 4.3.3, 5.3.3.1, 6.2.6, and 6.2.7).

7.1.2.7.1 Ineffective strategic planning

The policymaking process is adversely affected and, in turn, adversely affects the policy implementation process, when the education department fails to recognise the fundamental alterations in the environment and their significance for the system because of an ineffective strategic planning component (see sections 5.3.2.1, and 6.2.6.1).

7.1.2.7.2 Entrapment to outdated policies.

Because of rapidity of external and internal changes, policies which had been contemplated and commenced in an earlier period of relative stability tend to be adhered to despite greatly altered environmental and systemic conditions (see sections 5.3.2.1 and 6.2.6.2).
7.1.2.7.3 Hyperrationalisation tendency in policymaking

Value changes and alterations in power relations and the resultant climate of policy instability in the system are likely to influence upper management to display a hyperrationalisation tendency in policymaking in an effort to fashion out quick solutions to some of the more serious crises in the system (see sections 5.3.2.1 and 6.2.6.3).

7.1.2.7.4 Ineffective communication of policies

When policymaking and policy control structures lack legitimacy for many participants in the system, ineffective communication of policies can act as a barrier to policy implementation in that even those inclined to implement the policy may be frustrated by confusion about policy goals and procedures (see sections 5.3.1.2 and 6.2.7.1).

7.1.2.7.5 Quality of policy

In a society in transition, the substantive quality of policy proposals may not be a decisive factor. The policy implementation process is actually an arena of contestation for professional, political, and group values and priorities (see sections 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.4, 4.3.2, 4.3.4.2, 5.3.1.8, 5.3.2.2, 5.3.2.3, and 5.3.4.2).

7.1.2.7.6 Perceived self-interest of policy actors

The perceived self-interest of policy actors will influence the policy implementation process, policy resistance tending to be especially pronounced in policies that are perceived to result in an increase in the work load and a reduction in relative professional autonomy (see sections 4.3.4.1.3, 5.3.4.1.3, and 6.2.3).

7.1.2.7.7 Policy content

Policies that seek to produce behavioural changes and alterations in the technical core of the school system are more likely to be resisted than
those which focus on administrative aspects of schools. Similarly, policies that seek to produce extensive change in existing patterns of interaction in schools are more likely to resisted than those which focus on incremental alterations. Faced by system instability, policymakers may not plan adequately for responses such as these (see sections 5.3.4.2 and 6.2.7.2).

### 7.1.2.7.8 General failure of control systems

When there are value conflicts, alterations in power dependencies, and increased loosely coupled functioning of the system, policy resistance and policy violations are likely to be widespread. If the education department lacks legitimacy and is confronted by teacher militancy and teacher unionism, efforts to reverse this trend are likely fail (sections 4.3.1.3, 4.3.1.4, 5.3.1.3, 5.3.1.4, and 6.2.7.4).

### 7.1.2.7.9 Decline in job satisfaction and staff morale

The climate of rapid change, uncertainty, and conflict may lead to a general decline in job satisfaction and staff morale. Confronted by tensions in the system and the fragmentation of pre-transition coherence of values and role relationships, educators are likely to be stressed by the emergence of conflictual roles of education practitioner and militant professional. In addition, peer-group and staffroom pressures for political activism may generate conflict in those who are more inclined to concentrate on the stability of basic teaching functions (see sections 5.3.2.5, 5.3.2.6, 5.3.2.7, and 6.2.7.5).

### 7.1.2.8 Relative surface stability of the system

If the policy crises are not temporally extensive and if they do not become an arena for violent political and professional conflicts, the education system is likely to continue functioning with relative surface stability because of the functional outcomes of loose coupling, the negotiation of order among system participants, and the general operation of legitimation processes (see sections 5.3.3.4 and 6.2.8.1).
7.1.2.9 Spiralling impact of system changes

The continued turbulence in the environment and the general alterations in the cultural, interpersonal, and structural linkages in the system will act recursively upon interactions among policy actors and produce spiralling cycles of systemic policymaking and policy implementation consequences. Figure 7.2 presents a diagrammatic summary of the whole process in a system where the values of the community are generally supportive of education.

7.1.3 Chaos state of the system

In a society undergoing fundamental socio-political change, the education system is likely to display chaos qualities. Dependence on tried and tested strategies for containing uncertainty may become dysfunctional as the repetition of the same policy act may bring about radically different policy outcomes and become new attractors for value conflicts and power struggles in the system. Values and goals themselves may lose their constancy because of the rapid, unpredictable alterations in contexts shaping priorities. As a result, policymaking may increasingly become a 'fuzzy gambling' activity where decisions are made on the basis of risks and possibilities in the face of unpredictable configurations and discontinuities (Dror, 1983: 9-10).

7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has focussed on the impact of a society undergoing processes of transition to democracy and regime change on education policy implementation. To what extent, however, are the findings of this study relevant to a smoothly functioning, legitimate system that is located in a society characterised by rapid change? The theoretical bases for the model presented in Chapter 6 (see section 6.3.2) suggest that the findings may be substantially relevant. In more stable systems, there are still likely to be the basic tensions that occur in a turbulent environment (see section 6.3.2.1); there are likely to occur in such situations the processes of structural conditioning, political and educational interaction, and structural elaboration identified by Archer (1979; 1981; 1984) (see section 6.3.2.2); there are also likely to occur the types of organisation changes identified by Ranson et al. (1980) and Greenwood & Hinings (1988) (see section 6.3.2.6); and under the pressure of a turbulent environment a system may move towards more
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loosely coupled functioning (see section 6.3.2.7). Therefore many of the recommendations that follow may be relevant to policy implementation in any education system located in a turbulent, densely-textured environment.

