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SUMMARY

The introduction of outcomes-based education in South African schools has changed the roles of all role players. For outcomes-based education to be successfully implemented everyone should fully understand these new roles. Since the principal should ensure that there is effective teaching and learning at school, this study explored his/her role in the implementation of outcomes-based education. This study includes a literature review of instructional leadership and outcomes-based education in South African schools. A qualitative investigation of the role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools was conducted. Data were analysed, discussed and synthesised. It was found, inter alia that principals and educators do not fully understand the instructional role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education. Lack of training appeared to be the major reason that exacerbates the problem. Based on findings, recommendations for improving the role of the principal were proposed.
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CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND, PROBLEM FORMULATION AND AIMS

1.1 INTRODUCTION: OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION IN KWAMASHU SCHOOLS

The announcement by the South African government that Curriculum 2005 (an outcomes-based approach to education) would be implemented in all grade one classrooms in January 1998 triggered a vigorous public debate. Concerns were expressed about the prospects of implementation given the lack of educator training, the low levels of material support for the new curriculum and the complexity of this curriculum innovation (Jansen, 1999b:203). It was argued that these factors make outcomes-based education difficult to implement in a developing country. Vakalisa (2000:21) maintains that outcomes-based education (OBE) is a controversial concept even in the country of its origin, the United State of America (USA).

South Africa is faced with complex challenges to implementation since educators have been accustomed to using a content-driven and largely rote learning type of approach when teaching. Attempts to rectify this situation by exposing them to outcomes-based education through workshops which are presented over a few days are inadequate. Nevertheless, their understanding of outcomes-based education is often clearer than that of their principals. This should not be the case, as principals are tasked with ensuring that departmental policies are correctly implemented. Therefore, as Pretorius (1998b:105) suggests, school principals should study the outcomes-based approach in depth and become specialists. This will promote their understanding of the changed role of the educator in the learning process and how they, as principals, should help the educator implement outcomes-based education successfully.

The school principal should lead and manage the staff in such a way that educators are able to work productively and provide the expected educative-teaching. The principal as instructional leader should always be at the forefront of whatever changes are being introduced, so that he/she can provide the necessary guidance and assistance. Morphet, Johns and Reller (1982:311) maintain that school administrators are educational leaders, that this includes being instructional leaders. Thus, the pertinent question is not whether they will be involved in the curriculum, but how they will be involved. School administrators in American schools often perform the type of work that principals
are tasked with in South African schools. Musaazi (1982:171) maintains that the principal, as an administrator has the responsibility of ensuring that the established procedures and structures help the school achieve its objectives. Outcomes-based education can be successfully implemented in a school whose principal, as instructional leader, is a member of the team and does not isolate himself/herself from the staff. As Pretorius (1998b:100) puts it, outcomes-based education is a process in which the whole community should grow together and develop continuously in the pursuit of excellence.

Outcomes-based education has not only changed the manner in which educators should teach and learners should learn, but also the manner in which schools should be managed. Therefore, not only do educators need training on how to implement outcomes-based education in the classroom, but school principals, too, need training on how to manage schools, so that outcomes-based education can be implemented successfully. So far, the emphasis of training has been on the educators and very little has been done to ensure that school principals are well trained, so that they can perform their tasks competently.

Killen (1999:4) states that one of the attractions of outcomes-based education is that it can provide administrators with some level of control over the outcomes of education, and at the same time provide educators with a large degree of freedom to select the content and methods through which they will help learners achieve those outcomes. Killen goes on to say that these two issues of control and freedom may generate tension. Educators may disagree with the controls imposed and administrators may not like the way educators use their freedom of choice. Therefore, school principals should be given adequate training so that they know exactly what role they should play in the implementation of outcomes-based education.

Badenhorst (1993:343) maintains that the principal plays a cardinal role in the management of any school. Obviously, there can be no effective teaching in a school which is not well managed, no matter how well informed the educators are. Educators will always rely on the support and assistance of their principal as a leader and a manager. However, the principal will experience difficulties in offering such support and assistance if he/she has not been trained to support the educators in their activities. Thus far, as Chisholm (2000:84) points out, many school principals have not been orientated to Curriculum 2005 to enable them to support implementation in schools. Those that have received orientation have only completed a one-week workshop.
Vally and Sreen (1998:14) argue that one of the factors that impede the implementation of outcomes-based education is a lack of parental support. The school principal is the one who should know when and how to communicate with, not only the parents, but also the community at large. If the principal is not well informed about outcomes-based education, it will be difficult for him/her to inform the parents and community about outcomes-based education or to win their support. McNeir (1994:31) asserts that failure to obtain community support and a degree of consensus can sidetrack an outcomes-based education programme.

1.1.1 KwaMashu schools

The educational setting and the poorly resourced schools in KwaMashu impact upon various aspects of management and educational success. KwaMashu is situated about 25 kilometers north west of Durban in KwaZulu-Natal Province. It covers an area of approximately fifteen square kilometers. The township is divided into fourteen units. It is surrounded by informal settlements, which mushroomed in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The majority of community members in KwaMashu and the surrounding informal settlements are very poor, semi-literate and unemployed.

The bulk of the learners in schools in KwaMashu come from the surrounding informal settlements as most of the permanent residents in KwaMashu have enrolled their children in the former White, Indian and Coloured schools. In spite of very low school fees levied by KwaMashu schools, most parents from the informal settlements cannot afford even this contribution to their children’s education. As a result, almost all schools in the area are poorly resourced and lack even the basic requirements, such as furniture and textbooks. Most classrooms are overcrowded. As a result conditions in these schools are not conducive to traditional effective teaching and learning, apart from the challenge of implementing outcomes-based education. Although parents are involved in the governance of schools through School Governing Bodies, they scarcely understand the outcomes-based education concepts because of their own disadvantaged educational background.

Most school principals in KwaMashu are struggling to manage their schools in a manner that would enable the effective implementation of outcomes-based education. These principals have difficulty in understanding the guidelines of the new curriculum. This is exacerbated by the fact that what is to be taught is implicitly stated rather than explicitly which further adds to the principal’s lack of confidence, as he/she has to implement a curriculum, which is vague in its very inception. In
addition, the new curriculum has been revised or reviewed several times (Chisholm, 2000:3). Generally, most school principals are uncertain as to how this curriculum change should be managed. Garrett (1997:95) maintains that the ability to manage change is an essential skill for all those in schools, whether they are managing at classroom level, middle management level or senior management level. Change, which is not properly managed, may have undesired effects that can cripple the individuals associated with the organisation and also hinder the achievement of the school’s objectives.

In January 2001, outcomes-based education was implemented in grade eight countrywide. However, secondary school principals (or principals whose schools offer grade eight) in most districts had attended very few workshops on outcomes-based education. In KwaMashu, in particular, principals have, to date, only attended one workshop on outcomes-based education. In addition, principals have to manage schools that follow two conflicting curricula. While grades eight and nine follow the new curriculum, which is outcomes-based, grades ten, eleven and twelve, still follow the old curriculum, which is content-centred. The fact that some educators teach both the new and the old curricula simultaneously, as they teach grades eight and nine as well as other grades, compounds the problem.

The foregoing discussion indicates the need to investigate the problem that faces secondary school principals when outcomes-based education is implemented in their schools.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The complexities of the changes demanded by outcomes-based education and the consequent sophistication of the leadership roles required of school principals, are not matched by the training of principals in this regard. This problem is more prevalent in the previously disadvantaged schools due to lack of resources, significant numbers of under-qualified educators and overcrowded classrooms. The poor socio-economic conditions of the parents and community compound the problem. As instructional leader the role of the principal is important during the process of any curriculum change – more so when the circumstances in which the changes have to take place are problematic.
The above background suggests that a need exists to investigate the role of KwaMashu school principals in the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools.

1.2.1 Formulation of the main research problem

What is the role of KwaMashu school principals in the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools?

1.2.1.1 Formulation of sub-problems

According to Leedy (1993:13-14), to make the research problem more manageable, researchers usually divide the problem into sub-problems. Resolving the sub-problems will ultimately resolve the problem. This approach has been adopted with the same view in mind. Thus, the following questions have been formulated or identified as sub-problems:

- What is the instructional role of the principal?
- What is outcomes-based education and why it has been introduced in South Africa?
- What are the perceptions of the stakeholders of outcomes-based education and the manner in which it is implemented?
- Which roles are school principals playing in the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools?
- How can these findings contribute to strengthening the role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in schools?

1.3 AIMS OF THE RESEARCH

In view of the above main research problem and sub-problems, the following aim and objectives may be identified:

**Aim:** The main aim of this research is to investigate the role of KwaMashu school principals in the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools.

**Objectives:** The following objectives can be identified:
• to investigate the instructional role of the school principal.
• to describe outcomes-based education and to determine the reasons for the introduction of outcomes-based education in South Africa.
• to determine the perceptions of the stakeholders on outcomes-based education and the manner in which it is being implemented.
• to identify and describe the role that the school principals play in the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools.
• to determine how these findings can contribute to strengthening the role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in schools.

It is hoped that this research will extend the body of knowledge concerning the role that principals play in the implementation of outcomes-based education in schools in KwaMashu area. As a result, thereof recommendations may be made on ways in which principals can manage their schools more effectively during the implementation of outcomes-based education. It is also hoped that this will lead to further research on this topic.

1.4 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

Ary, Jacobs and Razavich (1990:463) suggest that any terms that may not be familiar to the reader, or those to which the author is ascribing specific meaning should be defined in the way they are used in the study. Therefore, in order to gain a clear understanding of the role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools, it is important that certain concepts should firstly be defined. For the purpose of this study, therefore, the instructional role of the principal, outcomes-based education and Curriculum 2005 are defined, as they have a bearing on the topic.

The three concepts are defined as follows:

**The instructional role of the school principal**

"The instructional role of the principal is to translate the principal's vision into attainable goals and to establish a school climate that is not only conducive to learning, but supportive of teaching" (Hoberg, 1994:44). The instructional role of the principal is to articulate the vision vigorously and
to direct the organisation towards the achievement of its goals. It is to translate the Department of Education policy initiatives into practice and to support educators in the implementation of these policy initiatives. It is to encourage, motivate and influence the educators to co-operate in achieving the school’s objectives. Pretorius (1998b:105) sees the instructional role of the principal to be that of a facilitator and coach in the activities of the team.

**Outcomes-based education**

Mothata (2000:120) defines outcomes-based education as a design for education that is learner-centred and orientated towards results or outcomes. It is based on the belief that all individuals can learn. Mothata sees outcomes-based education as a learner-centred approach to education and training that is primarily characterised by a focus on results and outputs rather than inputs and syllabi or curricula. It is an approach that starts by looking at the desired outcomes or results before a decision is taken of what content can or should be used. This is a new learning approach that is opposed to the old learning approach that was content-based. It is learner-centred and the emphasis is not on what the educator wants to achieve, but rather on what the learner should be able to know, to understand, to do and to become. It is a method of teaching ‘how’ in the classroom.

**Curriculum 2005**

Curriculum 2005 is the new national education curriculum for South Africa and was introduced in January, 1998 (Dreyer, 2000:3). According to Dreyer (2000:4), outcomes-based education is the underlying philosophy of the new curriculum. This new curriculum aims at changing the face of South African education and training. Curriculum 2005 is underpinned by the philosophy of outcomes-based education. According to Mothata (2000:39), it is hoped that through this curriculum the learners will become critical, independent thinkers, prepared for functioning in society. This new curriculum is referred to as Curriculum 2005 because of the underlying initial expectation that its implementation would be completed in all grades by the year 2005.

**1.5 DEMARCATION OF THE PROBLEM**

“Demarcating the problem means establishing the boundaries of the problem area within which the research will progress” (Hoberg, 1999:190). This implies that the problem should be demarcated so
that it is manageable. Therefore, the researcher has decided to demarcate the problem in the following manner:

Within the KwaMashu district, the focus is only on the implementation of outcomes-based education in grades seven and eight. Therefore, the research is confined to only those principals whose schools offer grades seven and eight. This research is limited to KwaMashu schools because the researcher is familiar with the locality as he lives and works there. Grade eight in particular, has been chosen because outcomes-based education was implemented in this grade for the first time in 2001. On the other hand, grade seven is also included in order to consider the transition from the primary school to the secondary school that commenced with outcomes-based education in 2001. Time, financial constraints, limited resources and other personal commitments limited the researcher to a study of one district (KwaMashu district), and a selected number of schools offering grades seven and eight. However, sample of schools chosen and participants interviewed is consistent with qualitative research, which is used in this study. This small sample provided an in-depth understanding of the role principals play in the implementation of outcomes-based education as seen through the eyes of the participants.

1.6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

According to Ary et al (1990:32), research method refers to the general strategy followed in gathering and analysing the data necessary for answering the question at hand. The method employed by the researcher to examine the research problem and to interpret relevant data about the role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools includes the following:

- A review of literature on outcomes-based education, particularly literature on the management of schools implementing outcomes-based education, the management of change and the instructional leadership role of the principal. This literature review serves as the framework for gathering of data.
- The gathering, collection and interpretation of relevant data from bulletins, circulars, brochures, booklets and newspaper articles, because the implementation of outcomes-based education is both recent and controversial that debates and new information are published.
The researcher uses qualitative research to determine the perceptions of stakeholders of outcomes-based education and the role of the principal in this endeavor. Qualitative research is an umbrella term used to refer to several research strategies that share certain characteristics. The data collected, analysed, and interpreted is "rich in description of people, places, and conversations and is not easily handled by statistical procedures" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992:2). McMillan and Schumacher (1997:15) regard qualitative research as research that presents facts in a narrative with words. This approach is used because as Hoberg (1999:76) suggests, qualitative research is mainly concerned with understanding the problem/issue from the participants' perspective as they (the participants) experience the problem as it is related to their reality (the school and education). These experiences are invariably multilayered and interactive.

The methods that the researcher uses are interviews, both individual and focus group interviews. Individual interviews are conducted with principals as they are considered to be particularly information rich, may have unique problems and experiences and may be reluctant to share these should other principals be present. Likewise, their busy schedules may present practical problems in arranging group discussions. Moreover, Van Dalen (1979:159) suggests that individual interviews enable the subjects to feel free to express themselves fully and truthfully. On the other hand, focus group interviews are conducted with educators because it is envisaged that when the educators assemble in a group to talk about a particular topic or problem, they will stimulate each other, thus exploring the topic (outcomes-based education) more fully. Van Dalen (1979:159) maintains that focus group interviews provide an opportunity for individuals with common or divergent background to explore a problem.

Research is conducted in four schools (two primary and two secondary schools) in KwaMashu area. The schools were chosen because of their accessibility and willingness to be included in the research. Although it cannot be claimed that the chosen schools are the most typical of schools in the area, they can be said to be "in some important way" like the majority (Wolcott, 1995:174).

The following participants are interviewed:

- Individual interviews are conducted with two principals of primary schools where outcomes-based education has been implemented for a few years. This is done in order to find out what
these principals know about outcomes-based education and to what extent these principals were trained in outcomes-based education. Likewise, the interviews will explore how these principals now see their role as instructional leaders and also to establish whether their role as instructional leaders has changed because of the introduction of the outcomes-based approach.

- Focus group interviews are conducted with four educators from each of the two schools that have been using outcomes-based education for a few years, namely grade seven educators. These interviews are conducted in order to ascertain to what extent the school principal(s) assisted them (educators) in the implementation of outcomes-based education and to identify problems they experienced with the implementation of this new approach.

- Individual interviews are conducted with two principals of secondary schools where outcomes-based education was implemented for the first time in 2001. This is done in order to find out what their perceptions are about this new approach. These interviews are also conducted in order to explore the principals’ knowledge of outcomes-based education, and to establish what training they have been offered and how they see their role as instructional leaders.

- Focus group interviews are also conducted with four educators from each of the two schools where outcomes-based education is being implemented for the first time in 2001. This is done in order to establish to what extent their principals assisted them with the implementation of outcomes-based education and to find out what problems these educators experience with the new approach.

- An individual interview is also conducted with one official of the Department of Education in the KwaMashu district who is involved in the training of school principals. This interview is conducted in order to ascertain what training or training programmes are being offered to school principals to help them to cope with outcomes-based education and to establish how the KwaMashu district office views and manages the implementation of outcomes-based education in this district.

Thus, in total four principals, sixteen educators and one Department of Education official are included in the study.
Interviews are recorded and the tapes are later transcribed for closer examination. The data are finally analysed by a process of identifying, coding and categorising the primary patterns in the data (Patton, 1990:381).

The methodology is discussed in more detail in chapter three.

1.7 PROGRAMME OF STUDY

The study is divided into five chapters. These can be distinguished as follows:

Chapter 1

This chapter provides an orientation to the problem, problem formulation, aims and methodology to be followed.

Chapter 2

This chapter consists of a review of the literature which provides a conceptual and a theoretical framework for the study. Firstly, a literature review of the role of the principal as instructional leader receives attention. Secondly, the reasons why outcomes-based education has been introduced in South Africa and criticism of outcomes-based education are explored. Lastly, chapter two focuses on the implementation of outcomes-based education in South African schools.

Chapter 3

Chapter three deals with the research methodology and the procedures followed in the study. It discusses how the study is designed and conducted. This chapter describes the selection of participants and the manner in which the interviews were conducted. This chapter focuses on how data were collected. Basically, chapter three looks at all steps that were followed in order to investigate the research problem.
Chapter 4

The chapter reports on and discusses the findings of the research.

Chapter 5

This chapter deals with a synopsis of the findings arising from the study. The conclusions suggest role school principals should play in the implementation of outcomes-based education. Finally, problematic areas of the study are discussed and recommendations for further research are given.

1.8 SUMMARY

This study has been initiated by an awareness of the problems that are experienced by KwaMashu school principals as far as the implementation of outcomes-based education is concerned. Principals of KwaMashu schools lack training, facilities and financial and intellectual support.

An attempt is made in the study to investigate a number of questions that relate to the role of the school principal in so far as management of the transition to an outcomes-based education paradigm is concerned. The researcher has opted for a qualitative approach using individual and focus group interviews as the instruments for gathering data. The data gathering is limited to specified schools and levels of schooling within the KwaMashu area.

It is, therefore, imperative that relevant literature should be reviewed in order to establish how the implementation of outcomes-based education is viewed both locally and internationally. This is done in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 2

THE PRINCIPAL AS INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER AND OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Educational reforms taking place globally present various challenges and place demands on schools. How schools will respond to these challenges and demands depends to great extent on the role played by their school principals. As Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:161) put it, leaders (school principals) themselves are the best or worse tools in the facilitation of change. An outcomes-based approach has been implemented in a number of developed countries such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and a few states in the United States of America (Malcolm, 1999:80; Vakalisa, 2000:21). South Africa, too, has recently adopted this approach. Because of this new approach, school management needs to be re-organised. This places the role of the principal as instructional leader under scrutiny.

The school principal plays an important role in translating the departmental policies into practice. Therefore, this section looks at the role of the school principal as instructional leader as set out in both the international and local literature. This literature study will also focus on the implementation of outcomes-based education in South African schools.

2.2 THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AS INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

The school is responsible for carrying out the primary function of the education system, which is, educative-teaching. However, for the school to carry out this function effectively, the school principal must fulfill his/her instructional role. Thus, Donmoyer and Wagstaff (1990:20) contend that school principals are increasingly asked to be instructional leaders. Boyd (1996:63) concurs and maintains that recently there is a demand for principals to be instructional leaders as well as managers.

Marsh (1992:391) regards instructional leadership as the ability of the principal to carry out developmental supervision and provide curriculum/instructional leadership in the school. Likewise,
Hoberg (1994:44) maintains that instructional leadership implies that the principal as the manager of the school should provide a clear vision and direction and be able to delegate certain responsibilities to competent staff. Educators can only perform their task of educating successfully in a school which is effectively managed at every level. Thus, Van der Westhuizen (1991:41) states that guidance must be given so that all efforts in the school can be channelled correctly.

Donmoyer and Wagstaff (1990:20) maintain that an instructional leader is someone who has a significant impact on learners' opportunities to learn in the classroom. Donmoyer and Wagstaff (1997:20) stress that principals influence instruction and learning whether they intend to or not. Thus, school principals should ensure that learners receive quality instruction both inside and outside the classroom. This is their main function and all other responsibilities are subordinate to this. Whitaker (1997:3) suggests that principals must keep educators informed about educational tools and developments in the field of effective teaching. They must also be available to educators to help critique these tools and teaching practices and to determine their applicability to the classroom.