7.2.1 Research recommendations

The social and political pace of change that characterised the 1990 to 1994 period in this country is likely to continue for some time. Though legitimacy of the socio-political system is no longer an issue, the 'realities' of the policy actors in the education system will still act as one of the basic preconditions in the policymaking and policy implementation processes and these 'realities' will still be influenced and re-influenced by the social and political struggles of the second phase of transition. Therefore further research in clarifying the dynamics of education policy implementation in a society in transition is essential both for policymakers and educators. The findings and conclusions in this study may contribute to this research. It is recommended that:

- The theoretical model presented in this study should be subjected to further examination under different systemic and environmental conditions.

- The research attention in such studies should, inter alia, be directed at:
  - analysing the impact of rapid change on education policymaking and policy implementation processes in a unitary system of education
  - examining the operation of system preconditions and emergent attractors on education policymaking and policy implementation processes
  - identifying the influence of specific attractors on the form and functioning of emergent education systems.

7.2.2 General policy process recommendations

The government of national unity that was established in South Africa after the 1994 general elections is basically a mechanism to facilitate the second phase of transition. Conditions of uncertainty and ambiguity still characterise the larger socio-political environment. The education
system still displays many of the features that Dror (1983) associates with an intermediate model of 'policymaking as fuzzy gambling.' As Dror (1983: 10) points out:

a. In part, outputs can be predicted in terms of risks and in terms of possibilities. In part, outputs will take the form of unpredictable configurations, with discontinuities and jumps.

b. In part, situations can be diagnosed as more in the direction of jumps or more in the direction of smooth continuity; in part, ignorance dominates, with no possibility to assess situations in advance as smooth or jumping.

c. Utility of subjective probabilities and decision analysis methods based on them, constancy of values and goals, potentials of intelligence for containing and reducing ignorance, and so on, depend on the situational mixes of uncertainties and on ignorance on this matter itself.

d. Low probability events occur with changing frequency and surprise is endemic.

Despite these conditions, education policymakers have to take policy decisions and confront the possibilities of policy failure, public outcry, and unanticipated outcomes. Therefore, expanding on Dror (1983: 12), it is recommended that:

- Policymaking and policy implementation should, draw upon a 'fuzzy gambling perspective' with close attention to the inherent uncertainties and ambiguities of the situation.

- Policymakers and education administrators at all levels of the system should develop an openness to uncertainty and ignorance and an ability to cope with unexpected outcomes and crises.

- 'Debugging' should become an essential managerial skill to improve on decisions, reduce errors, identify policy implementation problems, and identify appropriate avenues of action.

- The whole process should be as open and participatory as possible: representatives of all the key stakeholders should be engaged in the discussion of a policy and formulation of a policy and its implementation strategies to reduce the situational mixes of uncertainties and ignorance and to broaden the sphere of accountability and involvement.

7.2.3 National and provincial education system level recommendations

Despite the uncertainties and ambiguities of the process, both at
national and provincial level, the state is faced with the responsibility and challenge of establishing a post-apartheid education system that will address issues such as equity, redress, quality, efficiency, local ethos and national coherence, democratic rights, and incentives-driven change (Department of Education, 1995: 42-43).

7.2.3.1 Developing a new vision for education

The policymaking and policy implementation processes in relation to these priorities are likely to occur against a background of cultural, interpersonal, and structural changes in the existing education structures. Therefore, for coherence of values, it is recommended that:

- The national and provincial education departments should work jointly with all the stakeholders to develop a new vision for education and to publicise it as widely as possible.

- The national and provincial education departments should develop political consensus about the goals of education. As Clune (1990: 126-127) observes, the absence of political consensus on education goals results in a general absence of national yardsticks to measure the success of the education system and to identify sources of problems.

- In doing so, education policymakers should take cognisance of system preconditions and the operation of chaos features and attractors.

7.2.3.2 Recognising the new education reality and creating structures in harmony with the new vision

Generally education is resistant to change. More specifically, any move towards the realisation of a new vision for education that leaves the basic structures of the past intact is likely to fail because of incompatibilities between the education ideologies of the past and the present. Therefore it is recommended that:

- All 'old' policymaking and policy control structures should be evaluated for their congruence and contribution to the new education vision.

- Education structures that are incompatible with the new vision should be dissolved as ideological and structural incompatibilities will
retard the emergence of effective policy and practice linkages in education.

- Simultaneously, there should be efficient structures for consultation to enable the development of bottom-up participation in policymaking and education administration, the fostering of professional creativity and initiative, the promotion of school-level leadership, and the advancement of parent involvement in school governance.

7.2.3.3 Accommodating and constraining individual and group interests

In a period of transition there is strong possibility that policy actors in the emergent system may have enhanced opportunities to promote individual and sub-group interests and so undermine the achievement of coherent, stable system orientation. Therefore it is recommended that:

- An effective appraisal system should be developed to identify effective professional functioning and to act as the basis for career advancement.

- Greater emphasis should be placed in developing a culture of professional co-responsibility at all levels of the system.

- Structures should be created to ensure that policy consultation and negotiation allows the balancing of the interests of different groups. Teacher bodies which tend to protect and advance their own interests in policy negotiations should not be allowed to act as the dominant policymaking partner with the education department. Parent and student organisations should also be consulted so that their interests are not subordinated to those of teachers.

- The loosely coupled functioning of the education system should be recognised and formalised into a system that has, simultaneously, some elements which are tightly coupled and others which are loosely coupled. While aspects such as conditions of service, the broad curriculum, and standard setting devices at exit points from the school system should be tightly coupled, other aspects such as parent involvement and classroom practices of teachers should be loosely coupled to enable parent and teacher empowerment and accountability. If national and provincial education departments adopt a minimalist policymaking position, then more aspects of the system can fall into the loosely coupled sphere of functioning than in the tightly coupled.
7.2.3.4 Adopting a minimalist policymaking strategy

A major finding of this study is that in a society in transition to democracy and regime change policy implementation often becomes an arena of contestation over emergent values and power relations. The real source of the crisis in these situations is not the merits or demerits of the policy but the clash of values and power relations set in motion by these policies. Therefore it is recommended that:

- In a period of societal transition, education policymaking should reflect a minimalist focus, avoiding complex procedures, rapid policy changes, short-term solutions, and panic responses.

- Education policymaking should be based on constant scanning of the environment and identification of strategic problems and strategic solutions within the framework of 'fuzzy logic' (Reavis, 1990: 78).

- Greater attention should be directed to resolving value conflicts and hierarchical tensions through the recognition of professional competences and the devolution of decision-making powers.

7.2.3.5 Developing models and strategies to maximise effective policy implementation

In a society in transition, the education system, a generically loosely coupled structure, is likely to experience higher levels of loosely coupled functioning. Close supervision of the policy implementation process is not likely to be a feasible option. In this situation, the linkage between policy goals and policy outcomes is likely to be weak and unpredictable. Therefore it is recommended that:

- The identification of the most appropriate and effective policy implementation strategy should be integral to the policymaking task itself.

- Careful attention should be paid during the policy design phase to the behavioural and organisational changes that may be required during policy implementation. Only then can there be effective formulation of policies and heightened possibilities of policy goal attainment.

- During the policy consultation and negotiation phase consensus must be reached on procedures relating to control and revision of the
policy during the implementation process itself to enable the operation of an effective 'debugging' system (see section 7.2.2).

- An effective policy implementation model for an education system undergoing transformation should contain:
  
  - effective communication of policies to schools
  
  - effective control and co-ordination procedures
  
  - re-establishment and refinement of the role of the Inspectorate and the advisory services
  
  - formulation of an effective model for professional accountability
  
  - effective standard setting and standard monitoring devices at exit points from the school system.

**7.2.3.6 Training and retraining of macro-level education officials to maximise effective policy implementation**

Most macro-level education officials in the present, emergent education system belong to one of two categories. First, there are those who were trained in an era of relative environmental and political stability and socialised into an educational management ideology that is no longer acceptable. Second, there are those who are newly promoted to senior positions but lack familiarity with the dynamics of education systems and education systems management. Presently we need education officials similar to those whom Davies (cited by Chadwick, 1985: 11) saw as necessary for the rapidly changing education system in England and Wales in the 1980's. They should be capable of:

- Communicating a moral vision and commitment to education larger than any given pressure group and displaying an acute understanding of social and educational forces and their significance for education

- Creating channels of communication to enable interest groups to articulate their interests and concerns to education policymakers

- Helping education departments and schools chart clear education directions in the midst of marked conflict and ambiguity

- Creating organisational arrangements to facilitate change and improvement rather than allowing the perpetuation of the status quo
• Generating and implementing projects to realise the new education vision by approaches based on adaptability, evaluation, and purposive budgetary techniques.

Qualities such as these are essential in all education officials if the post-apartheid education system is to act as a key component in the nation building process. Therefore it is further recommended that:

• Training and retraining of all macro-level educational officials must be an urgent priority of new education policy.

• The training and reskilling programme must be directed at equipping education officials to grasp operationally the alterations in the education landscape and their implications for the establishment of an effective education system. Moreover, education officials must not only look outward but inward and develop self-consciousness about the impact of their own values, their cultural background, their management habits, and their knowledge background (see section 7.2.2).

7.2.4 School-level recommendations

Generally education policies are developed at national and provincial level with limited thought being directed at school-level factors. The impression in the minds of policymakers seems to be that schools are identical and uniform in their functioning. Yet a common finding in the literature on effective schools is that schools that are similar in their social composition and ecological background may have totally different records of pupil attendance, pupil delinquency, academic attainment, and transfer of pupils to post-secondary education: the literature, in fact, repeatedly points to school-focused explanations for academic success and failure (Silver, 1991: 275). Therefore it is recommended that:

• Policymakers should not lose sight of the fact that education policies only find expression through schools and their corporate energy.

• In designing policies and devising implementation strategies, policymakers and education officials should not lose sight of the fact that school-level variables will undermine or enhance the achievement of policy goals.

• Policies should be constructed with strong sensitivity to the fact that schools are delicately balanced structures. Each has its own style, culture, ethos, norms, rituals, and internal relationships.
The relevance of these recommendations also rests on the findings in this study which suggest that the cultural, interpersonal, and structural linkages between the education department and its schools and within schools themselves are likely to be weakened during periods of environmental turbulence and societal transition.

7.2.4.1 Establishing multiple lines of communication and collaborative functioning among policy actors

The findings in this study suggest that upper management and superintendents of education tend to be culturally and interpersonally isolated from the world of educators at school level during periods of societal transition (see sections 4.3.1.4.2, 5.3.1.1, 5.3.1.4, 5.3.2.1, 5.3.3.3, and 6.2.5). It is therefore recommended that:

- Upper management education officials must work more closely with schools, meet principals of schools regularly for group feedback and briefing sessions, meet teacher organisation representatives equally regularly for feedback on policy issues and teacher problems, and closely monitor the school environment for changes that may impact on the functioning of the system.

- Superintendents of education must give priority to their boundary spanning role insofar as communication, information transfer, identification of policy problems, and the control and coordination of policy implementation are concerned, assist schools in the development of year plans and improvement programmes, and facilitate policy adjustments in terms of local conditions.

Though lower in the education hierarchy, principals play a pivotal role in the establishment of effective schools. The findings in this study suggest that in situations of organisational conflict and power struggles, principals tend to retreat to a purely administrative role. Therefore it is recommended that:

- Principals should be encouraged to concentrate on school leadership, the development of a school vision, and the direction of the school, on a collegial, participative basis with teachers, parents and pupils for the attainment of high standards of education.