According to Smith and Andrews (1989:23), the principal as instructional leader means that the principal is perceived as:

- providing the necessary resources so that the school's academic goals can be achieved;
- possessing knowledge and skill in curriculum and instructional matters so that educators perceive that their interaction with the principal leads to improved instructional practice;
- being a skilled communicator in one-on-one, small groups and large-group settings;
- being a visionary who is out and about creating a visible presence for the staff, learners and parents at both the physical and philosophical levels concerning what the school is all about.

However, both experience and training are needed to help the principal to gain and master these qualities. As Everard and Morris (1996:216) put it, true proficiency comes only from practical experience coupled with reflective learning. Thus, Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988:2) contend that some states in the United States of America have mandated that all principals and supervisors should go through state-approved and sponsored instructional leadership programmes as a condition of their continued employment and as part of a licensing system to certify them as educator evaluators. Meanwhile, Van der Westhuizen (1991:4) argues that if an educator is expected to be academically and professionally equipped before he/she can teach, the same requirements should be
set for a promotion position, at least in respect of the post of the principal. This endorses the necessity of educational leaders to acquire academic and professional training and skills in educational management.

Since instructional leadership is about school improvement and effectiveness, school principals need to spend most of their time performing this cardinal role. Morphet et al (1982:300) point out that surveys typically show that principals regard instructional leadership as a primary function and one on which they would like to spend the major portion of their time. Duke (1987:57) agrees but argues that school leaders, particularly principals, spend relatively little time observing in classrooms and working with the educators to improve instruction. Murphy, Hallinger, Weil and Milman (1983:141) are of the opinion that one of the important reasons for the lack of instructional leadership activity on the part of many principals is their lack of a strong knowledge base about instruction and curriculum. This has a negative effect not only on the achievement of the school’s objectives, but also on the individuals associated with the school. This confirms what Ngongo (1995:31) asserts that without supporting effective teaching, principals are robbed of the core purposes for the existence of the school, namely teaching and learning.

William (in Squelch & Lemmer, 1994:1) maintains that the performance of the school, its staff and learners is deeply affected by the principal’s leadership role. The principal as instructional leader should play a positive role particularly if the whole approach to teaching is changing. This implies that all school principals should ensure that their role as instructional leaders is always given priority because it is about school improvement and the learner’s growth.

Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1989:155) identify the following three requirements for instructional leadership:

- the leader should have a vision for excellence in teaching. Snowden and Gorton (1998:66) concur, adding that the leader must have the organisational vision necessary to direct the organisation into its future and an ability to articulate this vision. Thus, the principal should not only be clear about where he/she wants to take the school, but also to be able to make this clear to the staff;
- instructional leaders work with other educators to develop a shared commitment to a common vision of excellence in teaching;
• instructional leaders and their teaching colleagues have the knowledge and skill to bring that vision to reality.

These requirements can be fulfilled in a situation where there is a healthy and objective relationship between the principal and the staff. Lezotte (1992:1) warns that the vision of the principal cannot endure unless the principal can create a critical mass of support for it among those helping implement it. Meanwhile, Hoy and Miskel (1991:277) maintain that the quality of leader-member relations is the most important factor in determining the leader’s influence on the group members.

Murphy et al (1983:138-142) identify ten functions that the instructional leader has to perform, whereas Duke (1987:81-83) identifies seven situations with which the instructional leader has to deal. The frameworks these authors suggest have been used to identify the following functions as cardinal to the instructional leadership role of the principal.

2.2.1 Determining objectives

The principal plays a key role both in the conceptualisation and framing of objectives, which require the principal to develop school objectives and obtain staff consensus regarding them (Murphy et al, 1983:140). Van der Westhuizen (1991:94) maintains that educators and learners look up to the educational leader for direction and motivation. Therefore, the school principal should constantly remind the educators and the learners about the objectives to be achieved by the school. As Van der Westhuizen (1991:94) points out one of the educational leader’s tasks is to integrate individual needs and organisational objectives.

Likewise, without clearly defined goals, the school principal cannot manage the school effectively. Murphy et al (1983:140) argue that without the presence of clear goals and objectives, it is difficult, if not impossible, to measure effectiveness and efficiency of school operations. Van der Westhuizen (1991:144) remarks that without goals, the organisation (i.e. the school) would increase the tendency to entropy. Thus, framing of school goals and objectives should be regarded as the primary instructional leadership function. The school principal should ensure that the staff as a whole is actively involved in determining the school’s objectives. People are more likely to work towards achieving goals/objectives when they are part of the decision-making process. However, Van Wyk and Mothata (1998:10) warn that not all educators are willing to be involved in decision-
making processes. Therefore, those educators who do not want to be involved should not be forced and their choice should be respected.

Setting and determining objectives collectively, however, does not relieve the principal of his/her responsibilities. As instructional leader, the principal has to encourage and motivate educators, learners and parents constantly to work conscientiously so that educational objectives may be achieved. They should know which goals and/or objectives are to be accomplished both in the short and/or long term. However, these goals/objectives should not be in conflict with those of outcomes-based education. McNeir (1994:31) states that at its core, outcomes-based education is concerned with a community vision of what learners need from schools to be effective adults. Thus, the principal as instructional leader should involve all stakeholders in determining how outcomes are designed, specified and assessed in order to achieve the goals/objectives of outcomes-based education.

2.2.2 Curriculum co-ordination

Educational changes taking place globally require that school principals should pay more attention to curriculum co-ordination. Hallinger and Murphy (1987:57) maintain that principals co-ordinate curriculum by ensuring that learners receive appropriate instruction in areas identified by the school district. Thus, in South Africa school principals must help educators interpret and implement the curriculum as desired by the Department of Education. As Drake and Roe (1986:152) put it, improving teaching and learning should be the primary focus of the principal’s time. Stoll and Fink (1996:105) concur and maintain that the instructional leader should work with educators to promote classroom learning.

Murphy et al (1983:141) maintain that principals promote curricular co-ordination in the following three ways:
- they work to ensure that basic and supplemental materials used in their schools are consistent and mutually reinforcing;
- they make sure that the curriculum content is consistent with both instructional objectives and with the tests used to measure mastery of those objectives;
- they establish programme evaluation procedures and ensure that these evaluations occur on a regular basis.
Sergiovani and Starratt (1988:263) maintain that the curriculum is designed and produced outside the classroom and developed inside the classroom as educators adapt the prepared materials for classroom episodes of teaching. Thus, the principal as instructional leader should assist educators to alter, rearrange, and reinterpret the curriculum. However, Hallinger and Murphy (1987:61) warn that a weak knowledge base in curriculum and instruction, fragmented district expectations, territorial treaties negotiated with educators, and the diverse roles played by the principal can prevent the principal from performing this role (curriculum co-ordination) effectively. Thus, principals need to be supported in order to be able to fulfill their responsibilities more effectively.

2.2.3 Didactic leadership

Krug (1992:432) contends that the primary service that schools offer is instruction. Thus, school principals should ensure that quality instruction is offered so that high quality teaching and learning can take place. Squelch and Lemmer (1994:11) regard the principal as the most important leader in the school, but not as the only person who is responsible for school improvement. Hence, they contend that an efficient team comprising staff and the parent community should support the principal. Obviously, the principal should always be present throughout the school to ensure that effective teaching and learning takes place. Therefore, to ensure that effective teaching and learning take place, the principal has to resort to, inter-alia, the following methods:

(a) Effective administrative management

Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee (1982:41-42) maintain that effective administrative management aims at effective teaching, which includes elements such as the following:

- Time utilisation: The efficient use of teaching time can be ensured by: allocating the correct time and period according to departmental prescriptions, introducing fixed test periods and avoiding unnecessary encroachment on lesson periods.
- Class size and composition: When drawing up the school time table the principal and his/her management team must ensure that classes have been put together as efficiently as possible.
- Distribution of work: The principal's distribution of work must be as balanced and fair as possible so that staff can proceed unhindered with their teaching task.
(b) Instructional leadership team

The success of the school should not depend on the principal alone. It should depend on the joint effort of the management team as well as the educators. Thus, Glickman (1991:7-8) maintains that the principal of the successful school is not the instructional leader, but rather the co-ordinator of educators as instructional leaders. Therefore, the principal can use the instructional leadership team to assist him/her in the didactic matters. This suggests that deputy heads, heads of departments and senior educators need to help the principal in the running of the school.

c) Clinical instructional leadership

Sergiovani and Starratt (1988:357) regard this aspect as an in-class support system designed to provide assistance directly to the educator. Donmoyer and Wagstaff (1990:25) suggest that for this model to work, it must be frequent and ongoing. Thus, principals should have time set aside for helping educators who experience problems inside and outside the classroom.

According to Sergiovani and Starratt (1988:350), clinical instructional leadership involves professional observation of the teaching and learning events, as well as improvement of the educator's teaching abilities with the view to professional development.

Sergiovani and Starratt (1988:306) suggest that improving classroom instruction must start with the educator. Therefore, educators should not feel threatened if the principal shows an interest in what they are doing in the classroom. However, the principal should make educators understand that his/her intention is to help them where possible.

2.2.4 Staff development

According to Dunlop (1995:147), the key to improving the teaching and learning process in school is the professional development of educators. The school cannot change and/or improve from what it is without the personnel being developed and changing their approach. Du Four and Berkey (1995:2-3) concur that people are the key to school improvement. They argue that organisations do not change, only individuals change. Thus, they maintain that the fundamental role of the principal
is to help create the conditions that enable the staff to develop so that the school can achieve its goals more effectively.

The principal should, therefore, identify the strengths and weaknesses of his/her educators in order to give support and find practical ways of overcoming the weaknesses of each educator. Likewise, the school principal should always be alert to all considerations affecting his/her staff’s productivity, effectiveness and job satisfaction. The principal should support the educators and should play a crucial role in helping the educators understand the school’s needs and requirements. By doing so, the principal is able to contribute positively to the professional development of his/her educators.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988:39) caution, however, that the school principal should bear in mind that staff development does not assume a deficiency in the educator, but instead a need for people at work to grow and develop on the job. As instructional leader, the principal should discuss with the staff the changes taking place and should persuade the staff to change teaching methods that are outdated. The principal should also encourage the staff to attend in-service training and workshops organised by the school, the Department of Education and/or by the Non-Governmental Organisations in order to familiarise themselves with new developments.

The principal should see to it that educators are developed according to their skills and capabilities. Bondisio and De Witt (1991:273) maintain that when the educational leader has the right attitude to personnel development and training, chances are much greater that teaching/educational situation in each classroom will be maximally effective and take place to the advantage of all learners. Therefore, the principal should also create internal in-service training for his/her staff. Such programmes should be within the school context.

2.2.5 Educator evaluation

Drake and Roe (1986:274) contend that the principal cannot exercise leadership to improve learning without evaluating the results. Evaluation is essential to the continuous improvement of the quality of life of each individual within the school, including both learners and educators. Bondisio and De Witt (1991:265) regard the following as some of the evaluation opportunities that the principal can make use of: class visits, staff meetings, extra-mural activities and social occasions.
To evaluate his/her personnel adequately, the school principal should decide carefully as to when, why and how this task will be performed. The principal as instructional leader should have a background knowledge of the activity to be evaluated. Without this knowledge, evaluation will be valueless to the educator.

Duke (1987:82) maintains that educator evaluation should be in accordance with the policies of the school. This generally implies that once evaluation has been undertaken, a written report should be compiled and the educator concerned should be issued with a copy. Moreover, it is also necessary that the strengths and weaknesses of the educator should be discussed constructively and the report kept for official purposes. As Drake and Roe (1986:274) sum up, evaluation is a continuous process, focused upon improving the effectiveness of reaching the school’s goals and objectives. Thus, evaluation should be used as an aid to improve work performance. However, Drake and Roe (1986:274) maintain that improvement cannot result from evaluation unless changes are implemented.

2.2.6 Enrichment programmes

According to Oldroyd, Elsner and Poster (1996:36) work enhancement/enrichment is a process of adding greater scope for personal achievement and recognition, more challenging and responsible work and greater opportunity for advancement and growth to the person’s work. Owens (1991:127) concurs and maintains that work enrichment is intended to redesign the work not for the purpose of making it easier but rather to make it more challenging, a source of personal growth and a source of a sense of achieving something worthwhile.

Van der Westhuizen (1996:208) contends that implementing work enrichment in schools is an important way of improving the quality of the educator’s working life. Van der Westhuizen (1996:208) warns, however, that before educators can experience an improvement of working life the following should be attended to:

- the work must offer variety that implies that different skills will be used in performing the work;
- the educator should understand the work and everything associated with it;
- the educator should experience the work as meaningful and as an important task;
- the educator should be allowed to perform the work independently and to make his/her own decisions regarding it;
the principal should give sufficient feedback while the work is being done.

2.2.7 Resource management

Duke (1987:204) maintains that resource management begins with an assessment of school needs and a determination of the funds needed to purchase the resources necessary to meet those needs. School principals should not only ensure that there are adequate teaching materials, supplies and other resources, but they should also ensure that these are passed on to the relevant educators. Meanwhile, Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:116-117) argue that while the principal and/or deputy principals have a major role to play, all staff members also have a key role to play in the management of resources.

The effective management of the school's resources will help to create an environment, which will be conducive for effective teaching and learning. Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:116-117) suggest that identifying the needs for resources, obtaining the resources, creating an effective stock-taking system, securing the resources, distributing resources effectively and fairly and maintaining resources, are central to the successful management of resources in a school.

Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:114) contend that problems associated with bad management of resources can affect and undermine the morale of educators. This in turn can lead to frustration, despair and failure. Likewise, this can minimise personnel effectiveness and job satisfaction. The result of this can have a negative effect on both the individuals and the achievement of the school's objectives.

2.2.8 Remediation

Duke (1987:128) maintains that no matter how good the supervision and evaluation process, it is reasonable to expect that some educators will be unable to benefit from the usual forms of professional assistance. Thus, to protect the welfare of learners and the integrity of the teaching profession, formal mechanisms must exist for remediating serious problems with teaching performance. These mechanisms will help to improve not only teaching and learning activities but also the professional development of the individual educator.
In order to help the educators effectively, the principal should analyse and understand the qualities of each individual educator. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988:406-409) identify four teaching improvement strategies: clinical supervision, co-operative professional development (whereby educators work together as collegial teams), individualised professional development (an educator working alone assumes responsibility for his/her own professional development) and informal supervision (a casual encounter by supervisors with educators at work).

Thus, the school principal must ensure that the school has its own remedial programmes, which are school based. The principal should also encourage the educators to attend these programmes. Thus, the principal should ensure that both educators and learners with specific problems attend relevant programmes offered by these support services.

2.2.9 Creation of positive school climate

Creating a climate is the management action that aims at creating a more effective organisational climate (Basson, Van der Westhuizen & Niemann, 1991:633). The climate of an organisation has a major impact on the performance of that organisation and the quality of work life experienced by its members. According to Van der Westhuizen (1996:92), organisational climate refers to the ‘team spirit’ in the school and the social interaction between educators and learners, among educators and among learners themselves.

Meanwhile, Hoy and Miskel (1991:413) regard organisational climate as a relatively enduring quality of the school environment that is influenced by educators, affects their behaviour, and is based on their collective perceptions of behaviour in schools. Likewise, Fox (in Basson et al, 1991:633) sets the following aims for creating a climate: work satisfaction, maximum productivity, co-ordination of tasks for a team effort and recognition of the principle of human dignity.

To ensure that quality educative-teaching takes place in a school, school principal should not only build a strong organisational climate, but should also be able to manage it. Hoberg (1994:45) maintains that the effective school principal should cultivate a school climate that will culminate in maximising the learning experiences of the learners and realise the goal achievement of the educators. Because of his/her position the principal is central to the creation of a positive organisational climate. Thus, Basson et al (1991:633) emphasise the importance of the leadership of
the school principal in determining the quality of the educational climate. Basson et al (1991:633) maintain that the leadership of the school principal is based on the ability to influence people to such an extent that he/she guides their actions so that they work together in a co-ordinated fashion with the view to achieving a common purpose (i.e. educative-teaching). At the same time the school principal should ensure that good relationships are maintained. Therefore, the school principal as instructional leader should set the tone so that people (educators) should generate shared values. This can motivate educators to work together as a team towards the accomplishment of the set goals.

In conclusion, school principals should perform the above functions/tasks as well as other responsibilities in the manner that is in line with the objectives of the outcomes-based approach. However, principals cannot perform these tasks effectively without proper training and support from other stakeholders.

2.3 OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS

South Africa’s social and economic systems are undergoing dramatic and rapid changes. As the country re-enters the international arena, it is critical that its education and training system keeps pace with international standards (The National Qualification Framework Network (NQF), 1996:2). Outcomes-based education has been introduced in order to change the face of education in South Africa. The type of education and training that is promoted by outcomes-based education (Curriculum 2005) will enable South Africa to compete on international markets. Nel (1995:533) contends that the South African labour market is facing a shortage of highly skilled people, while there is large-scale unemployment among the unskilled. This scenario is the result of the apartheid system, which failed to create a coherent, national education and training system, which could cater for the needs of all South African citizens. This has prompted the South African government to adopt a curriculum policy, Curriculum 2005, which it is hoped will redress the inequalities and provide equal learning opportunities for all learners in the country. However, like all other reforms, the introduction of outcomes-based education has received mixed responses. Van der Horst and McDonald (1997:6) argue that outcomes-based education is usually attractive to politicians, policy-makers and administrators during times of educational reform that follows socio-political reform. The South African government has taken this route in order to correct the wrongs of the past. It is against this background that Van der Horst and McDonald (1997:6) maintain that the stimulus for
outcomes-based education is thus often political. Pretorius (1998a:v) concurs that all reforms in South Africa, including the implementation of Curriculum 2005, is seen in certain circles as part of the politically oriented process. However, Vally and Sreen (1998:14) feel that Curriculum 2005 is likely to increase the resource and performance gap between advantaged and disadvantaged schools.

Van der Horst and McDonald (1997:6) maintain that the new outcomes-based curriculum in South Africa is aimed at developing thinking and problem-solving citizen who will be empowered to participate in an active and productive way. However, they feel that whether this will happen depends on the knowledge, expertise and motivation of the classroom educators and the willingness of learners to take the responsibility to work hard.

2.3.1 Reasons for introducing outcomes-based education in South African schools

Malcolm (1999:105) states that the decisions policymakers make about the basic ideas of outcomes-based education and which outcomes-based education models to consider, illustrate the depth to which education depends on politics, cultural norms, interest groups, history and the committees and individuals who provide educational leadership. The South African government introduced outcomes-based education for a variety of reasons. It is important that all those that are affected by it should know the purpose of outcomes-based education, so that they can participate constructively in its implementation. The purpose of outcomes-based education is to increase the knowledge and skills of the learners. Outcomes-based education creates a flexible education and training system, which provides life-long learning for all South Africans. Van der Horst and McDonald (1997:5) maintain that educational change is now required to provide equity in terms of educational provision and to promote a more balanced view by developing learners’ critical thinking power and their problem-solving abilities. By means of outcomes-based education it is hoped that the needs and interests of all South Africans will be catered for. According to Van der Horst and McDonald (1997:5), educational change is required because the majority of learners did not receive adequate educational and training opportunities during the previous era. Outcomes-based education endorses the concept of life-long learning. This means that all people who need to learn are given a chance to learn. This also includes adults and youths who have already left school.
Van Wyk and Mothata (1998:4) contend that by introducing outcomes-based education doors of opportunity may be opened for people whose academic or career paths were blocked because their prior knowledge had not been assessed and certified, or because their qualifications had not been recognised for admission to further learning and employment. Similarly, Monare (2000:1) maintains that the reasoning behind the introduction of Curriculum 2005 was that under the previous system learners of different race groups did not get the same quality of education. Thus, the previous system was skewed to benefit certain race groups. However, Söhngg and Moletsane (1997:274) argue that the advantages of outcomes-based education are not clear-cut, adding that educationists in many countries are debating the value of outcomes-based education.