The research in this study has also shown that a teacher culture oppositional to education authority may evolve during a period of rapid change and societal transition. As Meerkotter (1994: 29) observes of the larger education crisis during the transition years, many teachers
abdicated 'their responsibility for the education of "their" students.' Also focusing on this period, Morrow (1994: 28) observes that many committed teachers 'have been defeated not so much by the "state" or by the "system" as by the climate of demoralisation and cynicism which has spread among both teachers and learners, and by the lack of support, and sometimes even direct opposition, from their colleagues.'

Meerkotter (1994: 29) thus concludes that reconstructing a 'culture of teaching' requires teachers to 'accept responsibility for teaching and co-responsibility for the learning of youth of the community to which they are accountable.' It is therefore recommended that:

- The education department, working collaboratively with teacher and parent organisations, must give priority to the establishment of a 'culture of teaching.'

- Structural changes should be effected at school level to reduce the insulated performance of teachers and the cellular nature of schools through school-level collaborative planning and decision-making processes that relate to the development of school goals, to school improvement plans and school charters, and group attention to instruction, curriculum, peer evaluation, and effective measuring.

- The general conditions of service of teachers should be revised to make them more supportive of appropriate value structures.

### 7.2.4.2 Changing the organisational structure of schools

This study has shown that the general weakening of cultural, interpersonal, and structural linkages in the system contribute significantly to policy failures (see sections 4.3.1.9, 4.3.2.4, 4.3.3.3, 5.2, 5.3.1.10, 5.3.2.8, 5.3.3.5, and 6.2.3). At school level this may be accompanied by a collapse in control and coordination structures, power struggles and conflict, denial of the principal's authority, and general loss of job satisfaction and morale among educators. Therefore it is recommended that:

- Schools should be re-organised to enable a higher degree of parent involvement in school governance, higher levels of participative decision making, shared vision of the possible, trust, mutual accountability, and tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity.
7.2.4.3 Changing the decision-making structures at schools

Mechanisms and processes that organically link the members of the school and the school and the community are likely to suffer during periods of change and transition. It is therefore recommended that:

- Decision making at school level should be effected on a democratic and transparent basis with the full participation of educators, parents, students, and other relevant community stakeholders.

- The ambit of these decision-making powers should be clearly defined so that there is no possible conflict with national and provincial decision-making authority.

7.2.4.4 Developing new power relationships

In loosely coupled systems, the policy directions of the executive level may have no effect at all on lower level participants. This was often the case in the Indian education system as a result of teachers' refusal to acknowledge the legitimacy of the Department's authority. Therefore it is recommended that:

- The education department should develop new decision-making structures to enable the full participation of teachers, parents, and secondary students in the decision-making processes at national, provincial, regional, and school levels.

- At school level, parents as the primary stakeholders in the education of their children should have a numerically decisive voice on school governing bodies.

- The school governing body should function in terms of specific national and provincial criteria and, with capacity and capacity-building, have powers to decide on organisational issues, subject choices, fund-raising, and appointment and promotion of staff to the school.

- Members of school governing bodies must be provided with training in the exercise of their powers, the conduct of meetings, control of the school budget, fund-raising procedures, conduct of interviews for appointment of educators to the school, and the handling of conflict situations.
7.2.4.5 Training school principals for leadership for changing times

The findings in this study suggest that many principals were unable to cope with the uncertainty and ambiguity of rapid change. Often they abdicated their leadership responsibilities and concealed from the education department the general decline at their schools. Part of the problem was that their training and experience had not equipped them with skills relating to leadership for changing times. Therefore it is recommended that:

- All principals should be given intensive management training to equip them with the task of managing schools in a changing, dynamic environment.

- The content of the management training course should focus on skills relating to instructional leadership, participative management, conflict resolution, team building, financial management, and coping with 'tough' responsibilities.

7.3 CONCLUSION

Let us return to the problem with which we began: namely, the general failure of policy implementation processes in the Indian education system. This problem acquires a new relevance in a country undergoing the structural adjustments of regime change and the problems of social, political, economic, and educational reconstruction and development.

Obviously, educational initiatives alone are insufficient to address the complexities of nation building and reconstruction and development. Equally true, however, is the fact that without education, the transition to a fully coherent new dispensation will be slower and less certain of success. Therefore precedence should be given to the establishment of a new management paradigm that reflects a systematic removal of all structures that inhibit innovative adjustment to societal pressures. Comprehensive strategies should be developed to cope with uncertainty and ambiguity and with the fact that traditional planning and management procedures may prove inadequate in a volatile, densely-textured environment where anxieties and fears inherent in a situation of uncertainty and ambiguity may stifle constructive, innovative engagement. In short, the problems that may surface in an education system undergoing change need to be anticipated and addressed in a comprehensive and
unified fashion. Briefly there has to be:

- A unity of vision about the future and the role of education and educators in realising that future

- A generally accepted ethos guiding policymaking, policy implementation, and teaching so that there is a pervasive culture of collegiality, professional sharing, trust among administrators, educators, parents and pupils, and tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity

- A professionally engendered culture of teaching-learning that centres attention on critical thinking skills, moral judgements, professional mutuality, and social responsibility in teachers and pupils

- Emphasis on accountability of administrators, educators, parents, and pupils for the effective functioning of the system and the realisation of national, provincial, and school goals

- Collective acceptance of the need for the various group realities to co-exist harmoniously and productively in the system so that system preconditions may be accommodated while minimising the emergence of value conflicts and power struggles as disruptive attractors.

This study suggests that only with policymaking and policy implementation emphasis on fundamentals such as these can we be optimistic about the emergence of an effective education system in a post-transition era.
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APPENDIX 1

The schools that participated in this study
PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Below is a list of the schools that participated in the study, their grade, their staff complement, and pupil enrolment in 1992 when the field work for this study commenced in earnest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>STAFF COMPLEMENT</th>
<th>PUPIL ENROLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apollo Secondary School</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asoka Secondary School</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossmoor Secondary School</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Point Secondary School</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damorosa Secondary School</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durban Girls Secondary School</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandhi Desai Secondary School</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharwastan Secondary School</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marklands Secondary School</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowlands Secondary School</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilgiri Secondary School</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient Islamic Secondary School</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overport Secondary School</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risecliff Secondary School</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingen Heights Secondary School</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjuman Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Y S Memorial Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonella Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Heights Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescentridge Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossmead Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
<td>STAFF COMPLEMENT</td>
<td>PUPIL ENROLMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawnridge Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elora Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everest Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcon Park Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenridge Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juma Musjid Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariannhill Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianpark Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorlands Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorton Heights Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Padavathan Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northdene Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklands Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkview Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallcross Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simla Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Model Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Anthony's Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surat Hindoo Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umhlatuzana Primary School</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Park Primary School</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Demographic data relating to the samples for the questionnaire and structured interview
Table 1  Sex distribution for the various groups of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPUTY PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>HEAD OF DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91.91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL**</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondent did not indicate his/her sex.

** In some columns in this table and the tables that follow totals do not add up to exactly 100.00% because all decimals have been rounded off to the second place.
Table 2  Age distribution for the various groups of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE INTERVALS</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPUTY PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>HEAD OF DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 years+</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents did not indicate age.
Table 3: Total years of teaching experience of the various groups of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL N (%)</th>
<th>DEPUTY PRINCIPAL N (%)</th>
<th>HEAD OF DEPARTMENT N (%)</th>
<th>TEACHER N (%)</th>
<th>SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION N (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32 9.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32 6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 1.56</td>
<td>114 35.51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116 21.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 6.25</td>
<td>79 24.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87 16.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 9.09</td>
<td>21 16.41</td>
<td>38 11.84</td>
<td>1 3.70</td>
<td>61 11.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>11 24.44</td>
<td>2 18.18</td>
<td>49 38.28</td>
<td>32 9.97</td>
<td>6 22.22</td>
<td>100 18.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30 years</td>
<td>19 42.22</td>
<td>7 63.64</td>
<td>35 27.34</td>
<td>20 6.23</td>
<td>12 44.44</td>
<td>93 17.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 years+</td>
<td>15 33.33</td>
<td>1 9.09</td>
<td>13 10.16</td>
<td>6 1.87</td>
<td>8 29.63</td>
<td>43 8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45 100.00</td>
<td>11 100.00</td>
<td>128 100.00</td>
<td>321 100.00</td>
<td>27 100.00</td>
<td>532 100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Years of experience at the present post level for the various groups of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCE: PRESENT POST LEVEL</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPUTY DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>HEAD OF DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 8 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents did not indicate their years of experience.
Table 5  Academic qualifications of each group of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPUTY PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>HEAD OF DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73,33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54,55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36,36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6  Professional qualifications of each group of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPUTY PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>HEAD OF DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35,56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54,55</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57,78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45,45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29,69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.Ed.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents did not indicate their professional qualifications.
Table 7  Summary of respondents in terms of location in system and percentage in relation to the full sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>PRIMARY SCHOOL</th>
<th></th>
<th>SECONDARY SCHOOL</th>
<th></th>
<th>EDUCATION DEPARTMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>24.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>35.53</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>60.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of education (M)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of education (A)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>53.38</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages represent percentages in terms of the full sample of 532.
Table 8  Sex distribution of the various groups of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPUTY PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>HEAD OF DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60,00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75,00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40,00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9  Teaching experience distribution of the various groups of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPUTY PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>HEAD OF DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30,00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40,00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 years+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30,00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

The questionnaire used in this study
TO THE RESPONDENT

The basic aim of this study is to closely examine the implementation of educational policies in a system undergoing transition while located in a broader environment which is in a state of turbulence. The Indian education system is a good example of such a system: it is often wracked by the problems of change and transformation while located in a social and political context which is also in a state of transition. It is only by revealing how the actions, values and perceptions of Departmental officials, principals, school-level management personnel, teachers, pupils, parents and environmental forces interact in a situation characterised by change and transition, to produce policy outcomes can the constitutive sub-processes be unravelled, debated and corrected.

Though your participation in this study is voluntary, it is hoped you will offer it your full cooperation and support, especially since its primary goal is to offer management solutions to the enormous practical and logistical problems that relate to the realisation of any educational policy.

Each item in this questionnaire seeks to elicit your views, feelings and perceptions about Departmental policies and their implementation in our schools. Your response to the questionnaire will be completely confidential: neither you nor your school will be identified in any way.

In filling this questionnaire, please note:

1. PART 1, PART 2, AND PART 3 OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ARE TO BE FILLED BY ALL RESPONDENTS.

2. PART 4, WHICH TOUCHES ON MANAGEMENT ISSUES IS TO BE FILLED ONLY BY ACTING PRINCIPALS, PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS OF EDUCATION IN ADDITION TO PARTS 1–3.

Please note also that in this questionnaire, the masculine pronouns, ‘he’ and ‘his’ also refer to ‘she’ and ‘her’. This usage is not sexist: it is purely a matter of convenience to avoid the constant use of ‘he/she’ and ‘his/her’.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

H. RAMESHUR
**PART 1 : ABOUT YOURSELF**

The items below relate to demographic details about you and your background. The information is necessary solely for purposes of statistical cross-tabulation. Place a cross in the appropriate box for each item.