2.3.1.1 The basic principles of outcomes-based education

Killen (1999:2) contends that in order to understand why outcomes-based education is seen as a suitable focus for the reform of South African education, it is necessary to clarify some of its underlying principles. "Outcomes-based education is founded on three basic principles: all learners can learn and succeed, (but not on the same day- in the same way), success breeds success and schools control the conditions of success" (Spady & Marshall, 1991:67).

Killen (1999:4-5) suggests that on the above points one can overlay the philosophical base suggested by Mamary in his discussion of outcomes-based schools:

- all learners have talent and it is the job of schools to develop it;
- the role of schools is to find ways for learners to succeed, rather than finding ways for learners to fail;
- mutual trust drives all good outcomes-based schools;
- excellence is for every child and not just a few;
- by preparing learners everyday for success the next day, the need for correctives will be reduced;
- learners should collaborate in learning rather than compete;
- as far as possible, no child should be excluded from any activity in a school;
- a positive attitude is essential.
Killen (1999:5) suggests that within the framework of the above premises and philosophies, outcomes-based education can be developed around eight principles that guide design, delivery, documentation and decision-making:

- The outcomes-based programme must have a clear focus on significant learning outcomes that are stated clearly and unambiguously;
- These outcomes should be practical, useful, and morally and ethically defensible;
- Curriculum and instructional design are derived from these significant outcomes;
- The outcomes should be challenging, and all learners should be expected to achieve them at high performance levels;
- Time should be used as a flexible resource that allows educators to accommodate differences in learners’ learning rates and aptitudes;
- Learners should be given more than one uniform, routine chance to receive instruction and to demonstrate their learning;
- Assessment should be an integral component of instruction and should, as far as possible, be authentic (i.e. use real-world situations in which to test applications of knowledge and skills);
- Learners should be expected to take some responsibility for their learning.

Killen (1999:5) concludes that Curriculum 2005 indicates quite clearly that the South African government has incorporated these principles into its plan for the introduction of an outcomes-based education school system.

2.3.1.2 Differences between the old and new Curriculum

The Department of National Education has tabulated differences between the “old” and “new” curricula. However, Van der Horst and McDonald (1997:27) argue that some of the comparisons are not a true reflection of what has been accomplished in many South African classrooms in the past. They argue that many excellent educators have, for instance, employed methods purported to be typical of an outcomes-based approach for years. This suggests that while some educators were textbook bound, others used textbooks as a guide but they ensured that the learners were actively involved in the teaching-learning situation. These educators, as Van der Horst and McDonald (1997:27) put it, managed to develop the skills required for research in subject areas and motivated learners to become thoughtful and skilled people.
Kudlas (1994:32) concurs that outcomes-based education is not new. It is an age-old, common sense approach. Kudlas (1994:32) contends that educators who have been concerned with what is to be learned or rather the outcome of the teaching-learning situation have been applying the principles of outcomes-based education. Nevertheless, it is important to include the table taken from Van der Horst and McDonald (1997:27-28) showing how the Department of National Education differentiates between the “old” and “new” curricula.

**Table 2.1: The “old” and “new” curriculum approaches in South African schools.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Old”</th>
<th>“New”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• passive learners</td>
<td>• active learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• exam-driven</td>
<td>• learners are assessed on an ongoing basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• rote-learning</td>
<td>• critical thinking, reasoning, reflection and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• syllabus is content-based and broken down into subjects</td>
<td>• an integration of knowledge; learning is relevant and connected to real-life situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• textbook/worksheet-bound and educator-centred</td>
<td>• learner-centred; educator is facilitator; educator constantly uses group work and team work to consolidate the new approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sees syllabus as rigid and non-negotiable</td>
<td>• learning programmes seen as guides that allow educators to be innovative and creative in designing programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• educators responsible for learning; motivation dependent on the personality of the educator</td>
<td>• learners take responsibility for their learning; learners motivated by feedback and affirmation of their worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• emphasis on what the educator hopes to achieve</td>
<td>• emphasis on outcomes (what the learner becomes and understands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• content placed into rigid time-frames</td>
<td>• flexible time-frames allow learners to work at their own pace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.2 Criticism of outcomes-based education

Outcomes-based education has been criticised by a number of academics. These critics presented reasons for the possible failure of outcomes-based education in South African context. Jansen (1999a:13) argues that outcomes-based education has not worked in the United States of America and is unlikely to work within South African schools. Jansen (1998:323-329), one of the most powerful critics of outcomes-based education, presents ten major reasons why outcomes-based education will have a negative impact upon South African schools.

Jansen (1998:323) maintains that the language of innovation associated with outcomes-based education is too complex, confusing and at times, contradictory. The only certainty about outcomes-based education and its predecessor language is that it has constantly changed meaning. This language is quite simple inaccessible. Chisholm (2000:16) confirms and maintains that the levels of understanding of Curriculum 2005/outcomes-based education are compromised by the complex terminology used. Thus, it will be difficult for most educators to give these policies meaning through their classroom practices.

Outcomes-based education as curriculum policy is implicated in problematic claims and assumptions about the relationship between curriculum and society. While the proponents of outcomes-based education maintain that it can change the focus of the country’s economy, Jansen (1998:324) disagrees and maintains that there is no evidence in almost 80 years of curriculum change literature to suggest that altering the curriculum of the schools leads to or is associated with changes in national economies.

Jansen (1998:325) claims that outcomes-based education is based on the flawed assumptions about what happens inside schools, how classrooms are organised and what kinds of educators exist within the system. For transformational outcomes-based education to succeed highly qualified educators will be required. De Clercq (1997:140-144) argues that educators with poor teaching and/or professional background, limited resources and working in difficult environments will find it
near impossible to improve their professional performance through this form of outcomes-based curriculum. However, the more professional educators who have innovated to improve the quality and skills of their learners will find an opportunity to enhance and monitor more closely their performance through this form of curriculum. Jansen (1998:326) maintains that there are strong philosophical reasons for questioning the desirability of outcomes-base education in democratic school systems. There are also important political and epistemological objections to outcomes-based education as curriculum policy.

Jansen (1998:327) questions the extent to which educators were involved in the outcomes-based education initiative. He argues that only a small elite group of educators, often expert and white, have driven the Learning Area Committees and other structures in which outcomes-based education has developed. Yet, De Clercq (1997:140) contends that curriculum research throughout the world has shown the vital importance of building the professional capacity of educators and involving them centrally, as key agents in the design and implementation of new curricular approaches. Malcolm (2001:231) argues that education in South Africa has no history of trusting educators to design curriculum and assessment. Likewise, Jansen (1998:327) argues that outcomes-based education with its focus on instrumentalism – what a learner can demonstrate given a particular set of outcomes – sidesteps the important issue of values in the curriculum. In other words, outcomes-based education enables policy makers to avoid dealing with a central question in South African transition, namely what is education for?

The management of outcomes-based education will multiply the administrative burdens placed on educators. The lack of support and the current policies of rationalisation and the subsequent increase in class sizes will mitigate against the conditions of its success (Jansen, 1998:328). Chisholm (2000:3) agrees and adds that implementation was not always carefully thought through, properly piloted or resourced and enormous stresses and strains were consequently placed on already overburdened principals and educators in widely divergent educational contexts. Jansen (1998:328) is of the opinion that outcomes-based education trivialises curriculum content. Learners do not learn outcomes in a vacuum. Thus, curriculum content is regarded as a critical vehicle for giving meaning to a particular set of outcomes.

The successful implementation of outcomes-based education will require trained and retrained educators. Outcomes-based education requires that educators, principals and parents should be
retrained (Jansen, 1998: 328-329). According to Kraak (1998:49), one of the areas of substantial critique regarding outcomes-based education is its disregard for the centrality of the curriculum and the need for a professionally trained and motivated educator corps. Pretorius (1998b:108) concurs that if the country’s educators are not thoroughly trained for an outcomes-based approach to education, and the implementation does not go hand-in-hand with constant and well-planned support, little will be achieved concerning the high expectations of educational reform.


According to Van Wyk and Mothata (1998:1), South African education has undergone extensive change during the past few years. The system has changed from a racially based to a geographically based one. However, the gap between the previously advantaged schools and the previously disadvantaged schools still exists. Vally and Sreen (1998:14) maintain that the previously privileged schools have more qualified educators with greater confidence in their teaching ability, stronger parental support and increased access to the private sector for supplemental materials and technologies. On the other hand, the previously disadvantaged schools have poorly qualified educators, lack parental support and have little, if any, access to the private sector. De Clercq (1997:140) concurs that educators with poor teaching and/or professional backgrounds, limited resources and working in difficult environments will find it difficult to improve their professional performance through this form of outcomes-based education curriculum. Considering that even most first world countries still find it difficult to implement outcomes-based education, it can be argued that South Africa, where discrepancies still exist between the previously advantaged and disadvantaged schools will find it even more difficult to implement outcomes-based education.

2.3.3 The implementation of outcomes-based education in South African schools

For the outcomes-based approach to succeed, it is imperative that all stakeholders should work together. An active involvement of all stakeholders can, to some extent, minimise a number of
problems associated with outcomes-based education. Presently this is not the case as the new approach lacks the involvement of all stakeholders.

Districts in different provinces have adopted different approaches in order to implement outcomes-based education in schools. Therefore, there is no co-ordinated or uniform policy/approach, which is being followed by all districts in different provinces in order to ensure that outcomes-based education is implemented successfully. In fact, Mahomed (1999:158) maintains that since the release of the first National Curriculum policy document in December 1995, there has been a raging debate about the formulation and implementation of the new curriculum policy for South Africa. Outcomes-based education and training has been at the centre of this debate. Probably this is why outcomes-based education has been received with mixed feelings from the onset. Pretorius (1998a:v) argues that outcomes-based education is not only controversial in countries abroad, but is proving to be most controversial in South Africa. Thus, it is argued that it is not possible for outcomes-based education to succeed in a situation where favourable educator-learner ratios are not possible, where educators have not received adequate training and where there are insufficient resources and support.

Due to a number of problems associated with the implementation of outcomes-based education the Minister of Education, Kader Asmal set up a committee chaired by Linda Chisholm to review the new curriculum. According to Chisholm (2000:5), the brief was to review Curriculum 2005 and not outcomes-based education. Chisholm (2000:4) maintains that the committee was required to investigate the following:

- steps to be taken in respect of the implementation of the new curriculum in grades 4 and 8 in 2001;
- key success factors and strategies for a strengthened implementation of the new curriculum;
- the structure of the new curriculum;
- the level of understanding of outcomes-based education.

Chisholm (2000:18-21) lists the following as the key findings of the review committee:

- strong support for principles of Curriculum2005, but levels of understanding are varied;
- a skewed curriculum structure and design;
- lack of alignment between curriculum and assessment;
- inadequate orientation, training and development of educators;
• learning support materials vary in quality and are often unavailable;
• insufficient follow-up support;
• limited transfer of learning into classroom practice;
• time frames unmanageable and unrealistic.

According to Monare (2000:1), the outcome of the review committee suggests that money and resources used to buy the material were wasted, the South African government has been unable to achieve its objectives and the education system in South Africa has once again been thrown into confusion.

Department of Education (2001:1) maintains that the review committee, based on its findings, recommended:
• strengthening the curriculum required streamlining its structure and design, accompanying its language through the production of an amended national curriculum statement;
• improving teacher orientation and training, learning support materials and provincial support;
• relaxation of timeframes for implementation.

According to the Department of Education (2001:1) in June 2000, the Council of Education Ministers accepted the curriculum recommendations of the review committee. In July 2000, Cabinet resolved that:
• the development of a national curriculum statement, dealing in clear and simple language with what the curriculum requirements are at various levels and phases, must begin immediately;
• the concerns around curriculum overload must be addressed;
• a clear description of the kind of learner in terms of knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that is expected at the end of the GET band must be given.

2.3.4 Training of educators

Le Roux and Loubser (2000:101) state that "the introduction of outcomes-based education and the new curriculum will undoubtedly influence how educators teach and practicing educators will need to be trained to implement the new system if it is to succeed". Likewise, Potenza and Monyokolo (1999:236) maintain that educators are in many senses the most important educational resource and that they will determine whether the new curriculum succeeds or not. Therefore, the success of the
new curriculum depends on the training and support that educators receive and their ability to mobilise and manage the resources around them to implement the curriculum. This suggests that educators need to be adequately trained in order to implement the outcomes-based approach. Söhinge and Moletsane (1997:274) feel that in South Africa the implementation of outcomes-based education will depend on the adequate preparation of educators in the principles that guide, design, delivery, documentation and implementation of outcomes-based education. Chisholm (2000:14) concurs that the implementation of an outcomes-based education curriculum framework ultimately rests on adequately prepared educators, motivated to teach and supported in their work. Educators can only be committed and motivated to do their work if they have been adequately trained and they know exactly what is expected of them. Vermeulen (1998:60) argues that only informed educators and parents will be able to overcome the possible detrimental effect and dangers of outcomes-based education as it was experienced in other parts of the world. Chisholm (2000:19) is concerned, however, about the duration and quality of training offered to educators. In South Africa educators were trained for a few days and returned to schools to train their colleagues. Chisholm (2000:53) maintains that this training model, commonly referred to as the ‘cascade model’, became the primary means of preparing the majority of educators for Curriculum 2005. However, Chisholm (2000:19) contends that there were complaints about the cascade model of training, district trainers themselves often did not understand Curriculum 2005 and did not apply the principles of Curriculum 2005 in their own methodology of training. Thus, Chisholm (2000:19) is of the opinion that attention needs to be paid to the following strengthening and adapting the model/s of training and the duration of educator training; addressing the quality of the trainers and training materials; improving the quality of the content and methodology of the training; and providing for follow-up in-class support for educators.

2.3.5 The principal and outcomes-based education

Basson et al (1991:646) feel that the school principal fills a key role in any change that takes place at the school – whether as initiator or supporter. However, the principal cannot play this cardinal role successfully without training. Therefore, principals need to be trained in order to become more effective in their tasks.

The introduction of outcomes-based education in South African schools has changed the role of the school principal. Thus, this role needs to be redefined so that principals perform it successfully.
According to Pretorius (1998a:v), school principals are confused concerning the implications of the new model for the management of their schools. Such confusion can have detrimental effects on schools, if it is not given the appropriate attention. Pretorius (1998b:105) maintains that in the new model, the responsibility of the principal moves back to instructional activities and to high quality accomplishment of the desired outcomes. Therefore, the school principal should have a clear grasp of these outcomes, so that he/she can ascertain whether the desired outcomes have been achieved or not.

Pretorius (1998b:105) is of the opinion that the instructional leader can have credibility in a group only if he/she is prepared to learn and develop with the team and become an expert in outcomes-based education. Malcolm (2001:221) maintains that successes of learner-centred education and outcomes-based education depend on whole-school approaches and overall leadership within the schools. Thus, Malcolm (2001:221) suggests that school leaders and the whole school should be a primary target for in-service education. Moreover, school development and professional development should work together, reinforcing each other.

According to Chisholm (2000:20), there is a widespread sense that department and school management provide far too little support and cannot support the educators. This lack of support makes it difficult for educators to implement the new curriculum in the classroom as it was intended. Chisholm (2000:20) contends that provincial and district capacity to implement Curriculum 2005 and provide support to educators in classrooms is hampered by problems in the organisation of curriculum support structures, shortages of personnel, inadequate expertise of personnel and lack of resources for supporting Curriculum 2005. Thus, Chisholm (2000:20) indicates a need for reorganisation and consolidation of curriculum structures at national, provincial and district levels, reinforcement of personnel and adequate resource provision.

The lack of support can be attributed to the fact that departmental officials and school principals lack the necessary training and skills. Thus, they are uncertain as to what kind of support educators require and how to offer that support.

Basson et al (1991:648) feel that the first task of a school principal is one of advisory and psychological support in the programme of change. This can only happen in a situation where the school principal understands the needs and requirements of the educators, as well as those of the
school. Pretorius (1998b:105) feels that because of outcomes-based education the school principal should lead by listening. Leading by listening implies that the opinions of the educators should be respected and sought. After all, the principal is the leader among equals.

According to the Department of Education (2001:3), the following are the key elements of a strategy for professional orientation and development of educators, school management and district-based personnel in relation to the revised national curriculum statement:

(i) the establishment of a cadre of trainers at national and provincial level who will use a training transfer model to orient educators, principals and district-based personnel to the revised national curriculum statement;

(ii) professional development of educators which focuses on: level and depth of knowledge, skills and values as well as resources and assessment strategies to be used in each learning area, learning area-specific training which focuses on the ‘newer’ learning area and the development and use of learning support materials;

(iii) redirection or training of educators in those learning areas where there is a shortage of educators;

(iv) involvement of higher education institutions, educator unions and non-governmental organisations in the required professional development of educators, and principals;

(v) a training of district-based personnel in learning programme development and implementation, team building, management, monitoring and evaluation in order to ensure more effective school-based support;

(vi) accreditation of short and long-term professional development to support the curriculum;

(vii) a review of the use of the 80 hours set aside for in-service training.

Although the principal may not be involved in all the above, he/she needs to ensure that this strategy for professional orientation and development of educators takes place.

In conclusion, school principals should be trained and supported in order to understand the principles of outcomes-based education. They should know and understand what outcomes-based education is and how it should be implemented. Principals should also understand their role as instructional leaders in the implementation of outcomes-based education. This can enable them to manage their schools more effectively.
2.3.6 Assessment

Assessment is one of an educator’s most important activities in outcomes-based education. In outcomes-based education assessment is often described as ongoing or continuous. This means that assessment forms an integral part of all teaching-learning activities (Van der Horst & McDonald, 1997:12-13). According to Malan (1997:24), assessment is universally conceptualised as a process by means of which the quality of a candidate’s achievements can be judged, recorded and reported. It is, therefore, important that the principal, educator, parent and learner should all be familiar with the assessment requirements.

Killen (1999:18) maintains that assessment of learning that takes place within the classroom is an essential element of outcomes-based education. A fundamental part of outcomes-based education is the notion that learners should be able to demonstrate their achievement of predetermined outcomes. However, learners can only demonstrate their knowledge, ability and competency if they are provided with opportunities and encouraged to demonstrate these. It is important that educators and learners understand why, when and how assessment should take place. This will ensure that learners direct their actions towards the expected outcomes. On the other hand, the educator will be able to assess the learners in a fair and equitable manner. As Killen (1999:18) puts it, without appropriate assessment procedures, educators simply will not know whether learners have achieved the outcomes and more importantly, neither will the learners.

According to Killen (1999:18-19), to be useful in an outcomes-based education system, assessment should conform to the following principles:

- it should be valid (it should actively assess what you intend it to assess);
- it should be reliable (it should give consistent results and not be unduly influenced by extraneous factors such as the time of day);
- it should be fair (it should indicate what learners have learned and not be influenced by any irrelevant factors such as the learner’s cultural background);
- it should reflect the knowledge and skills that are most important for the learners to learn;
- it should support every learner’s opportunity to learn things that are important.

Furthermore, Killen (1999:19) maintains that in an outcomes-based education system, assessment should be seen as an integral part of learning and teaching rather than as a culmination of the
process. Assessment should always contribute to the goal of improving learners’ learning. Hence, Van Rensburg (1998:82) maintains that unless assessment is properly aligned with curriculum reform and teaching practices, the desired changes in education will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to implement. Yet, Chisholm (2000:19) discovered that there is a lack of alignment between curriculum and assessment policy as well as a lack of clarity regarding assessment policy and practice.

Malan (1997:59) maintains that educators have a central role to play in assessment, as they have to communicate information to the learners, parents, principal and the department officials. But as Duke (1987:224) suggests, school leaders need to help educators broaden the scope of their assessments to include higher-level skills. Thus, school principals should ensure that they acquire more knowledge on assessment requirements in order to be able to support educators with their assessment activities.

2.4 SUMMARY

In this chapter the role of the principal as instructional leader as well as the implementation of outcomes-based education in South African schools was explored.

Here, both the local and the international literature have been reviewed in order to determine how the role of the principal as instructional leader is viewed. The literature review also determined how the issue of outcomes-based education as a new curriculum approach is being addressed.

With regards to the role of the principal as instructional leader, some of the tasks that the principal should deal with were emphasised. As far as the implementation of outcomes-based education in South African schools is concerned, reasons for introducing outcomes-based education in South African schools, criticism of outcomes-based education and the implementation of outcomes-based education in South African schools were covered.

The next chapter deals with the research methodology and the strategies that will be followed in the study.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The literature study presented in chapter two provides a theoretical background of both the role of the school principal as instructional leader and outcomes-based education in South African schools. It indicates that the school principal needs to perform his/her instructional leadership role in order for the outcomes-based approach to be effectively implemented. Thus, it is necessary to investigate how principals perform their instructional role by means of an investigation of the perceptions of educators, principals and a Department of Education official regarding the implementation of outcomes-based education. This chapter provides an account of how the study was designed and conducted. The chapter covers the method of investigation that includes data gathering techniques and the design of the research.

It was briefly stated in chapter one (cf 1.6) that qualitative research is used and the reasons for choosing this method were given. Here the researcher explores the use of qualitative approach in more detail.

3.2 THE USE OF A QUALITATIVE APPROACH TO RESEARCH

3.2.1 Qualitative research

Strauss and Corbin (1990:17) regard qualitative research as any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of quantification. It can refer to research about person's lives, stories, behaviour and organisational functioning, social movements or interactional relationships. McMillan and Schumacher (1997:392) add that qualitative research is concerned with understanding the social phenomenon from the participants' perspective. Thus, qualitative research regards the participants as the prime source of information. Since the aim of this study is to determine the perceptions of the participants of the role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in schools, a qualitative approach is considered to be appropriate. Bogdan and Biklen (1992:2) maintain that the qualitative researcher strives to understand behaviour
from the participant’s own frame of reference. This implies that the researcher needs to interact with the participants as closely as possible in order to acquire such understanding. Borg and Gall (1989:24) contend that the research data arise out of these interactions in the form of what people reveal to the researcher and the researcher’s impressions.

Since the implementation of outcomes-based education is directly experienced by the participants, it should be established what meanings these participants ascribe to outcomes-based education and its concepts. For McMillan and Schumacher (1997:392) participants’ meanings include their feelings, beliefs, ideals, thoughts and actions. It is, therefore, hoped that the use of a qualitative approach will lead to a better understanding of the research problem. Hoberg (1999:51) suggests that qualitative methods are used when the researcher aims to understand human phenomena and investigates the meanings that people give to events they experience. Meanwhile, Tuckman (1994:366) maintains that the researcher uses a qualitative approach when he/she attempts to identify the chief concerns of the various participants and audiences and to assess the merit, worth or meaning of the phenomena to the participants.

Furthermore, Bogdan and Biklen (1992:2) maintain that qualitative researchers do not approach their research with specific questions to ask or hypotheses to test. They develop a research focus as they collect their data. They tend to collect their data through sustained contact with people in settings where subjects normally spend their time. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1992:29-33), qualitative research has the following five features:

- qualitative research takes place in natural settings. Qualitative researchers go to the particular setting under study because they are concerned with context. They feel that action can be understood when it is observed in the setting that it occurs.

- qualitative research is descriptive. The data collected are in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers. The written results of the research contain quotations from the data to illustrate and substantiate the presentation.

- qualitative researchers are concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products.

- qualitative researchers tend to analyse their data inductively. They do not search out data to prove or disprove hypotheses before entering the study; rather, the abstractions are built as the particulars that have been gathered are grouped together.
meaning is of essential concern to the qualitative approach. Qualitative researchers are concerned with participants’ perceptions.

It is, therefore, important that the researcher who undertakes qualitative research should be familiar with these features as they form the basis of qualitative research. These features are relevant to the study as they provide a direction and framework for developing specific designs and concrete data collection tactics (Patton, 1990:59).

3.2.2 The role of the researcher

Ary et al (1990:447) contend that in qualitative studies, the researcher is the data-gathering instrument. The researcher talks with people in their setting natural, observes their activities, reads their documents and written records and records this information in field notes or journals. Patton (1990:14) maintains that validity in qualitative methods, therefore, hinges to a great extent on the skill, competence and rigor of the person doing fieldwork.

McMillan and Schumacher (1997:412-413) maintain that the importance of the researcher’s social relationship with the participants requires that studies identify the researcher’s role and status within the group. A researcher who is a full participant or already has status within the social group being observed may limit opportunities to extend the findings (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997:412-413).

This implies that the researcher’s role can have both a positive and/or negative influence on the data gathering and the research findings. Measor (1985:57) maintains that in qualitative research the researcher must strive to build a relationship of reciprocal trust and rapport with his/her subjects. The quality of the data depends on this rapport in so far as it increases the likelihood of participants sharing authentic knowledge of their life-world with him/her. Thus, the qualitative researcher should deal with the participants in a professional manner in order to be able to acquire the required information. Bogdan and Biklen (1992:58) maintain that qualitative researchers should proceed as if they know very little about the people and places they visit.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992:36) maintain that the researcher is a learner, a curious learner, who comes to learn from and with research participants. Thus, the researcher should not come to the field as an expert or authority. However, the researcher is by no means a passive participant. He/She actively interacts with research participants in different ways. Glesne and Peshkin (1992:36) are of
the opinion that the ideal of participatory research is for the researcher to be engaged in an interactive, action-oriented process.

Qualitative researchers attempt to cleanse their preconceptions mentally (Bogdan & Biklin, 1992:58). In this study the researcher attempted to put all preconceived ideas aside to allow the participants to explain their experiences and perceptions from their own point of view.

3.2.3 Data collection strategies

Patton (1990:10) maintains that qualitative methods consist of three kinds of data collection. These are:

- in-depth, open-ended interviews: the data from interviews consist of direct quotations from people about their experiences, opinions, feelings and knowledge.
- direct observation: the data from observations consist of detailed descriptions of people’s activities, behaviours, actions and the full range of interpersonal interactions and organisational processes that are part of observable human experience.
- written documents: documents consist of excerpts, quotations, programme records, memoranda correspondence, official publications, reports, and personal diaries et cetera.

Glesne and Peskin (1992:24) also list these methods and add that to determine which techniques to use the researcher should consider carefully what he/she wants to learn. Likewise, the researcher should choose techniques that are likely to elicit data needed to gain understanding of the phenomenon in question, contribute different perspectives on the issue and make effective use of the time available for data collection (Glesne & Peskin, 1992:24). For the purpose of this study, individual interviews and focus group interviews were chosen and the reasons for choosing these data collection strategies are discussed below.

3.2.4 Reasons for the choice of data collection strategies

Best and Kahn (1993:190) contend that the choice of strategy “depends on the focus of the research and the desired time frame for the study”. Therefore, the researcher has to choose data collection strategies that will enable him to be in close interaction with the participants. This, in turn will
enable the researcher to elicit more information from the participants. In this study the researcher used individual and focus group interviews.

3.2.4.1 Individual interviews

Van Dalen (1979:158) maintains that many people are more willing to communicate orally than in writing, and, therefore, will provide data more readily and fully in an interview than on a questionnaire. Furthermore, Van Dalen (1979:158) contends that in a face-to-face meeting, a researcher is able to encourage participants and to help them probe more deeply into a problem, particularly an emotional one. Against this background the researcher chose to choose individual interviews as an appropriate data collection strategy for eliciting data from the school principals and a departmental official.

The researcher used interviews because they bring the researcher and the participants in direct contact. This enables the researcher to acquire more information than he/she could with other data collection strategies. Furthermore, Van Dalen (1979:158) points out that through participants’ incidental comments, facial and bodily expressions and tone of voice, an interviewer acquires information that would not be conveyed in written replies. Thus, the researcher felt that interviewing the role players could reveal their perceptions on the implementation of outcomes-based education.

It was indicated in chapter one (cf 1.6) that principals were interviewed individually because it would have been too expensive and time consuming to assemble principals of different schools. Moreover, interviewing them individually was useful as it enabled them to talk freely about the subject.

School principals were regarded as key-informants because they are in charge of their respective schools. As heads of these institutions they should know what is happening in these institutions. Likewise, the Department of Education official was chosen because he was regarded as a knowledgeable expert (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997:399).
3.2.4.2 Focus group interviews

According to Patton (1990:335) focus group interviews are used to elicit data from a small group of people on a specific topic. Groups are typically six to eight people who participate in the interview for thirty minutes to two hours. McMillan and Schumacher (1997:433) regard the focus group interview as a strategy for obtaining a better understanding of a problem or an assessment of a problem, concerns, a new product or idea by interviewing a purposefully sampled group of people rather than each person individually.

Bogdan and Biklin (1992:100) maintain that focus group interviews are a useful way of getting insights about what to pursue in individual interviews. Likewise, McMillan and Schumacher (1997:453) add that by creating a social environment in which group members are stimulated by the perceptions and ideas of each other, one can increase the quality and richness of data through a more efficient strategy than one-on-one interviewing. Thus, focus group interviews were used for groups of educators because, as Krueger (1994:19) puts it, they produce qualitative data that provide insights into the attitude, perceptions and opinions of participants. Krueger (1997:19) also maintains that the focus group presents a more natural environment than that of the individual interview because participants are influencing and influenced by others, just as they are in real life. However, Van Dalen (1979:159) warns that the researcher should guard against the situation whereby one person dominates the interview. Likewise, Bogdan and Biklen (1992:100) mention the following problems: starting focus group interviews; controlling the person who insists on dominating the session; and reconstructing tape-recorded interviews. The researcher should try to minimise these problems. The researcher should ensure that no participant dominates the interviews by intervening and asking others to voice their opinions. The tape-recorded data should be transcribed soon after the interviews while the discussion is still fresh in the researcher’s mind. This helps the researcher to recognise who is speaking (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992:100). This was done in this research.

3.2.5 Reliability and validity of research

Shimahara (1988:86) maintains that validity and reliability of research are crucial in all social research regardless of disciplines and methods employed. Collected data must be accurate, authentic and represent reality. LeCompte and Goetz (1982:32) maintain that while reliability is
concerned with the replicability of research findings, validity is concerned with the accuracy of scientific findings.

Miles and Huberman (1994:38) maintain that in qualitative research issues of instrument validity and reliability ride largely on the skills of the researcher. Goetz and LeCompte (in Wolcott, 1990:126) argue that reliability poses serious threats to the credibility of much ethnographic work. However, validity may be its major strengths.

Shimahara (1988:87) maintains that measures to enhance reliability involve a complete description of the research process, so that independent researchers may replicate the same procedures in comparable settings. This includes the following: a delineation of the physical, cultural and social contexts of the study; a statement of the researcher’s roles in the research setting; an accurate description of the conceptual framework of research; and a complete description of the methods of data collection and analysis.

Wiersma (1991:4) maintains that regardless of the form research takes or the ends to which it is directed, researchers want research to be valid, that is, to possess validity. Marshall and Rossman (1995:143) contend that the strength of qualitative study that aims to explore a problem or describe a setting, a process, a social group or a pattern of interaction will be its validity. Marshall and Rossman (1995:99) add that using a combination of data types increases validity as the strengths of one approach can compensate for the weaknesses of another approach. Reliability and validity are again discussed under 3.3.6.

3.3 THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH

According to Bogdan and Biklen (1992:58), design refers to the researcher’s plan of how to proceed. McMillan and Schumacher (1997:33) maintain that the research design refers to the plan and structure of the investigation used to obtain evidence to answer research questions. McMillan and Schumacher (1997:33) assert that the design describes the procedures for conducting the study, including when, from whom, and under what conditions the data will be obtained. Thus, design indicates how the research is set up, what happens to the participants and what methods of data collection are used.
As McMillan and Schumacher (1997:34) put it, “the purpose of a research design is to provide the most valid, accurate answers possible to research questions”. Such answers make it possible for the researcher to proceed with the investigation and specify what problems if any were experienced during the investigation.

This research is qualitative in nature. The research is conducted in a natural setting. There are no manipulation of variables, simulation, or externally imposed structure on the situation (Wiersma, 1991:219). The research embodies the three characteristics of ethnographic interviews as suggested by McMillan and Schumacher (1997:40): they are conducted with individuals and small groups to capture the participants’ perspectives of the outcomes-based approach; they are semi-structured and open-ended to provide the participants with every opportunity to describe and explain what is most salient to them and verbatim words and phrases from the interview are analysed and used as data to illustrate findings.

The researcher is not concerned here about generalisability and only accurate and adequate description of the situation being studied is paramount (Wiersma, 1991:219).

3.3.1 Statement of subjectivity

Marshall and Rossman (1995:145) maintain that a qualitative research proposal should respond to concerns that the natural subjectivity of the researcher will shape the research. The researcher should gain some understanding, even empathy, for the research participants in order to gain entry into their world. The success of the qualitative research depends on the willingness of the participants to participate. Thus, the researcher should gain trust and confidence of the participants. Glesne and Peshkin (1992:35) maintain that trust should be developed before people are willing to release certain kinds of information. Meanwhile, Patton (1990:472) maintains that because the researcher is the instrument in the qualitative inquiry, a qualitative report must include information about the researcher.

3.3.1.1. Status

The researcher is an educator in a school in the KwaMashu district. He is conversant with the outcomes-based approach and uses this in some classes. However, because of the phasing in
approach of the Department, some classes he teaches still use the old curriculum. The researcher is a deputy principal in his school. This places the researcher in a better position to know what is happening in a class following an outcomes-based approach as well as what is happening in the principal’s office. However, the researcher entered the field as a ‘learner’ and tried not to impose his opinions on the research. He allowed all participants to speak freely and to tell him everything about outcomes-based education from their own frame of references. While some participants were initially reluctant to participate in the study, they agreed to participate after the researcher had explained to them that the study was for academic purposes and that they would not be identified in the report on the research.

3.3.1.2 The language issue

The researcher is known to the community and speaks the same language as the participants. He understands the dynamics and politics of the community in which these schools are situated. Thus, the researcher was not a stranger to the participants. As a result, the participants were able to discuss issues with the researcher and were confident that they shared a common understanding of all issues discussed.

Interviews were conducted in English since all participants understand it. Occasionally, however, the researcher and the participants used IsiZulu to clarify certain points. But after agreeing on that particular point, it was translated into English.

3.3.2 Rationale for doing research in KwaMashu

The background history of KwaMashu is briefly stated in chapter one (cf 1.1.1). Similarly, the reasons for doing research in KwaMashu were stated in chapter one (cf 1.5). It was also indicated in chapter one (cf 1.5) that the focus is only on grade seven and grade eight and the reasons for choosing these two grades are also given in chapter one (cf 1.5).

The decision to conduct the research in KwaMashu was prompted by the fact that it is where the researcher grew up and was educated. The researcher is not only familiar with school principals, educators and Department of Education officials, but also with community leaders and community
members. The researcher has background knowledge of each unit (section) in KwaMashu and knows which areas are safe and which areas are dangerous in the township.

Therefore, the researcher was in a better position to choose those schools that are situated in relatively safe areas.

3.3.3 Choice of schools

The letter from the Department of Education permitting the researcher to conduct a research project in KwaMashu schools stipulated that such a project should not interfere with the teaching-learning activities (cf appendix B). The researcher adhered to this, interviewing participants after school hours. In addition, the researcher chose schools that are within easy reach. Although the schools were chosen because of their proximity and accessibility, they can also be said to be similar to other schools in KwaMashu.

The researcher is also familiar with these four schools because the two primary schools are feeder-schoo ls to the researcher’s school and the two secondary schools interact with the researcher’s on a regular basis. Thus, the researcher as a deputy principal in his school is in constant contact with principals as well as educators from both the two primary and the two secondary schools. As a result, communication was not a problem because the researcher used whatever time available, for example, his break time to communicate with the participants. Glesne and Peshkin (1992:24) advise that the researcher should select a site where he/she would be accepted and where he/she would feel comfortable working.

However, the researcher was aware that this also has disadvantages. For example, knowing the status of the researcher, the participants may be reluctant to reveal their opinions freely. Educators may feel that the researcher is spying for the principals since the researcher is a deputy principal in his school. Likewise, principals may be reluctant to reveal how much they know about outcomes-based education as this may be seen as a weakness. There was also a possibility of both principals and educators refusing to participate on the basis that the researcher is from within the community and the researcher knows what is happening in KwaMashu schools.
The researcher visited the four selected schools, that is, the two primary schools and the two secondary schools to ask for permission to conduct a research project and to make appointments for interviews for both principals and educators. This personal visit was done to save time and to promote the importance of the study. Each principal was given a certified copy of a letter from the Regional Office (North Durban Region) that granted permission to undertake research in KwaMashu schools (cf appendix B). Each principal was also given a letter requesting for his/her co-operation as a prospective participant (cf appendix C). The researcher assured the principals that their responses would be treated with confidentiality and anonymity.

Particulars of the four schools selected are provided in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>School A (Primary school)</th>
<th>School B (Secondary school)</th>
<th>School C (Secondary school)</th>
<th>School D (Primary school)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium of instruction</td>
<td>IsiZulu and English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>IsiZulu and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of learners</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of educators</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classrooms</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff room/s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal’s office</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principal/s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/s</td>
<td>Yes (20)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of conduct (learners)</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Unwritten</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security at school</td>
<td>Fenced</td>
<td>Fenced</td>
<td>Fenced</td>
<td>Fenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport-fields</td>
<td>Soccer &amp; Netball</td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The four chosen schools

All schools chosen are easily reached by tarred roads. Schools B and C are situated along the same main road, whereas schools A and D are reached by the minor roads. Despite the fact that schools B and C are situated along a very busy main road, there are no traffic signs showing that children/learners are crossing the road or that there are schools. Taxis transporting learners to and from different schools and other community members in transit mainly use this main road. All schools are surrounded by a concrete fence. In school D the fence is falling apart as a result there are gaps leading into the school. Most learners and a number of educators who do not have cars use these spaces to get into the school. Only a few learners and educators with cars use the main gate.

Security personnel man gates in schools A and C. But visitors are allowed into the schools without any details taken. This raises questions about the security in these schools as the security guards merely open and close gates for people coming in and out of these schools. Meanwhile, there are no security personnel manning gates in schools B and D and getting into these schools is even easier. Gates to these schools are always open. Next to the gates of all four schools hawkers, particularly women, sell fruits, chips, broken biscuits, sweets, sausages and juice to learners during the break times for income. None of the schools in the study has a tuck shop and learners go out to buy their lunch from tuck shops in the township, since there are very few shops in KwaMashu particularly next to these schools. Schools A, C and D have well paved parking areas; whereas school B has no parking area and finding a space to park is difficult.

Schools A and D are well cared for and classrooms are very clean. Generally, buildings in these schools are in good condition and neat. Schoolyards in schools A and D are very clean and the grass is cut. In contrast, schools B and C are not well cared for and classrooms are dirty. Buildings are not in good condition; graffiti on walls, in some instances in unacceptable language and a number of windows are broken. Unlike the case of schools A and D, in schools B and C the schoolyards are dirty especially after the break times. Learners litter during the break time and there are no dustbins around these schools in which learners can place garbage.

With regard to facilities, the level of availability varies from school to school. For example, only school A has computers and a fax machine, while school D has only a fax machine. Generally, all schools have limited facilities. However, the schools chosen are similar to most schools in the
KwaMashu district since they have basic facilities, such as classrooms, running water, toilets, furniture, though these facilities are not adequate.

With regard to extra-mural activities, all four schools chosen are involved in various cultural activities as well as various sports. Soccer and netball are the most popular sports in all four schools. Rugby and cricket are, however, also slowly becoming popular among boys in secondary schools. However, only school A has sport-fields for both soccer and netball and school B has only a netball ground. Schools C and D have no sport-fields.

3.3.4 Choice of participants

Measor (1985:55) maintains that one of the most important tasks for a researcher is the selection of educational settings and negotiation of access to the participants. Bogdan and Biklen (1992:80) maintain that the first problem to face in fieldwork is getting permission to conduct your study. The research is based on the role of the school principal in the implementation outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools. However, the focus is on the implementation of outcomes-based education in grades seven and eight.

Negotiating for and gaining an access was relatively easy for the researcher. The researcher obtained permission for conducting research in KwaMashu schools from a Regional Representative who is known to the researcher. The researcher was advised to apply to the Regional Office (North Durban Region) for permission. The letter was addressed directly to the Representative as advised (cf appendix A). Permission was granted within a few weeks (cf appendix B). However, because of personal commitments the researcher was unable to conduct the research immediately after permission had been granted.