1. **Sex:**
   - Male
   - Female

2. **Age (at last birthday):**
   - 20–25
   - 26–30
   - 31–35
   - 36–40
   - 41–45
   - 46–50
   - 50+

3. **Total years of experience (at the end of this year):**
   - 1 – 5
   - 6–10
   - 11–15
   - 16–20
   - 21–25
   - 26–30
   - 31+

4. **Total years of experience in the present position at the end of this year:**
   - 1– 2
   - 3– 4
   - 5– 6
   - 7– 8
   - 9–10
   - 11+

5. **Your academic qualifications**
   - Matric
   - Partial degree
   - Bachelors
   - Honours
   - Masters
   - Doctorate
6. Your professional qualifications:
   - Diploma
   - B.Ed.
   - M.Ed.
   - D.Ed.

7. Your position:
   - Teacher
   - Head of Department
   - Dep. Principal
   - Principal (Acting)
   - Principal
   - Sup. of Education (M)
   - Sup. of Education (A)

8. Your school/office:
   - Primary school
   - Secondary school
   - Truro House

PART 2: YOUR VIEWS ABOUT EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

In this section, which consists of several subsections, we are interested in eliciting your views about educational policies. Needless to say, there are no 'right' or 'wrong' responses.

2.1 AGREEMENT WITH POLICIES

Assess the degree to which you agree or disagree with Departmental policy directives in each of the areas listed below:

Scale: 1 = Strongly agree
   2 = Agree
   3 = Slightly agree
   4 = Slightly disagree
   5 = Disagree
   6 = Strongly disagree

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Admission age of junior primary pupils:
2. Promotion/retardation of pupils:
3. Use of corporal punishment:
4. Curriculum (in your subject):
5. Technical vocational education:
6. Education welfare board and disciplinary action:

For Processing Use
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STRONGLY AGREE ———> STRONGLY DISAGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervision for staff development:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluation and promotion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Staffing and staff rationing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provision of stocks and text books:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Plant maintenance and cleaning services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Finance control:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Parent teacher association:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 CHANGE REQUIRED BY POLICIES

Indicate the degree of change from past that is required by recent Departmental policy directives in each of the areas listed below:

Scale: 1 = Very great change
2 = Much change
3 = Minor change
4 = No change at all

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Admission age of junior primary pupils:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotion/retardation of pupils:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use of corporal punishment:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Curriculum (in your subject):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Technical vocational education:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Education welfare board and disciplinary action:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervision for staff development:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluation and promotion:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Staffing and staff rationing:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provision of stocks and text books:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Plant maintenance and cleaning services:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Finance control:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Parent teacher association:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 DEPARTMENTAL CONTROL OVER POLICY

Indicate what you consider to be the degree of control exerted by the Department during policy implementation in each of the areas listed below. In other words, how tight or loose is the control exerted by the Department?

Scale: 1 = Maximum discretion allowed to school and educator.
2 = Loose control with much leeway allowed to school and educator.
3 = Close control with some leeway for local conditions.
4 = Very close control by the Department with little or no leeway.

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM.
PART 3 : OTHER POLICY IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS

In this section, which consists of several subsections, we are concerned with eliciting your views about the various actors and forces in the policy implementation process in our schools.

3.1 THE DEPARTMENT AND SENIOR DEPARTMENTAL OFFICIALS

In this subsection, the focus is on the policy implementation role of the Department and its superintendents of education.

Scale: 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Agree  
3 = Slightly agree  
4 = Slightly disagree  
5 = Disagree  
6 = Strongly disagree

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH ITEM.

STRONGLY AGREE ———> STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. Departmental circulars often require the assistance of superintendents of education before the underlying aims and procedures are fully grasped.

2. The Department makes all important policy decisions openly and with adequate inputs from all interested groups.

3. Departmental policies reflect a sensitivity to social and political forces in the community it serves.

4. Departmental circulars present policy objectives and procedures in a clear, unambiguous manner.
5. Superintendents of education are able to elicit cooperation in implementing Departmental policies because they can give special benefits to those who cooperate with them.  
6. The Department is made up of highly competent officials who have a broad and comprehensive grasp of educational and organisational issues.  
7. The Department acts responsibly and in the best interests of all educators, pupils, and parents in its policy making and policy implementation duties.  
8. Superintendents of education are able to win cooperation in implementing Departmental policies because they have the authority to instruct subordinates to carry out their instructions.  
9. Superintendents of education speed up the process of policy communication and implementation by talking directly to relevant school-based management staff and educators.  
10. Policy changes will often be resisted by educators as long as there is an ‘Indian’ department of education.  

3.2 SCHOOLS AND POLICY IMPLEMENTATION  

In this section the focus shifts to schools and school-based staff. The interaction among personnel at schools contributes to the policy implementation process.

Scale:  
1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Agree  
3 = Slightly agree  
4 = Slightly disagree  
5 = Disagree  
6 = Strongly disagree  

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH ITEM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>(\text{For Processing Use})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal works hard to enhance the promotion and career advancement prospects of teachers in this school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff at this school feel free to approach the principal with their personal problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal makes his requirements about school standards known to each member of staff in this school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal expects staff to carry out his decisions even if they disagree with them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal at this school is often willing to bypass Departmental policy requirements to help educators, pupils, and parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal and management staff at this school often discourage teachers who want to try out ideas that differ from those recommended by superintendents of education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this school, the principal and the staff work as a group in making decisions that affect the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal uses every opportunity to stress the accountability of every educator for high standards of pupil performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal usually disagrees with the majority of the staff on issues relating to teacher militancy and teacher unionism.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of the staff often disagree with the principal and his senior management staff on how the school should be run.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff at this school are like a family where everyone is friendly and supportive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the many cliques in the staff, there is a general lack of togetherness in the staff room.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this school, while teachers are consulted on school policies, the final decision is made by the principal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this school, educators are active members of the organised teacher body and attend most of its meetings and conferences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal encourages teachers to contribute to the running of the school and to involve themselves in the solution of school problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition and struggle for control among the various groups on a staff are on the increase in our schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These days, many educators do not experience any sense of pride or accomplishment in the work they do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite all its present problems, I feel a sense of pride working for the Department of Education and Culture (H.O.D.).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3 TEACHERS, PUPILS, PARENTS AND EXTERNAL FORCES

In this section, we are interested in eliciting your views on teachers, pupils, parents and some external forces that can influence the policy implementation process in our schools.