The researcher approached the four principals, who subsequently introduced the researcher to their respective staff members. The purpose of the study was discussed and the terms of access were negotiated. The researcher oriented the educators of the two chosen grades to the purpose of the study and what was required of them. These educators were given letters asking for their assistance and explaining the value of the study (cf appendix D). Four educators in each case were requested to volunteer for focus group interviews. In most cases, they volunteered, except in one instance where educators were reluctant to participate. However, educators volunteered after the researcher
had emphasised that he was doing an academic study and asked the educators to contact his supervisor if they wanted to confirm this.

The researcher also visited the District office in order to ask for permission to interview the Department of Education official who is responsible for the training of school principals. The official agreed to be interviewed and the terms of access were negotiated. The official was given a copy of a letter from the Regional Office that granted the researcher permission to undertake the research (cf appendix B). The official was also given a letter requesting his co-operation as a prospective participant (cf appendix E). The researcher assured the official that his responses would be treated with confidentiality and anonymity.

3.3.5 Interview guide

Patton (1990:283) regards an interview guide as a list of questions or issues that are to be explored in the course of an interview. An interview guide is prepared to make sure that basically the same information is obtained from a number of people by covering the same material. McMillan and Schumacher (1997:447) agree that in the interview guide topics are selected in advance but the researcher decides the sequence and wording of the questions during the interview.

Patton (1990:283) lists the following advantages of an interview guide:

- it ensures that the interviewer has carefully decided how best to use the limited time in an interview situation.
- it helps make interviewing across a number of different people more systematic and comprehensive by delimiting in advance the issues to be explored.
- it is useful in conducting group interviews: it keeps the interactions focused but allows individual perspectives and experiences to emerge.

Therefore, in this study an interview guide was used to ensure that all aspects were included in the interviews. However, the interview guide did not dictate structure of the interviews and the participants were allowed to raise issues and/or expand on answers.
3.3.6 Data gathering

The researcher used individual and focus group interviews as data collection strategies. Krueger (1994:29) maintains that qualitative procedures, such as focus groups or individual interviews, enable the researcher to get in tune with the respondent and discover how that person sees reality.

3.3.6.1. Individual interviews with principals

The researcher conducted individual interviews with two KwaMashu primary school principals where outcomes-based education has been running for a few years. Individual interviews were also conducted with two KwaMashu secondary school principals where outcomes-based education was implemented for the first time in 2001.

The researcher and the participants agreed on time, date and venue for the interviews. Generally, interviews with principals proceeded without any problems. Principals were very keen to participate in the process. These principals were interviewed in their offices and there were no interruptions. This setting provided for privacy and principals were able to talk freely.

Interviews with principals were tape-recorded with the permission of the principals and were later transcribed. Recording allowed the researcher to be actively involved during the interviews. The researcher, however, also took notes during the interviews. Although the researcher had prepared possible interview questions, these were used as guides and the participants were encouraged to reveal as much as they could on the issue (cf 3.3.4).

On two different occasions two principals cancelled interviews because they had just received circulars inviting them to a principals’ meeting on the day scheduled for the interviews. Both contacted the researcher telephonically. These interviews were then rescheduled.

In total, four principals participated in four individual interviews. The characteristics of the principals are discussed in more detail in chapter 4.
3.3.6.2 Individual interviews with the Department of Education official

One Department of Education official who is involved in the training of school principals and/or educators in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools was interviewed. This official was chosen because he is the outcomes-based education co-ordinator in the KwaMashu district. The interview with the Department of Education official can be seen as a reputational case, that is using a knowledgeable expert as a participant (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997:399).

This interview was tape-recorded with the permission of the participant. The researcher also took notes during the interview. This interview proceeded well. The official was very co-operative. The official disconnected his telephone and cellular phone during the interview/discussion to avoid any interruption.

3.3.6.3 Focus group interviews with educators

The researcher conducted two focus group interviews with four grade seven educators from each of the two chosen KwaMashu primary schools where outcomes-based education has been running for a few years. Two other focus group interviews were also conducted with four grade eight educators from each of the two chosen KwaMashu secondary schools where outcomes-based education was implemented for the first time in 2001. Thus, a total of sixteen educators participated in four focus group interviews.

The interviews took place at the time, date and venue agreed upon by the researcher and the participants. Generally, these interviews went smoothly. Educators agreed to be interviewed after school hours. In one school, however, it took the researcher a very long time to convince the educators to agree to remain at school after school hours.

Interviews were conducted in English. The vernacular, namely IsiZulu, was occasionally used to clarify certain points. But after agreeing on that particular point it was translated into English (cf 3.3.1.2). The researcher is fluent in IsiZulu and undertook any translation himself.
These interviews were tape-recorded with the permission of the participants. The tapes were later transcribed. The researcher also took notes during the interviews to supplement the tape-recording. The researcher, however, ensured that note taking does not interfere with the spontaneous nature of the group discussion (Hoberg, 1999:141).

The characteristics of the educators interviewed are discussed in Chapter 4.

3.3.7 Transcribing the data

Patton (1990:347) warns that no matter what style of interviewing is used, and no matter how carefully one words interview questions, it all comes to naught if the interviewer fails to capture the actual words of the person being interviewed. The researcher transcribed all tape-recorded interviews verbatim immediately after the interviews had taken place. Patton (1990:379) regards verbatim transcription as the essential raw data for qualitative analysis. Van Wyk (1996:164) warns that there is always the danger that transcribed words may loose some meaning as tone, volume, emotionality and accompanying facial and body gestures (body language) and disposition cannot be portrayed. Thus, a diary was kept to record many of these aspects, during and immediately following the interviews. Patton (1990:351-352) argues that recapturing and conveying those perceived meanings to outsiders are innate to the nature of qualitative research at the point of analysis and writing.

3.3.8 Analysis of the data

Marshall and Rossman (1995:111) regard data analysis as the process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the mass of collected data. It is a messy, ambiguous, time-consuming, creative and fascinating process. Likewise, Patton (1990:371) argues that the process of data collection is not an end in itself. The data collected should be analysed, interpreted and findings presented.

In this research the data consist of the transcripts and notes taken during and immediately after the interviews. In analysing the data the researcher initially read the transcripts and the notes repeatedly in order to gain familiarity with them. The researcher also listened to all recordings of the interview, at the same time checking the accuracy of the transcriptions. Marshall and Rossman (1995:113)
maintain that reading, reading and reading once more through the data force the researcher to become familiar with those data in intimate ways.

The researcher searched through the data for regularities and patterns as well as for topics in the data and wrote down words and phrases to represent these topics and patterns. These words and phrases are coding categories (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992:166). Taylor and Bogdan (1984:136) maintain that in qualitative research coding is a systematic way of developing and refining interpretations of the data. The coding process involves bringing together and analysing all the data bearing on themes, ideas, concepts, interpretations and propositions. Thus, data was divided into topics or categories and this was done in order to work with it easily. The categories and subcategories were identified as natural themes, rather than on the basis of an a priori category system. As categories and themes emerged, they were colour coded (Van Wyk, 1996:166). Glesme and Peshkin (1992:134) recommend that there should be as many major codes as needed to subsume all of the data, appreciating that more may develop than will hold up as separate codes.

Marshall and Rossman (1995:111) regard qualitative data analysis as the search for general statements about relationships among categories of data. This builds grounded theory. Thus, the process embodied in the research programme was one of moving between data already gathered, relevant existing theory and further data collection and analysis (Van Wyk, 1996:166).

3.3.9 Reliability and validity of the study

According to Best and Kahn (1993:208) reliability and validity are essential to the effectiveness of any data gathering procedure. Meanwhile, Patton (1990:11) maintains that the validity and reliability of qualitative data depends to a great extent on the methodological skill, sensitivity and integrity of the researcher (cf 3.2.6).

3.3.9.1 Reliability in data collection

Bogdan and Biklin (1992:48) maintain that in qualitative studies, researchers are concerned with the accuracy and comprehensiveness of their data. Qualitative researchers tend to view reliability as a fit between what they record as data and what actually occurs in the setting under study, rather than the literal consistency across different observations. McMillan and Schumacher (1997:404-406)
maintain that qualitative researchers commonly use a combination of strategies to enhance reliability in data collected. Thus, the researcher used these strategies to ensure that data was reliable: verbatim accounts of conversations, transcripts and direct quotations were used as data; mechanically recorded data (a tape recorder was used during the individual and focus group interviews); low-inference description: concrete, precise descriptions from field notes and interviews elaborations were used; and member checking. Each participant was given a copy of the transcript of the interview to check if it was correct.

3.3.9.2 Internal validity

McMillan and Schumacher (1997:404) regard validity of qualitative designs as the degree to which the interpretations and concepts have mutual meanings between the participants and the researcher. Thus, the researcher and the participants should agree on the descriptions and the meanings of different events. Shimahara (1988:87) maintains that internal reliability is closely related to validity; hence measures used to enhance internal reliability may also be used to maximise ethnographic validity. In this study the researcher used these strategies to enhance internal validity: participants’ verbatim language: participants’ words were transcribed as they were spoken; triangulation: multi-data collection techniques were used; comparison of data: all data collected were compared to check their validity; and feedback from participants: each participant was given a copy of the transcript of the interview to check if it was valid.

3.3.10 Triangulation

Best and Kahn (1993:203) maintain that triangulation is the use of multiple data collection techniques. It enables the researcher to study the data from more than one perspective. Patton (1990:245) adds that a multimethod, triangulation approach to the field increases both the validity and reliability of evaluation data.

Best and Kahn (1993:202) maintain that all of the data collection techniques have strengths and weaknesses. Thus, triangulation helps to emphasise the strengths and minimise the weaknesses of the chosen data collection technique(s). Against this background Best and Kahn (1993:203) argue that good qualitative research will often include multiple methods of data collection. By selecting
complimentary methods, a researcher can cover the weaknesses of one method with the strengths of another.

In this study, the data collected have been triangulated in the following manner:
- comparing data from focus group interviews with educators from different schools;
- comparing data from individual interviews with principals from different schools;
- comparing data from focus group interviews with educators and individual interviews with school principals;
- comparing data from individual interviews with school principals and individual interview with the Department of Education official;
- using the circulars and notes on outcomes-based education as issued by the Department to validate statements made by participants.

3.4 SUMMARY

This chapter covers the use of a qualitative approach to research. It describes the methods used to obtain data, namely, individual and focus group interviews. It also covers the design of the research such as the rationale for doing research in KwaMashu, choice of schools et cetera.

In the next chapter, the researcher will analyse the data emerging from the interviews with educators, school principals, departmental official, as well as data obtained from the documents.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents data generated during individual interviews with four principals and one Department of Education official, as well as four focus group interviews with sixteen educators. Firstly, schools included in the research are discussed. The characteristics of participants are summarised in Tables 4.1 to 4.5 and the significance of the experiences of the participants is discussed. All principals and educators teach in the KwaMashu district and the Department of Education official also works in the KwaMashu district as the Superintendent of Education Management (previously known as inspector of schools). However, the characteristics of the Department of Education official were not included. This was done in order to protect his identity. It would be easy to identify the informant by looking at his personal information, as there are very few Department of Education officials in the KwaMashu district. The researcher had assured all participants of confidentiality and anonymity, so the researcher felt obliged to do so in the case of the Department of Education official.

The ensuing sections (4.4 to 4.9) present significant themes which emerged from the interviews. Interviews were conducted in English and occasionally the local vernacular, namely IsiZulu was used to clarify certain points. But after agreeing on that particular point it was translated into English (cf 3.3.1.2). The researcher used the participants’ words verbatim and no alterations were made. Quotations are presented in indentations and comments in brackets.

4.2 SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN THE RESEARCH

Schools do not operate in isolation. They form part of the social structures that are found within communities and are, therefore, influenced by both the communities and the context of their environment. Therefore, to understand what is happening in the school, one needs also to understand what is happening in the community that the school serves.
4.2.1 The context of the schools

KwaMashu Township is situated about 25 kilometers north west of Durban in KwaZulu-Natal Province (cf 1.1.1). The township got its name from Sir Marshall Campbell, the former owner of the land, who was known as “Mashu” by the Africans in the area. It covers an area of approximately fifteen square kilometers. The township is divided into fourteen units. It is surrounded by informal settlements which mushroomed in the late 1980s and early 1990s (cf 1.1.1). People who erected these shacks came from different rural areas, mainly to look for job opportunities or as a result of faction clashes in the rural areas. Residents of the informal settlements mostly use schools and other facilities belonging to the community of KwaMashu, since they have very limited facilities.

There are 31 primary schools, 11 secondary schools and one school for learners with special educational needs. Presently, there is only one Technical College and the other institution for higher learning which served the community of KwaMashu, namely Ntuzuma College of Education was recently closed when the Provincial Department of Education and Culture reduced the number of Colleges of Education in KwaZulu-Natal Province. There is also one municipal library in the area. The majority of its patrons are students attending tertiary institutions. Very few school goers make use of the library. The library is under-resourced.

The bulk of learners in schools in KwaMashu schools come from the surrounding informal settlements as most of the parents who are permanent residents in KwaMashu have taken their children to the former White, Indian and Coloured schools (cf 1.1.1). While there is a secondary school or two in each unit (section) most secondary school learners do not attend schools in the vicinity of their homes. Learners travel to and from schools by foot or use taxis, which contributes to late coming. In most cases, taxi-drivers transporting these learners do not respect traffic signs and always play their music loudly in order to attract learners, as most learners do not use taxis that have no sound system. Hence learners, particularly girls wait for a taxi that has music even if it means being late for school. Most learners go to school very late and some of them also leave school very early.

KwaMashu is known as one of the most dangerous townships in the country. The crime in the township has reached an unbearable level. Criminal activities are witnessed on a daily basis. People
are frequently robbed of their valuables at gunpoint. A number of schools that have been recently renovated by the Department of Education and Culture in KwaMashu have again been vandalized. In most cases, resources that are meant to help the learners, like computers, television sets, fax machines and photocopiers are targeted. The community members are afraid or reluctant to protect schools from these criminals.

4.2.2 The schools in the research

Four schools (two primary schools and two secondary schools) were chosen for this study (cf 1.6 & 3.3.3). Schools A and D (primary schools) are well cared for and classrooms are very clean. In contrast, schools B and C (secondary schools) are not well cared for and classrooms are dirty. Learners in all schools wear school uniforms but in schools B and C some boys do not wear full school uniform. These boys sometimes wear takkies and black, navy or other colours instead of grey trousers. Learners, particularly boys in schools B and C tend to come late after the break time and frequently leave school earlier than the normal time.

The situation with regard to facilities varies. For example, only school A has computers (20 computers) and a fax machine, while school D has only a fax machine. Generally, all schools have limited facilities. But all schools chosen have, like most schools in the KwaMashu district, basic facilities, such as classrooms, running water, toilets, furniture (desks and chairs), though often these facilities are not adequate (cf 3.3.3).

4.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS

This section presents responses by participants that are related to personal characteristics. Attention is also given to the experience of the participants in the education system, since participants may view outcomes-based education in comparison with the old curriculum according to their experiences with the two curricula. The characteristics of the participating schools are summarised in Table 3.1 and should be read in conjunction with the ensuing sections.
4.3.1 The school principals

Four school principals were interviewed in this study. Their personal characteristics are included in Table 4.1. This information is necessary in order to understand the background of the participants in relation to their responses. It was noted that all school principals participated in this study were males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals (Primary school)</th>
<th>School A (Primary school)</th>
<th>School B (Secondary school)</th>
<th>School C (Secondary school)</th>
<th>School D (Primary school)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic qualification/s</td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>B Paed</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualification/s</td>
<td>PTD and HDE</td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>B Paed</td>
<td>B Ed, PTD and FDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further field of study</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>M Ed (incomplete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of experience as educator</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of experience as principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General training for principalship</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training course on instructional leadership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who offered the training</td>
<td>Dept. of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training course for OBE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of training courses for OBE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who offered the training</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ilkwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education (Curriculum Unit)</td>
<td>Dept. of Education (Curriculum Unit)</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ilkwezi Community College of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key:

BA : Bachelor of Arts
B Ed : Bachelor of Education
B Paed : Bachelor of Pedagogics
Dept. : Department
FDE : Further Diploma in Education
HDE : Higher Diploma in Education
M Ed : Master of Education
OBE : Outcomes-based education
PTD : Primary Teachers’ Diploma
STD : Secondary Teachers’ Diploma

School principals who participated in this study are all males who fall within the age group of 42 and 54 and have seventeen or more years of teaching experience (Table 4.1).

All four principals have attended outcomes-based education courses. Principals of schools A and D attended two and three courses respectively, while principals of schools B and C both attended only one course. While principals of schools B and C only attended courses organised by the Department of Education (Curriculum Unit), principals of schools A and D attended both courses organised by the Department of Education and also by the Non-Governmental Organisation, namely Ikhwezi Community College of Education.

4.3.2 Educators

In total sixteen educators were interviewed in this study. Their personal details are included in Tables 4.2 to 4.5.

**Table 4.2 : Educators at school A (Primary school)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic qualification/s</td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>Matric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualification/s</td>
<td>PTD and HDE</td>
<td>PTD</td>
<td>PTD</td>
<td>PTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further field of study</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of experience as educator</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade taught</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of experience using an OBE approach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training course for OBE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of training courses for OBE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who offered the training</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How training was offered</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental programmes at school</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who offers these programmes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

Dept. : Department  
HDE : Higher Diploma in Education  
OBE : Outcomes-based education  
PTD : Primary Teachers' Diploma

In school A the focus group included two females and two males who fall within the age group 34 and 43 and have many years of teaching experience. All educators teach grade seven which follows the outcomes-based education curriculum. All educators have attended outcomes-based education training courses/workshops organised or offered by the Department of Education and Ikhwezi Community College of Education (the Non-Governmental Organisation). The courses dealt with the different learning areas and those attending the courses had to pass the information on to colleagues teaching the same learning area. This is known as the cascade method. Most of these courses/workshops took one to two days, while a few were conducted in the afternoon. Educators had to leave school earlier to attend these workshops.
There are no other courses offered by any of the schools to assist in the professional development of educators.

### Table 4.3: Educators at school B (Secondary school)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic qualification/s</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Matric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualification/s</td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>JSTC</td>
<td>STD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further field of study</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BA (Incomplete)</td>
<td>B Ed (incomplete)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of experience as educator</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade taught</td>
<td>8, 9 &amp;12</td>
<td>8, 9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>8 &amp; 11</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of experience using an OBE approach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of training courses for OBE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who offered the training</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How training was offered</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental programmes at school</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who offers these programmes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- **BA**: Bachelor of Arts
- **B Ed**: Bachelor of Education
- **Dept.**: Department
- **JSTC**: Junior Secondary Teachers' Certificate
- **OBE**: Outcomes-based education
- **STD**: Secondary Teachers' Diploma
In school B the focus group included two males and two females approximately 40 years of age and with many years of teaching experience. All educators teach grade eight and three of them also teach grade nine. Both grades follow the outcomes-based education curriculum. Three educators in school B also teach other grades (ten, eleven and twelve) which have not changed over to the outcomes-based education curriculum. All educators have attended outcomes-based education courses. Three educators have two years of experience using an outcomes-based approach, while one educator has only one year of experience using an outcomes-based education approach.

Table 4.4 : Educators at school C (Secondary school)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic qualification/s</td>
<td>BA (Hons)</td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>B Paed</td>
<td>Matric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualification/s</td>
<td>JSTC</td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>B Paed</td>
<td>STD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further field of study</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of experience as educator</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade taught</td>
<td>8, 9 &amp; 11</td>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>8, 10 &amp; 12</td>
<td>8 &amp; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of experience using an OBE approach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of training courses for OBE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who offered the training</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How training was offered</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental programmes at school</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who offers these programmes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

BA (Hons) : Bachelor of Arts (Honours)
In school C the focus group included one male and three females who fall within the age group of 28 and 47 and whose teaching experience varies from one year to 22 years. All educators teach grade eight and two of them also teach grade nine. Both grades follow the outcomes-based education curriculum. Three educators in school C also teach other grades (ten, eleven and twelve) which have not changed over to outcomes-based education curriculum. All educators have attended outcomes-based education courses.

Table 4.5: Educators at school D (Primary school)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic qualification/s</td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>Matric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualification/s</td>
<td>PTD &amp; HED</td>
<td>PTD</td>
<td>STD &amp; HDE</td>
<td>PTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further field of study</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of experience as educator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade taught</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of experience using an OBE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of training courses for OBE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who offered the training</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Ikhwezi Community College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How training was offered</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
<td>Cascade model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental programmes at school</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who offers these programmes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key:

Dept. : Department
HDE : Higher Diploma in Education
HED : Higher Education Diploma
OBE : Outcomes-based education
PTD : Primary Teachers' Diploma

In school D the focus group included one male and three females who fall within the age group of 30 and 45 and whose teaching experience varies from six to seventeen years. Two educators in school D have three years experience using an outcomes-based education approach, while the other two have two years of experience using an outcomes-based education approach. All educators have attended outcomes-based education courses.

4.3.3 The Department of Education official

One Department of Education official was interviewed in this study. This person has many years of experience as an educator, a principal as well as the Superintendent of Education Management. This means that the official has experience of both the old curriculum and the new curriculum. More detail has been withheld to protect the identity of the official, as was explained in 4.1.

4.3.4 The significance of the experiences of the participants

As shown in Table 4.1 all principals with the exception of one have more than five years of experience as principals. This means that they should be familiar with their role as instructional leaders and should be able to prioritise their responsibilities. Secondly, it indicates that they previously managed schools following the old curriculum and they have to currently manage schools following the old as well as the new curriculum. Thus, they can differentiate between managing a school following the old structure and a school following the outcomes-based approach. The principal, who has only one year of experience as a principal, has been a deputy principal for five years. This implies that he experienced the transition from the old structure to outcomes-based education while occupying a management position.
With regard to outcomes-based education, principals interviewed have attended between one and three full day outcomes-based education courses (cf Table 4.1). Considering the fact that principals are instructional leaders, it is unlikely that they would be adequately prepared for this task with only a few training sessions on outcomes-based education. Principals should have a clear understanding of their role as instructional leader in the implementation of outcomes-based education in order to ensure that it is implemented effectively in their schools.

All sixteen educators, with the exception of one with only two years of teaching experience, have many years of teaching experience. They taught the old curriculum and are now teaching the new curriculum, and are able to compare the two curricula.

In terms of outcomes-based education courses, all educators have undergone training. However, the number of training courses attended by these educators varies and the duration and the quality of training offered to educators are a major concern. Educators are only able to implement outcomes-based education effectively if they are given adequate training (cf 2.3.4). Furthermore, none of the schools chosen offer courses to assist in the professional development of educators.

The Department of Education official is in a good position to understand the attitude and perceptions of the principals and educators towards educational changes in the country, particularly the implementation of outcomes-based education because he is involved in the training and organisation of workshops for both principals and educators. The official also knows how the Department of Education ensures that outcomes-based education and other current educational changes are being implemented. He knows how the KwaMashu district supports both the principals and educators in the implementation of educational changes at their schools.

4.4 POLICY CHANGES IN EDUCATION

Since 1994 the education system in South Africa has been revolutionised and a number of changes has been introduced. The system has changed from a racially-based to a geographically-based one; compulsory education for all children has been instituted, an outcomes-based approach to education has been adopted; school governance has been reviewed; the higher education system has been investigated and a qualifications framework has been established (Van Wyk & Mothata, 1998:1) (cf 2.3.2). These policies formulated by the government are to be implemented by educators all
teaching in different contexts. De Clercq (1997:130) maintains that principals and educators are implementers and their role is to enact these policies. To ensure that policies are effectively implemented, principals in particular should have a clear understanding of the policies.

4.4.1 Knowledge of policy and policy changes

An important stage in the policy process is the communication of policy in a manner that will enable those who have to implement the policies to do so effectively. However, school principals in this study maintain that it is sometimes difficult for them to communicate the new policies to their staff members, as these policies have been introduced within a short space of time. They feel that there are too many changes and argue that they spend a lot of time out of schools attending information briefing sessions. This seriously impacts on their ability to fulfill their obligations as school principals. Both principals and educators interviewed pointed out that they were not opposed to the policies or new changes, but to the manner in which these changes are introduced and communicated. The principal of school A sums this up:

Changes are good and the intention of introducing these changes is very good, but the manner in which these changes are introduced is not good at all. We (principals) are called to a string of briefings and workshops all the time and we are expected to implement all these things simultaneously.

Educators confirm this and maintain that principals are always out of schools attending workshops and, as a result, do not have time to report back to them. Educators complain that by the time principals get an opportunity to report, there is too much information and educators have difficulties in absorbing the information. An educator in school B says: “The Department should give us enough time to understand one change or policy before introducing another change or policy”.

Both principals and educators maintain that they have limited knowledge of policy and policy changes and blame the Department for the manner in which information on education policies is being communicated to them. Principals acknowledge that the KwaMashu district office passes on information, materials and documents to them that come from the Regional office regarding changes taking place in the education system. But these principals complain that the amount of work that they are expected to deal with is too much. As a result they do not have sufficient time to
study these documents thoroughly. Principals, therefore, pass on information that was not fully understood to educators. This impacts negatively on the implementation of those policies. The principal of school D suggests:

I think the Department should introduce changes little by little so that we (principals) can be able to understand them. In that way, we can relay something we are clear with to educators.

Likewise, educators accuse the Department for failing to give them sufficient time to acquaint themselves with the new policies. This influences their implementation of these policies. An educator in school C explained: “There are too many things that we are expected to implement. They (the Department of Education) do not even check whether we do understand these things or not”. Educators also blame their principals for failing to request the Department not to pass on too much information. According to the educators, principals are in a good position to do this because they represent the Department of Education at school level.

The Department of Education official agrees that there are too many policies that are being passed on to principals. Principals are in turn expected to communicate them to educators for implementation. The number of workshops, briefings and meetings attended by principals make it difficult for principals to disseminate the information to the educators and/or to monitor the implementation of policies. The official feels that there is information overload and doubts whether all these changes are effectively implemented. But the official maintains that the KwaMashu district ensures that principals and educators are kept well informed on whatever changes are being introduced in education. He explains how this is done:

Whenever there is a new change or a new document spelling out certain changes, we (the KwaMashu district) call the principals to a meeting and give them that information. We (district officials and principals) then go through that document together. We (district officials) do that after going through the similar procedure because the Regional office does the same with us.

The official argues that the principals and educators should not have inadequate knowledge as they are kept abreast with changes taking place in education system. While acknowledging that there is
too much information being passed on to schools, he feels that principals should make time
available to study these policies and then communicate the information to educators who should
also find time to acquaint themselves with these new policies. The official feels that the principals
and educators should have a clear understanding of the policy changes. This official explained:

Our principals are well empowered. I’m sure if they can find enough time to go through
these policies they can have no problems. I think this should be the case with educators
as well. It is just a question of finding time to go through these policies.

Discussion

For any change to be successfully implemented, it should be planned, controlled, co-ordinated and
managed effectively. Garrett (1995:95) maintains that change is always guaranteed to cause a great
deal of upset and disturbance in a school system if it is not well managed. Darling-Hammond
(1990:239) maintains that the process of change always requires time and an enormous amount of
support. Likewise, Evans (1993:20) maintains that implementation of change depends on these five
dimensions: the content of the reform, the faculty’s willingness and capacity of change, the strength
of the school as an organisation, support and training and leadership.

The school principal should not only keep abreast with relevant and recent developments to execute
the right tasks, but also ensure that this knowledge is passed on to his/her staff. According to Van
der Westhuizen (1991:41) guidance must be given so that all efforts in the school can be channelled
correctly. Thus, the principal should also understand both the internal and external environmental
conditions of the school, since he/she deals with educators and learners as well as the whole
community. The principal should know which knowledge is required and how to impart that
knowledge to these individuals. However, this becomes a problem if principals themselves are not
conversant with the new developments.

Introducing an outcomes-based approach is a challenging and complex task that requires
enthusiasm, motivation and dedication from all parties involved in the interests of education
(Wilkens, 1998:43). It is, therefore, important that reformers should ensure that policies are
correctly communicated to all stakeholders.
4.4.2 Attitude of participants towards changes in education

Changes are inevitable when a new government comes to power, particularly in a dynamic education system planning for a new millenium. The manner in which changes are communicated to the implementers during the initial stages has a major effect on the implementation of those changes. All participants maintain that they were in favour of changes in the education system. They regard changes as necessary in South Africa in order to redress the inequalities created by the apartheid system. But participants complain about the manner in which these changes are being introduced. Principals and educators complain that they are expected to implement many changes at the same time. As a result they become frustrated and little or no implementation takes place.

This is how the principal at school D expresses his frustration:

There are too many changes that we (principals) are expected to implement. We attend workshop after workshop and in these workshops we get piles of documents which we are expected to read and implement these things. As a result, you do not know where to start and you end up being confused and frustrated.

The principal is also concerned about the impact this has on educators and elaborates:

Educators too are complaining that we always come back from these workshops with new conflicting things. How can you attend three workshops in one week on three different things and be expected to pass all these things on to educators and expect them to implement these things? Really, it is frustrating.

Educators maintain that they have developed a negative attitude towards policy changes because of the manner in which they are being introduced. They feel that it is easy for the policy formulators to formulate as many policies as they can because they do not know what is happening on the ground. These educators claim that they are not given time to put these into practice. One educator feels that policymakers make all these policies at once just to shift the blame from them. This educator feels that policymakers wish to be seen to have done something to address the disparities of the past. Yet, the actual implementation is not being monitored and, in fact, very little is taking place on the
ground. This educator expresses his frustration: “Really, this is frustrating. We are expected to implement all these things at once”.

Most participants remarked on the extensive changes which have taken place in education since the change in government in 1994. These participants complained that they are expected to implement these changes with little training and/or at times without any training. This impacts negatively on their work as they lose confidence. The participants also maintain that there are no mechanisms in place to monitor these changes. The principal of school B expressed his feelings:

I really feel sorry for the Department officials. These people have a difficult job to do. They can't reach out to schools because they have a lot of changes to pass on to us. As a result, they spend a lot of time running workshops and they have no time to check if these things are being implemented.

This is confirmed by the Department of Education official who acknowledges the impact this may have on school principals who have to relay the information to members of staff and oversee the implementation of policy. According to the official, principals have to attend numerous briefing sessions and process complex information on policy which leads to information overload. The official adds:

Principals feel that there are just too many things they have to manage. Moreover, principals are not even familiar with most if not all of these things. This means principals are not comfortable at all.

**Discussion**

According to Everard and Morris (1996:219-220), one of the reasons why plans for implementing change fail is that reformers function on a different level from that of the people to be affected by the change. Thus, for any change to be successful reformers should ensure that implementers understand how it affects them and develop a positive attitude towards it.

People are more likely to develop a positive attitude towards a change that takes place in an evolutionary way. Principals and educators maintain that there are no mechanisms in place to
monitor whether changes are being implemented or not. This is in contrast with the view of Fullan and Miles (1999:83) who assert that substantial efforts should be devoted to tasks like monitoring implementation, keeping everyone informed of what is happening, linking multiple-change projects, locating unsolved problems and taking clear coping action.

4.4.3 Role of principals in times of change

School principals should be the people that educators look to for guidance, direction and support, particularly during times of change. Therefore, principals should read the policy documents thoroughly, process the information and determine what is relevant for their schools. They should relay the information to the relevant people by means of workshops, meetings and developmental programmes. This implies that the role of the principal is crucial in understanding the processes of policy implementation.

Principals in this study regard their role in times of change as to help educators and other staff members to understand changes that they are expected to implement. The principal of school B maintains that it is his responsibility to ensure that everyone at school understands how to implement the new policies. If they fail, it means he has failed to carry out his responsibilities. However, this principal is concerned about the number of changes that principals are expected to relay to their staff members. This principal complains that because of a number of workshops and/or briefing sessions that principals attend, it becomes difficult to read the documents that they receive from these workshops. He also complains that these briefing sessions are not always fruitful as facilitators are not always clear about the contents of these sessions. Hence, principals go back to their schools unsure of what to relay to their staff members. The principal of school A explains: “I think the Department should hire people with expertise. Most of us are really not happy with some of these facilitators”.

The principal of school D confirms that changes affect his role because he has to attend meetings most of the time. This principal maintains that when he comes back from these meetings/workshops there are many issues needing his attention leaving very little time to report to his staff. The principal of school C agrees that principals do not have time to relay the information to educators, nor to check if it is being implemented because they are always away from the schools. This principal expressed his frustration:
What frustrates is that we attend meetings after meetings and we have no time to give feedback to our educators. By the time you get it there is too much to report. When you start thinking where to begin you get confused and end up going back to your own way of doing things.

An educator at school D confirms that principals always attend workshops. Due to the number of workshops that principals attend it takes time for educators to get feedback from the principals. As a result, it becomes difficult for them to understand these policies. This educator expresses her frustration:

Principals attend too many workshops and then come back with too much information. Worse part principals are sometimes not even sure of these things. But we are expected to understand and implement these things.

Educators complain that their principals do not perform their role of empowering them by acquainting them with the policy changes. Educators claim that they expect their principals to be a source of information, but this is often not the case. An educator in school B maintains that they need their principals during these times of changes to guide and direct them. This educator explains: “I think we need principals most to understand what is happening in the education system. But principals are always in meetings”.

Discussion

For any change to be successfully implemented the principal should not only be knowledgeable of the role that he/she needs to play during the times of change, but should also become more proficient in that role. Basson et al (1991:648) maintain that the first task of a school principal is to provide advise and psychological support in the programme of change. There is more likelihood that educators will accept and implement changes more readily if the principal actively supports them. Basson et al (1998:648) are of the opinion that the school principal’s support role gives some prestige to the changes taking place in the school and engenders a feeling of dedication among the participants in the process of change.
4.5 THE INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE OF PRINCIPALS

Schools are about teaching and learning and, therefore, the principal should ensure that this takes place effectively and efficiently. Educators look to the principal for instructional leadership to enable them perform their instructional tasks, especially when new changes are being effected (cf 4.4.4). In times of policy change, the principal has to ensure that teaching and learning take place in the manner prescribed by the current policies. Thus, policy changes taking place in the South African education system require that the principal should provide this kind of leadership to educators. The principal should provide direction and guidance to educators and support them in implementing these changes correctly. Pretorius (1998b:105) maintains, though, that this does not mean that the principal has to take responsibility for a group of learners or a learning programme, but his/her involvement with the instructional programme of the school is needed as instructional leader.

4.5.1 Understanding of the instructional role of principals

For the principal to perform the instructional role effectively and efficiently, he/she needs to understand the role and how to perform it. The principal should ensure that educators and learners know and understand what role the principal should perform so that effective teaching and learning can take place. Likewise, educators need to understand the instructional role of the principal so that co-operation is ensured and tension between the principal and educators prevented.

Principals and educators interviewed in this study have different understanding of what the instructional role of the principal entails. Each group has its own perceptions and expectations of this role. However, all groups acknowledge that they are unsure as to what role the principal should perform as instructional leader. All groups maintain that the principal is an important figure in the school setting. They are of the opinion that without the presence of a good principal, the school cannot achieve its goals. The principal at school C sums up his lack of understanding of instructional role of the principal as follows:

I don’t have a fair understanding of the role of the principal as instructional leader. But I think it means that the principal is or should be there to guide educators, to give them
instructions, telling them what to do and how to do that. In short the principal is there as a figurehead. But I'm not quite sure whether this is what it really entails or not.

The fact that the principals interviewed are not sure of their instructional leadership role is alarming and indicates that the courses on instructional leadership they attended were insufficient. This lack of understanding and confidence has a negative effect on the role of the principal as instructional leader. The principal who lacks confidence in his/her role cannot fulfill this role effectively and will lack authority in his/her dealings with the educators in the school. All four principals insisted that they are not quite sure whether they understand the instructional role of the principal and if they perform it correctly or not. This is how the principal at school D expresses his uncertainty: "Really, I must say I'm not sure whether I'm doing it (instructional role) correctly. But I try to ensure that there is effective teaching and learning in the school".

Meanwhile, educators have their own perceptions and expectations of the instructional role of the principal. Almost all educators seem to reduce the role of the principal to that of supporting them with the necessary resources so that they can perform their instructional tasks effectively. However, educators in the four schools acknowledge that principals are unable to make the necessary resources available because schools have limited funds. As far as the subject matter is concerned, all educators maintain that there is very little that the principal can do to help them deal with the content of the subject. They argue that principals are not specialists and are not even trained in certain subjects. Thus, educators feel that principals cannot tell them how to teach or approach a particular subject. This is how an educator in school B puts it:

I think the principal's role is to ensure that we get the necessary resources to teach and that everything runs well in the school. But the principal is struggling because there is no money to buy these resources. I don't think the principal can help me with the subject matter. For example, how can the principal tell me what should I do in Accounting? The principal knows nothing about the subject.

It emerged in the interviews that both the principals and educators do not know exactly what the instructional role of the principal entails.
The official of the Department of Education maintained that some principals in the district are good instructional leaders, whereas others still need to be supported to ensure that they fulfill their instructional role. The official contends that certain factors contribute to the situation where the principal fails to fulfill his/her instructional role, among others the lack of motivation. The official explains:

Some people are generally motivated and they would just move along. You (the Department of Education) tell them a thing and show them how to do it or they attend a workshop once or twice and then they immediately move with the process.

Discussion

The responses of the principals and educators confirm what Ginsberg (1988:276) maintains, namely that more time is needed to research instructional leadership for principals. All principals interviewed in this study mentioned that they were not sure whether they were performing their instructional role correctly. Lack of confidence has a negative impact on the school. Principals should be certain of what they are doing otherwise they can lead their schools into entropy. Bailey and Dyck (1990:1) regard the principal as the key individual in facilitating school improvement. The principal is seen as instructional leader rather than a manager of buildings and people. Thus, the principal should work with educators to improve instruction in order to increase learner achievement.

The fact that educators maintain that there is very little that the principal can do to help them with the subject matter is a cause for concern since the main function of the principal is to ensure that effective teaching and learning take place. As Smith, Sparks and Thurlow (2001:10) point out, instructional leadership focuses on the core mission of the school, that is, classroom instruction, paying attention to what is happening at the chalk face. Therefore, the principal should know what is happening in the classroom even though he/she may not be actively involved in the teaching of that particular subject. But the principal should monitor the activities of the educators, for example by checking that educators have completed lesson preparation, are present in the classroom and mark learners’ books.
4.5.2 Changing responsibilities

As policies governing education change so too does the role of the different role players. Obviously, effective teaching and learning can only take place in a school where every role player knows and performs his/her role effectively and efficiently. The principal as the head of the school should help educators to understand their changing roles/responsibilities and perform them effectively so that the school can realise its goals. The principal should provide assistance and guidance to educators so that they can keep abreast of their changing responsibilities. However, educators will only be willing to accept guidance from principals they trust and respect and in whom they have confidence.

All participants in this study agree that the responsibilities of all role players in the school situation have changed. While principals interviewed in the study regard the smooth running of the school as their main responsibility, they also acknowledge that because of changes in the education system the manner in which they perform this role/responsibility has changed. For example, schools now have school management teams (SMTs) that help the principal with some of the management tasks. Thus, the smooth running of the school can no longer be regarded as the responsibility of the principal alone. Educators, learners (in secondary schools) and parents should also be involved in the decision-making processes. The principal at school A describes his responsibilities as follows:

As far as I'm concerned my main responsibility is to ensure that the school runs smoothly. I must ensure that educators are teaching and learners are learning properly. But I delegate some of my responsibilities to the deputy principal and even to the heads of departments.

However, the new responsibilities create different challenges. Principals in this study are of the opinion that more power has been given to the educators, which makes it more difficult for principals to monitor effective teaching and learning in the school. The principal of school B explained his position: “Things have changed. Educators have powers now. You have to be very careful of what you are doing all the time.”

Although educators agree that their responsibilities have changed, they maintain that these changes are not always effected as set out in policy documents. For example, educators complain that
theoretically they are part of decision-making process in their schools, but in most cases the management teams (principals, deputy principals and the heads of departments) always meet first and then come to them with a decision that they have already agreed upon. They expect educators to endorse what has already been decided upon. An educator explains:

How can you be regarded as part of decision-making personnel if you are not involved from the beginning? These people (the management teams) still decide for us. They meet first and take decisions and then meet us so that we can endorse what they have already agreed upon.