Scale: 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Agree  
3 = Slightly agree  
4 = Slightly disagree  
5 = Disagree  
6 = Strongly disagree

**PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH ITEM.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In recent years, the impression left in the minds of many is that the organised teacher body is more concerned with the rights of teachers than the needs of pupils.

2. The organised teacher body is quite likely to go out on a 'strike' of one form or another on matters where negotiations with the Department fail.

3. The organised teacher body's actions sometimes affects the principal's ability to run his school.

4. The attitude and social values of many pupils at this school greatly undermine their chances of academic success.

5. On an average day at this school, much of the principal's time is taken up attending to pupil discipline problems.

6. Pupil representative councils are a good 'safety value' but pupils should not be allowed to shape school policy.

7. Parents are becoming increasingly critical of the Department for initiating policies that cause major disruptions at school level.

8. Parents are beginning to question the authority of the principal in areas such as co-curricular activities, subject allocation, pupil discipline and teacher attendance.

9. Now parents do not hesitate reporting teachers to the principal and the Department for any imagined or real offence.

10. Religious and sectional values of parents and key community members frequently enter the school and affect its functioning.

11. The affluence of a school community can seriously affect the principal's ability to run his school because of frequent parent insistence that their needs be addressed.

12. The political 'contacts' and influence of individual parents in the school community often results in their exerting pressure on the school and the Department.

13. Education has become a major political issue in the community and is often used as a means to attack the tricameral system.
## PART 4: MANAGEMENT ISSUES

ONLY TO BE FILLED BY ACTING PRINCIPALS, PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS.

### 4.1 THE DEPARTMENT AND ITS FUNCTIONING

The items in this section centre on the Department and its officials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH ITEM.

1. Major policy decisions tend to be made by the C.E.D. and his Executive team with little or no inputs from other Departmental officials and educators.

2. Currently most of the energy of the Department is directed to short-term needs and objectives — little or no time is devoted to long-term policy making.

3. Limited policy making energy seems to be directed to the development of educational policies that are preparing the way for a unitary system of education.

4. Department officials are often made the scapegoats for policy failures and organisational crises.

5. Morale is generally high among management staff at all levels within the Department.

6. Special interest groups and sub-groups in the Department are becoming more vocal in support of their special goals.

7. When financial cutbacks occur, these are effected by the Department on the basis of a careful weighing of priorities.

8. Among the various groups in the Department, in-fighting and competition for control are on the increase.

9. The Department often ignores information about risks, altered circumstances and changed management contexts, resulting in continued commitment to policies made under different conditions and no longer appropriate.

10. The Department adopts policies only after careful analysis of future costs and benefits.

11. Superintendents of education generally have great influence in the formulation of all policies.

12. When faced with a crisis, the Department often seizes upon hastily contrived solutions without adequate examination of long-term consequences.
4.2 THE DEPARTMENT AND THE ORGANISED TEACHER BODY

The items in this section focus on the relationship between the Department and the organised teacher body (SADTU) and the impact of this relationship on the policy implementation process.

Scale: 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Agree  
3 = Slightly agree  
4 = Slightly disagree  
5 = Disagree  
6 = Strongly disagree

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH ITEM.

STRONGLY AGREE ——— STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. In recent years, the rising power of the teacher union has radically changed the pattern of school control.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 35

2. The Department still controls education but teacher unionisation and teacher militancy have substantially reduced its ability to administer schools.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 36

3. Consolidation of power by the organised teacher body has led to increased conflict between the Department and teachers.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 37

4. Principals and superintendents of education are increasingly finding it difficult to effect their role responsibilities because of the influence of the organised teacher body.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 38

5. Teachers want principals to become glorified clerks who do not have the authority to assert control over them.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 39

6. Teachers want to gain access to the management committee of schools to channel the authority of senior colleagues away from Department sanctioned policies and responsibilities.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 40

4.3 THE PRINCIPAL

The principal is the central figure in successful policy implementation at school level. Each of the following statements describes an opinion which some hold and others do not about the principal and his responsibilities.

Scale: 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Agree  
3 = Slightly agree  
4 = Slightly disagree  
5 = Disagree  
6 = Strongly disagree

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH ITEM.

STRONGLY AGREE ——— STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. Most of the difficulties presently experienced by principals in implementing educational policies stem from the severely diminished role of superintendents of education in schools.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 41

2. It is best for a principal to communicate with his staff in writing; this is efficient as it leaves no doubt about what is really said and what is required.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 42
STRONGLY AGREE ————> STRONGLY DISAGREE

3. The principal should consult with others before making decisions but he alone is primarily responsible for making the final decision.

4. The principal as administrator is more than anybody else a man-in-the middle trying to balance the needs and values of the Department, educators, pupils and the community.

5. The principal is the Department's representative in the school and is accountable to the Department for the execution of its policies.

6. Policies and regulations may be changed by the Department but until they are, the principal should see that they are carried out.

7. The principal should work with teachers, the organised teacher body and forces in the community to bring pressure to bear on the Department to change unwelcome policies.

8. Having clarified the school goals, the principal should persuade his staff, using rewards and sanctions if necessary, to translate them into action.

* Thank you for your cooperation.

* Please place the questionnaire in the envelope provided, seal it and send it to me.