This implies that educators do not regard themselves as part of teams in their schools. Moreover, educators maintain that the new approach to teaching has changed their role as well as that of learners. This new approach to teaching gives educators freedom to choose instructional content and methods. But some principals find it difficult to accept this new freedom of choice. In addition, the role of learners has changed. An educator in school B indicated that the new approach requires that learners be fully responsible for their learning. The educator continued:

There has been a drastic change. Now we are facilitators and we are no longer expected to do all the talking, but we just co-ordinate groups in the class. Learners are now actively involved in what is taking place in the classroom. But I'm finding it difficult to cope with. We were not adequately trained to do these things.

Educators also mentioned their increased administrative responsibilities following the introduction of an outcomes-based approach. An educator in school C explained:

There is also too much paperwork. We (educators) have to make sure that we fill in these papers so that when an official comes he/she can see that a particular thing has been done even if that thing was not done well.

Many educators felt that school principals did not fully appreciate their new responsibility.
Discussion

The change in the responsibilities of role players in the school suggests that all role-players need to be supported in order to understand the new and additional roles that they have to perform. Principals regard ensuring that teaching and learning take place in the school as their main responsibility but seem unclear as to how this should be achieved. Kruger and Van Zyl (2000:8) advocate that this entails creating conditions in the school that ensure that the learners receive quality instruction both inside and outside the classroom. This is their main function; other responsibilities are subordinate to this. Bailey and Dyck (1990:1) agree that the principal works with the educators to improve instruction in order to increase learner achievement. Creating conditions implies ensuring that educators are adequately empowered to perform the new responsibilities effectively.

Williams (1983:1) feels that the performance of the school and its staff is greatly affected by the principal’s leadership role. Hoberg (1993:65) agrees that what is achieved in the school in terms of the quality of education will invariably depend on the crucial leadership role of the principal and his/her ability to foster organisational commitment among the staff, learners and parents.

4.6 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION IN KWAMASHU AREA

Presently, outcomes-based education is being implemented in South African schools, including schools in KwaMashu area. Principals and educators interviewed in this study indicated that they are struggling to implement this new approach effectively. It emerged that both principals and educators in KwaMashu area are in a state of confusion as far as the implementation of outcomes-based education is concerned. This is compounded by the complex manner in which the outcomes-based approach is being implemented. This confusion could have been avoided or minimised if adequate training was offered before the new approach was implemented. Principals in KwaMashu schools are uncertain how outcomes-based education should be implemented and what role they should play in the implementation of outcomes-based education. Thus, it is difficult for these principals to support educators who desperately need guidance because they are also struggling with the implementation of this new approach. However, the educators’ understanding is often clearer than that of their principals (cf 1.1).
4.6.1 Understanding of outcomes-based education

In order for outcomes-based education to be implemented successfully, all staff members, learners and parents/community members should have a clear understanding of the approach and its objectives. It is not possible for the principal to give direction and to ensure that outcomes-based education is correctly implemented if he/she does not fully understand it.

Principals and educators interviewed in this study indicated that they do not fully understand outcomes-based education. Principals attribute this lack of understanding to the fact that they have not been given adequate training in outcomes-based education. They maintain that educators often understand outcomes-based education better than principals do. As a result, they rely on educators. The principal of school A explained: “In OBE educators are leading and principals are following. I think this is abnormal. The head (principal) must always be in front”.

What compounds the problem is that educators too do not have a fair understanding of what should be happening in the classroom. Although outcomes-based education has been running for a few years in primary schools, principals and educators in schools A and D (primary schools) like principals and educators in schools B and C (secondary schools) where outcomes-based education started in 2001 maintain that they do not have a fair understanding of outcomes-based education.

The principal of school A describes his understanding of outcomes-based education:

I think outcomes-based education means that education should be learner-centred. The learner should be actively involved in what is taking place in the classroom and the educator should act as a facilitator. I think outcomes-based education emphasises the outcome that the learner should produce. But I must add that I am not quite certain how these outcomes should be achieved, since we lack the necessary training.

This was confirmed by educators. They explained that they do not completely understand outcomes-based education, but that their understanding is far better than that of their principals. This was the case in both primary and secondary schools, despite the fact that outcomes-based education was introduced in primary schools a few years ago. Educators maintain that, in most cases their principals rely on them to implement outcomes-based education in their schools. The principals’ lack of understanding results in their acceptance of everything educators say. One
educator explained: "It is very difficult for the principal because he knows very little about outcomes-based education. So the principal accepts whatever we (educators) say". However, the principals should always be at the forefront of what is happening at school. Another educator quickly added: "At times some educators mislead the principal by using outcomes-based education terms and they (educators) know that the principal does not understand these terms".

Meanwhile, the official of the Department of Education argues that educators should have a fair understanding because they have attended workshops held on outcomes-based education. Moreover, the Department has recently set up circuit structures where educators within a circuit form committees for various Learning Areas. The official explained that these committees should meet regularly, exchange ideas and work together to improve their understanding of outcomes-based education.

Discussion

The fact that educators have attended more courses on outcomes-based education than their principals seems to suggest that their understanding of outcomes-based education is clearer than that of their principals. However, principals should ensure that departmental policies are correctly implemented (cf 1.1). If principals are not certain of what to monitor, educators may take advantage of this and teaching and learning can suffer. According to Garson (1999:1), many educators complain that their principals were not supportive of the new curriculum. Principals are not supportive because they have not been adequately trained how to support their staff in implementing this new curriculum. It is difficult for the principal to be an instructional leader if he/she does not understand curriculum changes.

Kudlas (1994:32) cautions that before initiating outcomes-based education, the district should be fully enlightened of its merits, cautioned about its problems and carefully guided through its implications. This warning was not, however, heeded in the South African context. Hence, principals who should be monitoring implementation encounter problems. As a result, educators are in a difficult position, as they require leadership to understand curriculum changes, but that leadership is often unavailable.
4.6.2 Attitudes towards outcomes-based education

Most participants maintain that they had a positive attitude towards outcomes-based education when it was introduced and were looking forward to its implementation. They maintain that they hoped that by introducing outcomes-based education, the Department of Education was going to address disparities in education. Therefore, they supported the idea of the new curriculum because their schools were previously disadvantaged. These participants were of the opinion that their schools were going to be improved so that they could compete equally with the previously advantaged schools. The principal of school B confirms this that he was very excited about outcomes-based education when it was introduced until he saw the practical difficulties. Principals indicate that when they started implementing outcomes-based education, they found it difficult to implement. But the principal of school B argues that his initial understanding was that outcomes-based education was going to be evaluated first. This principal comments on outcomes-based education as follows:

I supported outcomes-based education because they (the Department of Education) said it was going to be piloted first. I hoped we would see how the pilot schools operate, before we all implement it. Instead what happened is that it was piloted on the one hand and implemented on the other.

Principals also complain that they were never asked to comment on the implementation of outcomes-based education. They maintain that because they are uncertain about what is happening in the outcomes-based class, they do not know how to monitor the activities of educators and learners. This makes them frustrated. They are also concerned that their schools are unable to purchase the necessary teaching and learning materials due to limited funds. Principals maintain that this problem arises because most parents are reluctant to pay school fees.

Educators confirm that they initially supported outcomes-based education but are now frustrated because they get little help from their principals and the Department of Education. This is how an educator in school A explains this:
My attitude was positive. But now I'm finding it (outcomes-based education) so frustrating. What makes things worse is that the principal cannot even provide us with the necessary resources.

The official of the Department of Education confirms that in the initial stages both principals and educators appeared to be very positive about outcomes-based education, but they are becoming more negative. The official attributes this to a number of factors, for example the level of understanding of Curriculum 2005, lack of teaching and learning materials, large class sizes, et cetera. He sums up this dissatisfaction as follows:

Some people (principals and educators) no longer see this outcomes-based education thing as being the correct education solution anymore. They now resist it. Yes, there is now some resentment. Then, we have to slowly push people going.

Discussion

Jansen (1998:327) questions the extent to which principals and educators were involved in curriculum policy. He argues that only a small elite group of educators, often expert and white, have driven the Learning Area Committees and other structures in which outcomes-based education was developed (cf 2.3.2). While principals and educators indicated that they had a positive attitude towards outcomes-based education when it was introduced, they now appear to be demotivated. A school whose principal lacks motivation will find it difficult to motivate his/her staff to work productively.

4.6.3 Training in outcomes-based education

All educators in this study have attended outcomes-based education training courses organised or offered by both the Department of Education and Ikhwezi Community College of Education (the Non-Governmental Organisation) (cf 4.3.2). Primary school educators (schools A & D) have attended more training courses than educators from secondary schools (schools B & C). This is because outcomes-based education has been running in primary schools for a few years, while in secondary schools outcomes-based education was implemented for the first time in 2001 (cf 1.6). Training courses are offered by means of cascade model. A few educators attend a training course
for a day or a few days and are expected to go back to schools and train their colleagues (cf. 2.3.4). In contrast, most principals have attended only between one and three training courses. Principals from primary schools (schools A & D) have attended more training courses than principals from secondary schools (schools B & C). Both principals and educators interviewed are concerned about the lack of training that they have experienced.

Principals contend that the training they received was not sufficient and this has a negative impact on their instructional role. They argue that unless they receive enough training, outcomes-based education will not be implemented effectively in their schools. The principal of school A maintains that the instructional role of the principal has been greatly affected by the introduction of outcomes-based education and that they should have been adequately trained. As a result, principals do not understand outcomes-based education, its underlying principles, and the terminology used. This puts the principal in a difficult position because the principal has to rely on the educators for information relating to outcomes-based education and the implementation thereof. Thus, it is easy for educators to mislead the principal who tend to accept whatever the educator says. The principal of school D concurs:

Because of the lack of training, I rely on educators for information. What makes things worse is that educators too are not sure of what they are doing. Really, this makes my work very difficult because we (principals and educators) are not quite sure of what we are doing.

This was also confirmed by an educator in school B who contends that although their understanding of outcomes-based education is better than that of their principals, they are still not sure of what they are doing in the classroom. This is attributed to the lack of training. This negatively impacts on the teaching-learning situation. One educator in school B explains:

It is very difficult to say you understand this thing because whenever we attend a workshop we get new information. Even the facilitators themselves are not sure of what they tell us. Everyone is confused.

However, the Department official disputes that principals and educators lack training in outcomes-based education. He claims that the KwaMashu district has facilitators who were recruited from
educators and given intensive training in outcomes-based education. These facilitators then draw educators out of schools and train them. These educators are in turn expected to go back to their respective schools and train their colleagues. This implies that the whole process of training is a 'cascading one'. However, educators complain that the facilitators recruited by the district do not fully understand outcomes-based education.

The Department of Education official does, however, agree that not much has been done to empower principals to monitor the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools. According to the Department official, the Department of Education has required principals to attend a one-day workshop in the case of secondary school principals and a two-day workshop in the case of primary school principals. The emphasis was mainly on the basic tenets of outcomes-based education, such as the different learning areas and how to manage outcomes-based education. This official adds: “But I must admit this support is not enough, the Department does not have enough money to support all educators (also principals), as we would have liked”.

Discussion

The complaints raised by educators with regard to the cascade model and the facilitators confirm the criticism of Chisholm (2000:19) of this strategy. Chisholm contends that district trainers often did not understand outcomes-based education (cf 2.3.4). She (2000:14) maintains that implementation of an outcomes-based education curriculum framework ultimately rests on adequately prepared educators, motivated to teach and supported in their work. Educators can only be motivated to do their work if they have been adequately trained and they know exactly what is expected of them (cf 2.3.4). Pretorius (1998b:108) maintains that if the country’s educators are not thoroughly trained for an outcomes-based approach and the implementation does not go hand-in-hand with constant and well-planned support, the high expectations of educational reform will not be achieved. The lack of training on the part of educators makes them even more reliant on their principals for guidance. This guidance is not forthcoming because principals are also ill-prepared for outcomes-based education.
4.6.3.1 Training offered by the private providers

A number of private providers (Non-Governmental Organisations) are actively involved in training and assisting educators in the implementation of outcomes-based education. According to the principals and educators, these private providers have helped them tremendously particularly as the Department of Education is often limited by financial constraints. Educators maintain that the private providers have also helped them with teaching and learning materials. An educator of school A expresses his appreciation as follows:

If it were not for the NGOs, particularly Ikhwezi (Ikhwezi Community College of Education), educators in the district would be lagging far behind in outcomes-based education. These people are really supporting us, though the support is not enough. But they are trying.

Educators argue that workshops organised by the private providers are more informative and fruitful than workshops that are organised and run by the Department of Education. Principals too praised the private providers for the role they play in assisting their educators with the implementation of outcomes-based education. The principal of school C maintains that he mostly relies on the materials given by these private providers as the school and the Department of Education cannot supply sufficient teaching and learning materials.

The Department of Education official agrees that private providers have done a tremendous amount of work in schools in the past, but maintains that these Non-Governmental Organisations are no longer there. According to the official, the private providers minimised their involvement after the Department of Education started co-ordinating their activities. The official maintains that the Department of Education decided to co-ordinate these activities as it felt that there were too many private providers doing too many things at the same time. This was causing confusion among the educators. Moreover, the Department was not sure whether the content of training by private providers concurred with the content coming from the National Department of Education. To address this issue, private providers are now required to apply for the right to provide assistance to schools through the Curriculum Unit (North Durban Regional office). Thus, the official describes the role of private providers as in the past and present:
Yes, the private providers have played a very significant role in the early days of the implementation of outcomes-based education, but more recently I haven’t seen the NGOs around any more. I think the Department is doing the work on its own. But in the early days they were there in their numbers.

Discussion

Chisholm (2000:60) argues that NGOs are not adequately involved in supporting educators with the implementation of outcomes-based education. Where some involvement exists, the messages they send are not always the same. Conflicting messages can result in more confusion instead of helping educators with the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools. Outcomes-based education is a new concept to most educators as well as the Department of Education’s officials so it needs to be communicated by well-informed groups.

Chisholm (2000:100) suggests that the development of a partnership involving the Provincial departments, the NGOs and tertiary institutions should be encouraged to strengthen ongoing professional support and development at school level. However, the Provincial departments, Regional departments and/or District offices should ensure that they deal with only reputable NGOs and/or tertiary institutions. They should guard against collaborating with the private providers who are not really committed to providing a service. This does not, however, imply that all NGOs are bad. They have done a praiseworthy job in helping educators since the introduction of outcomes-based education in South African schools. Without the NGOs it would have been difficult for the Department of Education to reach all educators, particularly in the remote areas.

4.7 PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY KWAMASHU SCHOOLS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION

Many schools in South Africa are situated in previously deprived communities which are impoverished. While the Department of Education has tried to address a number of problems concerning the implementation of outcomes-based education, these difficulties have not been adequately addressed. Past disparities between the previously advantaged and previously disadvantaged schools still exist. Thus, the problems encountered by schools in the KwaMashu area may be similar to problems encountered by schools in other previously disadvantaged areas.
4.7.1 Lack of teaching and learning materials

Outcomes-based education can only be successfully implemented in a school where enough resources are available. All principals and educators interviewed in this study expressed their concern about the lack of teaching and learning materials in their school.

While one educator in school B acknowledges that the management team (the principal, deputy principal and the heads of departments) tries to make resources available, he argues that these resources are inadequate. The educator blames parents for their unwillingness to pay school fees and/or to buy textbooks and other needed materials for their children. An educator in school D expressed her frustration: “Sometimes you go to the principal to ask for something and the principal tells you that there is no money to buy that material. And you really get frustrated”. Educators maintain that they find it difficult to implement outcomes-based education because their schools lack teaching and learning materials.

The principal of school A confirms that outcomes-based education is going to fail if the issue of resources is not addressed soon. While principals acknowledge that it is their responsibility to ensure that educators get the necessary resources, they argue that without money there is very little that they can do. Principals feel that they are in a difficult position because their schools do not have funds to make resources available to educators. At the same time educators are in desperate need of these resources. The principal of school A describes his position as follows: “The principal is regarded as a failure if educators are failing to implement outcomes-based education because there are no resources”.

However, the official of the Department of Education feels that the issue of resources is being exaggerated. This official maintains that schools get certain funds from the Department of Education and these funds are allocated according to the needs of the individual school. He contends that these funds should be used to buy the resources to be used by outcomes-based educators and learners. The official describes the issue of funds allocated to schools by the Department of Education:
Each school gets an allocation from the Department called ‘the norms and standards allocation’. Schools are expected to use some of this money to buy textbooks and other teaching and learning materials.

However, the official confirms that most schools complain that the money from the Department is inadequate. The official adds that schools need to generate their own funds to supplement the money they get from the Department of Education.

Meanwhile, all principals interviewed argue that the funds that they get from the Department of Education is insufficient to address the basic needs of their schools. The principal of school B complaints that the Department of Education always talks about the ‘norms and standards allocation’, but the Department does not indicate to the public that they prescribe what schools must do with the money. The principal of school B points out: “They insist that priority number one should be the stationery. But the money allocated to us is not even enough to buy that stationery”. Likewise, the principal of school D complains about the ‘norms and standards allocation’ and the manner in the Department of Education is handling this issue. This principal feels that the Department is putting principals in a difficult position as the Department always maintains publicly that they give schools funds. This principal contends that some parents feel that it is not necessary for them to pay school fees because the Department of Education provides funding to schools. The principal adds: “Really, this is misleading and frustrating”.

Discussion

The provision of resources is an issue debated since the introduction of outcomes-based education. Jansen (1998:330) maintains that outcomes-based education has not taken adequate account of the resource status of schools in South Africa. Schools in South Africa have different backgrounds and this has impacted on whatever educational change is being introduced. Vally and Spreen (1998:14) maintain that the previously privileged schools have access to the private sector for supplemental materials and technologies. Meanwhile, most previously disadvantaged schools have little or no access to the private sector, so they struggle to get resources.
4.7.2 Lack of resources in the community

Like most of the previously disadvantaged communities, KwaMashu area has a lack of resources. This impacts negatively on the schools in KwaMashu. For example, there is only one municipal library that serves the whole township and the surrounding informal settlement and this library is under resourced (cf 4.2.1).

The principal of school C complains about the lack of resources in the community. This makes the schools’ work even more difficult. This principal maintains that in their school they have very limited resources and would have used community resources if these had been available. He also complains that one library is not enough for the community and calls for at least three libraries. This principal suggested: “The community of KwaMashu must demand these things (libraries & other facilities). That’s what they pay rates for”. The principal of school A agrees and adds that their learners are unable to utilise this library because learners cannot afford taxi fare to and from the library. In addition, younger learners cannot travel to the library on their own. For all practical purposes, the library is, therefore, of little use to learners.

An educator in school B who confirmed that whenever educators give their learners activities that require the library, very few would do those activities. The rest would claim that they were unable to go to the library because they did not have taxi fare.

Another educator maintains that the problem is compounded by the fact that most of the parents are not educated and do not read the newspapers. This educator explains:

Children are expected to do research and have cuttings, but there are no books in their homes, as most parents do not read books or newspapers. What makes things worse is that the library is far from their homes.

Educators maintain that while outcomes-based education demands that learners should have resources available to them, parents cannot afford to send their children to the library or to make copies of articles available at the library. This is due to the high level of unemployment among the parents. Educators also complain that the township has only one library and suggest that more
libraries should be erected in KwaMashu township. One educator expresses his concern: "KwaMashu is a big township, it cannot afford to have one library. We need more libraries here".

The school principal must ensure that close co-operation between the school and the community is maintained. Both principals and educators acknowledge that they have, thus far, not appealed to the community for support nor explained the necessity of learners having access to newspapers and magazines. While schools A and D maintain that they have met parents, they acknowledge that they have not spoken to the community at large about outcomes-based education. The principal of school D asks: "How can you involve the community when even parents who have children in this school show no interest in the education of their children"?

Discussion

Van Schalkwyk (1993:20) states that schools cannot function in isolation from their communities. Where the community's level of involvement and interest is low, the school should reach out and make people and institutions aware of their responsibility, keep them abreast of events and inform them of new trends in education. Thus, principals need to ensure that they communicate with the community to make resources that schools need available in these communities. Van Schalkwyk (1988:266) maintains that the education system and the community that is able to implement partnership in a responsible way will derive much benefit from the incalculable possibilities it will open up.