H. RAMESHUR
APPENDIX 4

Structured interview schedule used in this study
### PART 1: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. Respondent: | Male | Female |
| --- | --- | --- |

2. Position: | Superintendent (M) | Superintendent (A) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal (S)</td>
<td>Principal (P)</td>
<td>SDP/DP(S)/(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.O.D.(S)/(P)</td>
<td>Teacher(S)/(P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Years of experience (at the end of this year): |
| 1 - 5 years | 6 - 10 |
| 11 - 15 | 16 - 20 |
| 21 - 25 | 26 - 30 |
| 31+ |

### PART 2: THE DEPARTMENT

2.1 **Budget/Finance**

Presently the whole issue of educational financing is a subject of national concern. We in the Department of Education and Culture (House of Delegates) have had to contend with a shrinking education budget: in recent years financial cutbacks have affected every facet of the Department's operation. To what extent do you consider the monies available to the Department are utilised on appropriate priorities, policies, and resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spent appropriately</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Spent inappropriately</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
2.2 Superintendents of education
In recent years, teachers have strongly reacted against evaluation of their work by superintendents of education. What would you say is the extent of this opposition?

No opposition | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very strong opposition

Comment


2.3 Staffing
In 1992, the whole issue of staffing became a source of major tension between the Department and schools and, in a wider context, between the Department and parent groups. Insofar as the Department’s handling of the staffing of schools is concerned, how would you assess the problem?

Not serious | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very serious

Comment


2.4 Evaluation of educators
Policies associated with the evaluation and promotion of educators have also become sources of major conflict between the Department and educators. How would you assess this problem?

Not serious | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very serious

Comment


PART 3: THE SCHOOL
3.1 Adherence to Departmental policies
When a Departmental policy is one with which you are not in full agreement, how do you respond?

1. Follow it precisely because it is an official policy.
2. Modify, bend or adapt it for your situation.
3. Ignore it and use your own discretion.

Comment


For Processing Use
3.2 Principals and Departmental officials
To what extent do principals influence the decisions of Departmental officials during the policy implementation process?
To a very great extent 1 2 3 4 5 Not at all

Comment

3.3 Teacher union
How would you describe the impact of the teacher union on the policy implementation process in Indian schools?
Minor irritant 1 2 3 4 5 Major influence

Comment

3.4 Pupil involvement in decision making
When the Department advocated the formation of PTA's last year, there was wide criticism against this policy and many teachers refused to cooperate in the formation of PTAs. Many opponents of the policy also urged that pupils be given equal decision making powers by converting Parent Teacher Associations to Parent Teacher Student Associations (PTSAs). What I would like to focus on is the role of pupils. Should they be given full rights in the formulation of school policies?
YES 1 2 3 4 NO

Comment

PART 4 : THE ENVIRONMENT

4.1 Community support
To what extent is the community supportive of the Department as an agency of educational provision and control?

| Actively opposed | 1 |
| Opposed          | 2 |
| Disinterested    | 3 |
| Uninformed/not involved | 4 |
| Supportive       | 5 |
| Actively supportive | 6 |

Comment

11 12 13 14
4.2 Religious, sectional and language factors

Our community is characterised by great diversity in language, religion and culture. Often one hears and reads allegations of favouritism because of these forces. In your opinion, are such allegations valid?

YES 1 2 3 4 NO

Comment

PART 5 : GENERAL

5.1 Job satisfaction

Willingness to implement educational policies is clearly linked to educators' level of job satisfaction. If you were to rate your level of job satisfaction during the last 12 months, how would you rate it on a 5-point scale?

VERY LOW 1 2 3 4 5 VERY HIGH

Comment

5.2 Social and political change

To what extent, has the pace of social and political change in the country affected the implementation of educational policies in our schools?

TO A VERY GREAT EXTENT 1 2 3 4 5 NOT AT ALL

Comment

5.3 Biggest problem facing Indian schools

What do you think are the two most pressing problems with which Indian schools must deal?

01 Increase in pupil discipline problems
02 Education budget cutbacks
03 Admission of black pupils
04 Teacher militancy and unionism
05 Decline in teacher morale
06 Large classes
07 Lack of parent interest
08 Parent Teacher Associations
09 Inappropriate curriculum
10 Pace of Departmental policy changes
5.4 Success/failure of policies

We have covered a wide range of factors that impinge on policy implementation. But let's come down to the issue of success or failure of policies. What in your opinion are factors that contribute to the success or failure of policies at school level?

Comment

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 5

Letter of authority to administer the questionnaire and the structured interview and to use Departmental documents
Mr H. Rameshur  
6th Floor  
TRURO HOUSE

Sir

PERMISSION TO USE DEPARTMENTAL CIRCULARS AND PUBLICATIONS

Your letter dated 1994-09-16 in respect of the above refers

1. Permission is hereby granted to you to use Departmental publications, circulars and circular minutes, provided that:

1.1 No parts of confidential Circulars and Management Circulars are quoted in your thesis and that such circulars are cited only in terms of their relevant numbers and captions; and

1.2 All information obtained from the abovementioned sources is treated confidentially and used for academic purposes only.

2. The Department wishes you every success in your D. Ed. study.

Yours faithfully

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

941031/dcp/gn
Mr H. Rameshur
53 Degan Crescent
Reservoir Hills
DURBAN
4091

Sir

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH
Your letter dated 26 October 1992 has reference.

1. Permission is hereby granted to you to conduct your research at the schools as indicated in your letter provided that:
   1.1 prior arrangements are made with the principals concerned;
   1.2 participation in the research is on a voluntary basis;
   1.3 completion of questionnaires and the conducting of interviews are done outside normal teaching time;
   1.4 all information pertaining to educators is treated confidentially and used for academic purposes only.

2. Kindly produce a copy of this letter when approaching schools.

3. The Department wishes you every success in your research and looks forward to receiving a copy of the findings.

Yours faithfully

CHIEF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

92-12-30/research/nn