4.7.3 Problematic timetables

The introduction of outcomes-based education resulted in a number of changes in school organisation. Participants maintain that a major change is the changing of the timetable. These participants contend that outcomes-based education classes have one-hour periods, whereas the old structure had 30 or 35 minute periods.

 Principals of school A, B and C maintain that in their schools all grades now have one-hour periods to accommodate the outcome-based classes. School A changed from 30 minute periods, and schools B and C from 35 minute periods. This was done in order to minimise confusion that would have been experienced if grades that still follow the old structure had their own timetable, while the
outcomes-based grades another timetable. In contrast, the principal of school D maintains that in
their school they have different timetables. Grades that still follow the old structure have 30 minute
periods, while outcomes-based classes follow one-hour periods. The principal describes their
position as follows:

We have decided to use three different tones. The siren rings differently for one-hour
periods (outcomes-based classes), for 30 minutes periods (old structure) and for the
break.

The principal adds: “This is confusing to all of us (educators and learners), but we have to get used
to it”.

Educators in schools B and C (secondary schools) who use outcomes-based education and the old
curriculum maintain that they find it difficult to cope with both curricula. These educators maintain
that this is very frustrating. They go to an outcomes-based class and organise learners in groups
which work independently. The following period they go to a class that follows the old curriculum
and they are then expected to stand in front of the class and teach. They maintain that this has a
negative impact on outcomes-based education. One educator in school B is of opinion that it would
be better if educators who teach the old curriculum do not also teach outcomes-based education.
This educator expressed his concern: “This is funny. In an outcomes-based class you are a
facilitator and in an old structure you stand in front of the class and deliver the matter”.

Another educator in school B confirms that teaching outcomes-based education and the old
curriculum is confusing, but it is also challenging. This educator maintains that she has also started
following an outcomes-based approach in the classes that follow the old curriculum. This educator
maintains that she has divided learners into groups in her subject as required in outcomes-based
education. This educator claims that outcomes-based education has taught her how to involve
learners actively in their learning. But she quickly pointed out that most of the learners are not
coping with this new approach. This educator sums it up: “Learners do not want to work on their
own”.

All educators maintain that their principals have not assisted them in managing the different time
schedules applicable to the old and new curricula.
Discussion

Wilkens (1998:64) states that the timetable of a traditional teaching approach changes dramatically within the outcomes-based approach. In an outcomes-based approach, reference is made to notional time. No specific number of hours is allocated to any learning programme. The time that should be spent on the learning programmes is expressed in percentages. The weighting of a learning programme informs the schedule of work (timetable). This is sometimes not clear to those having to implement outcomes-based education in their schools.

Pretorius (1998b:100) maintains that schools need to be flexible concerning time. Likewise, Wilkens (1998:66) contends that the timetable should be arranged in such a way that it meets the different demands of the (foundation, intermediate and senior phases in primary schools.

4.7.4 Problems with the implementation of outcomes-based education in the classrooms

Educators maintain that while they experience problems with the practical part of outcomes-based education in the classroom, they get little support from their principals. One educator in school D explains:

My understanding is that the principal has a very little understanding of outcomes-based education. So it is not easy for him to support us. He just listens to us most of the time and expects us to come with solutions whenever there is a problem with regard to outcomes-based education.

Educators specifically mentioned the following problems:

4.7.4.1 The terminology used in outcomes-based education

All educators complained about the terminology used in outcomes-based materials and textbooks. Educators in school A, C and D in particular struggle to understand the terminology used in outcomes-based. An educator in school D feels that the language used is too complicated and confusing. This makes it difficult for them to pass on something to the learners that they do not
fully understand. One educator in school A expresses her concerns that learners cannot understand the different concepts used in outcomes-based education. This educator explains:

I find the language used in these textbooks too difficult to understand. Just imagine if I, as an educator have a problem with the language used, what do you expect with the learners?

Another educator adds:

You must remember, these textbooks are written in English and our learners struggle to express themselves in English. So how can they play an active role without the educator teaching them?

The problem is compounded by the fact that principals are not conversant with the terminology and are therefore unable to provide any assistance to educators.

Discussion

What was said by educators interviewed in this study with regard to the terminology used in outcomes-based education confirms what Jansen (1998:323) contends, namely that outcomes-based education is too complex, confusing and at times contradictory (cf 2.3.2). Jansen (1998:323) argues that because the language used is inaccessible, it is difficult for most educators to give these policies meaning through their classroom practices.

Chisholm (2000:18) concurs that dissatisfaction has stemmed from the complex language and confusing terminology used in Curriculum 2005. Chisholm identifies three particular problems: the use of meaningless jargon, vague and ambiguous language; the unnecessary use of unfamiliar terms to replace familiar ones; and the lack of a common understanding and use of Curriculum 2005.

4.7.4.2 The difficulties of assessment

Educators mentioned their difficulties with the assessment procedures that are followed in outcomes-based. They argue that these difficulties are compounded by the fact that their principals
cannot help them, as they know very little about these procedures. Educators contend that their principals do not know how learners' achievements are assessed and what is actually assessed. An educator in school C says: "No one is well trained in this OBE thing. As a result, we (educators) do not know whether we are right or not. Even the management team is confused". Principals confirmed that they are not familiar with these new assessment procedures. The principal of school B also mentioned that educators design the progress reports in his school because they know what is assessed and how to assess. The principal of school A confirms that he does not know how learners' performance is assessed.

An educator in school C explains that they assess the performance of their learners on a continuous basis, in contrast with tests and examinations which were used in the past. This educator, however, points out that they still have difficulties with assessment because there is no common procedure followed by all schools. This educator explained: "You see my wife and I teach the same grade, but she is in another District. I asked her to help me with my work the previous night, she couldn't, but we are teaching the same grade". This educator goes on to ask: "How do you explain this to the parent who does not know what is happening at schools? How can Districts so close to each other use different assessment procedures?"

Likewise, an educator in school A is also concerned that learners are expected to assess themselves. This educator feels that learners at primary school level do not fully understand English and, therefore, do not understand what has to be done. According to this educator the assessment procedures do not achieve the goals they were meant to achieve. As this educator puts it: "Learners have a problem of assessing themselves. They do not understand the language".

**Discussion**

Assessment is one of an educator's most important activities in outcomes-based education. Assessment is an indispensable part of any curriculum, particularly in outcomes-based education. In developing the curriculum, simultaneous attention should have been given to the development of policy for assessment (Polenza & Monyokolo, 1999:234). As Killen (1999:18) puts it, without appropriate assessment procedures, educators will not know whether learners have achieved the outcomes and more importantly, neither will the learners (cf 2.3.6). For the principal to ensure that learners are correctly assessed, he/she should be familiar with the assessment procedures.
4.7.4.3 Large classes

Educators regard overcrowding in their classes as one of the difficulties they have to deal with. An educator in school D complains that overcrowding makes it difficult to pay individual attention to each learner and/or each group, and to facilitate the achievement of the desired outcomes. Another educator explained: “Our classes are full such that putting this thing into practice becomes very difficult”.

Educators argue that the Department of Education should not have embarked on rationalisation and redeployment of educators if the Department wanted outcomes-based education to be implemented successfully. They maintain that rationalisation and redeployment reduces human resources. This results in large classes which are not conducive for outcomes-based education. Overcrowding makes it difficult to maintain all groups. An educator in school B describes this:

I don’t understand these people (the Department of Education), they started by reducing us then they introduced this outcomes-based education thing. This thing needs more educators, but we lost a number of educators through rationalisation and redeployment process.

Meanwhile, another educator in school B complains that because of the numbers that they have in their classes, most have discipline problems. This educator explains that while he is busy with the one group, other groups do not concentrate on their work and start making a noise. Similarly, the principal of school A complains about the noise that is made by the outcomes-based classes. Likewise, the principal of school C also complains about the noise. This disturbs the running of the school, particularly the classes that still follow the old structure. This principal states:

In most cases, they (outcomes-based classes) make a lot of noise. When I go to check what is happening there I would find them busy with the educator doing some activities. But this is very disturbing to classes that still follow the old structure.
Discussion

Most classrooms in KwaMashu schools are overcrowded. As a result conditions in these schools are not conducive for teaching and learning in general, let alone for implementing outcomes-based education (cf 1.1.1). Jansen (1998:330) warns that outcomes-based education further undermines the already weak culture of teaching and learning in South African schools by escalating the administrative burden of charge at the very time that rationalisation further limits the human resource capacity for managing such change. Furthermore, the issue of noise mentioned by both the educator at school B and principals of schools A and C confirms what a grade one educator reported in Jansen (1999b:203):

You find it very noisy, and when you are trying to teach; you’re to do different things with different groups. The noise level .... it can be too high. Because then you can’t work with others on a quieter level. So you’ve got to control that some way. I find that quite difficult. It is quite stressful not only for the educator but also for the learners.

4.7.4.4 Lack of support from principals

Educators can only implement outcomes-based education successfully if they have the full support of their principals and District office. However, educators interviewed in this study expressed their concerns about the amount of support they get from their principals. They attribute this to the fact that principals have very little knowledge of outcomes-based education, making it difficult for principals to support their educators. An educator in school C explained: “I think there is very little that the principal can do. He does not understand OBE”.

However, almost all educators regard the role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education as that of resource-provider. Thus, educators maintain that principals should locate and provide resources. Educators also maintain that it is necessary for their principals to get people with expertise from outside to come to their schools and provide training in outcomes-based education. However, one educator at school B feels that facilitators are often not clear about outcomes-based education. Thus, neither principals nor educators receive the necessary assistance from these facilitators. This educator maintains that their principal allows them to look for help outside as the principal cannot provide that help. The educator describes this position:
The problem is that even in other schools you find that they have their own problems. You go there and find conflicting information all the time. And you end up not knowing what to do. Really, we are not comfortable at all.

The educator adds: “In fact, facilitators themselves are not quite sure about what they tell us”.

Meanwhile, principals blame the Department of Education for failing to empower them. The principal of school A maintains that it is difficult to support his educators because he has not been empowered to do this task. This principal explained his concern: “Principals have a very little information. This really, puts the principal in a very difficult position”. According to this principal, what he has done thus far regarding the implementation of outcomes-based education is to encourage his educators to work as a team and look for help outside. Likewise, the principal of school B maintains that it is difficult for him to support his educators because his role in the implementation of outcomes-based education is not clearly defined. Thus, he does not really know what role he should play other than ensuring that educators have enough teaching and learning materials. This is how this principal puts it:

Outcomes-based education does not put the principal in a picture at all. You can see the role of the educator as a facilitator, but you can hardly see what role does the principal play in outcomes-based education.

However, the Department official disagrees that the Department is not supporting schools. This official maintains that the Department of Education and/or KwaMashu district supports educators by making facilitators available to schools. However, the official acknowledges that the support offered to schools is limited by financial constraints. The official also maintains that the KwaMashu district has recently set up circuit structures for outcomes-based education. Here educators from the circuit form committees of various Learning Areas. The idea is that these committees should meet on a regular basis, exchange ideas and work as teams. While the official maintains that the district has some support structures for educators, he also agrees that not much has been done to empower principals so that they can monitor the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools. Thus, he feels that some schools are still struggling with the implementation of outcomes-based education. As he puts it: “Some educators (also principals) still have not been able to grasp the real concept of outcomes-based education”.
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Discussion

Chisholm (2000:20) found that principals and educators complain about the lack of support from their superiors. She found that the Department and school management provide far too little support and cannot support educators (cf 2.3.5). Without the support of the superiors, educators develop a negative attitude towards the implementation of outcomes-based education, as they would feel that their superiors do not value their efforts.

Krug (1992:432) maintains that effective leaders provide information for educators to plan their classes effectively. They actively support curriculum development and although principals do not teach, they need to be aware of the special needs of each instructional area. Without a broad base of knowledge, principals cannot provide the resources that educators and staff need to effectively carry out the school’s mission. However, principals also need support in order to be able to support their educators. Bray in Jansen (1998:328) argues that outcomes-based education fails in the absence of adequate support such as ‘release time, aide support, and smaller class sizes …’ These are some of the problems that principals and educators complained about in the study.

4.8 THE ROLE OF LEARNERS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION

Outcomes-based education requires that learners should be actively involved in their own education. This implies that learners should be responsible for their own learning. However, all educators maintain that learners do not perform their role as required by outcomes-based education. Most of the learners are not interested in their schoolwork; as a result they do not play an active part in their learning. According to an educator in school B, this is more prevalent in secondary schools where learners deliberately ignore their work. This educator ascribed this to the abolition of corporal punishment. Thus, educators have no proper mechanisms to discipline learners who do not do their work. This educator explained:

As far as I am concerned, OBE is producing wild learners. I really find it difficult to discipline these learners. You ask them to do something or you give them a project to do, only a very few of them will do it. There is very little you can do. You just ask them to do it again, but they won’t.
Another educator quickly adds:

The only means of discipline that I can think of is detention because we are not even allowed to make them clean the schoolyard. That’s child labour. These kids have all the rights that you can think of. But detaining them is not a solution because you are also suppose to be there, meaning you also detain yourself. And there is no security here. You expose yourself to danger.

An educator in school C confirms that generally learners are not motivated to learn irrespective of outcomes-based education or the old curriculum. However, another educator feels that learners also have a language problem and this discourages them. Learners are divided into groups, which work on their own and that the role of the educator is to monitor them. However, learners start making a noise, as the educator moves from group to group providing whatever assistance each group might require. This educator maintains that their learners do not understand English; as a result it becomes difficult for them to comprehend. Another educator in school C asks: “How can you (the learner) play an active role if you do not understand what you are required to do?” An educator in school A confirms that while outcomes-based education requires that learners should also assess themselves, this is not easy for them to do. Learners are expected to assess themselves (self-assessment) and assess their peers (peer assessment). This educator asked: “How can learners be able to assess themselves without even understanding the language (English) used?” Moreover, principals are not familiar with the assessment procedures. Most principals agree adding that the lack of final examination in outcomes-based classes exacerbates the problem.

Discussion

The findings suggest that learners do not play their role in the implementation of outcomes-based education as required. They are not ready to play this role. Killen (1999:11) is of the opinion that if learning activities are to motivate learners, they must be seen by the learners to be purposeful, useful and challenging but not impossible. Before being able to play their role effectively and efficiently, learners need to understand what is required of them and why. Thus, the principal, who is tasked with ensuring that effective learning at his/her school takes place, should motivate learners, maintain discipline and ensure that each learner is properly guided. Moreover, the
language issue should also be addressed in such a way that learners will be able to understand what is required of them.

**4.9 THE ROLE OF PARENTS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION**

Parent involvement in an education system is essential because parents should support learning at home. Therefore, the principal and his/her staff should acquire skills needed to work with parents as partners for the benefit of the learners. For outcomes-based education to be successfully implemented, all stakeholders should be involved. Thus, the principal should take the lead in keeping parents and the community members abreast of events, informing them of new trends in education and the role that parents and community members need to play in order for these changes can be successful. This implies that schools should improve the manner in which parents are involved in the education of their children.

**4.9.1 Lack of parent involvement**

Participants in this study expressed their concerns about the role played by parents in education and in the implementation of outcomes-based education. Both principals and educators maintain that parents do not play their role as required. Parents show very little or no interest in the education of their children.

Principals of schools B and C (secondary schools) feel that the issue of parent involvement in the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools is difficult, arguing that one cannot involve parents who are not well educated in an issue that confuses even educators. The principal of school B asks: “How can you expect parents to understand something that confuses educators?” This principal adds: “The issue of involving parents in our community is just a joke”.

Likewise, the principal of school C is of the opinion that if the school calls the parents to explain outcomes-based education both the principal and educators become frustrated as the parents are not interested in education. This principal based this view on the fact that parents do not attend meetings nor pay school fees. This was confirmed by an educator in school C who contends that parents in their community make it very difficult for educators to do their work. This educator
complains that parents do not co-operate with the school nor support educators in their tasks. This is how this educator states his case:

*I recently gave my class homework and one girl did not do it. When I asked her why she didn’t do my work she said her mother had asked her to look after her younger sister until very late. Then, when she tried to do the work at night the mother complained that she was wasting the candle.*

Meanwhile, principals of schools A and D (primary schools) maintain that they try to involve parents in the implementation of outcomes-based education. However, parents experience difficulties in understanding outcomes-based education. What compounds the problem is that principals and educators only partially understand outcomes-based education.

An educator in school D confirms that the school occasionally meets with parents in order to update them about the progress of their children. However, this is not very successful, as parents do not understand the new progress report. This educator describes this position: “Parents even ask us to indicate whether the learner has passed next to *ready to progress* or fail next to *not ready to progress*”. The educator elaborates:

*They don’t understand the rating system, that is, these numbers – 1 to 4 that are now put in the report indicating the performance of the learner. But I don’t blame them. How can they understand something that we are struggling to understand?*

The fact that principals and educators in schools A and D (primary schools) have discussed outcomes-based education with parents while no discussion has taken place in schools B and C (secondary schools) indicates that there is a difference between parent involvement in primary schools and secondary schools. Parents in secondary schools are less involved in the education of their children. Principals of school B and C (secondary schools) pointed out that they had not discussed the issue of outcomes-based education with parents in their schools. Thus, parents in these schools are not informed of the changes in the education system and role that they should play as parents.
Discussion

The responses of participants seem to suggest that parents have not been orientated to the role that they should play at school for the benefit of their children. Vally and Spreen (1998:14) maintain that a factor that harms the implementation of outcomes-based education is the lack of parental support (cf 1.1). This is more prevalent in the previously disadvantaged schools. In contrast, the previously advantaged schools have stronger parental support and increased access to the private sector for supplemental materials and technologies.

Pretorius (1998b:106) is of the opinion that in the outcomes-based model, community members, particularly parents should be more actively involved with education than ever before. Outcomes-based education requires that the role of parent in education should be re-adjusted. The successful implementation of outcomes-based education depends on well-informed and motivated parents and communities. Vermeulen (1998:60) argues that only informed educators and parents will be able to overcome the possible drawbacks of outcomes-based education as it was experienced in other parts of the world (cf 2.3.4).

Pretorius (1998b:107) states that many parents have not been well informed about outcomes-based education. Their knowledge consists of what they have heard or read in the media. Meanwhile, Garson (1999:2) maintains that some educators feel that many parents are not educated enough to play the role encouraged by outcomes-based education. This need should be addressed urgently by South African schools.

4.10 SUMMARY

This chapter has described schools included in the research, characteristics of individual participants and the findings derived from the analysis of data. However, the characteristics of the Department of Education official were not included and the reasons for this are stated in 4.1. The data collected during the individual and focus group interviews are presented under the following themes: policy changes in education, the instructional role of principals and the implementation of outcomes-based education in schools in KwaMashu area.
Chapter five will conclude with a synthesis of significant themes and the implications for the role of the principal as instructional leader in the implementation of outcomes-based education and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 5

OVERVIEW OF THE INVESTIGATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins with a general overview of the investigation in order to show that the aims of the research expressed in 1.3 have been achieved.

The theory underlying the instructional role of the principal, as well as an overview of outcomes-based education in South African schools is given. The literature is integrated with the experiences of principals, educators and a Department of Education official concerning the role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools. A synthesis of the main findings is also provided in this chapter. Recommendations for improving the role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education derived from the research are briefly stated. Possible areas for further research are also identified in this chapter. The chapter concludes with the identification of limitations of the study.

5.2 OVERVIEW OF THE INVESTIGATION

Exactly what constitutes the instructional role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education is difficult to determine as the term *instructional leadership* is not clearly defined. Ginsberg (1988:279) maintains that the definitional inadequacies of the concept of instructional leadership for principals constitute the major obstacle to implementing effective plans of actions. Changes taking place in education system in South Africa, however, demand that principals should provide this kind of leadership to educators. Central to the success of the principal in performing his/her instructional role in the implementation of outcomes-based education is that all stakeholders should understand how this role is to be performed.
5.2.1 Principal’s instructional role: A theoretical basis

In order to determine the role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education, a literature study was undertaken. The emphasis was on the instructional role of the principal and outcomes-based education with particular reference to South Africa.

This research illustrates that the principal must fulfill his/her instructional role so that effective teaching and learning can take place in schools (cf 2.2). The school principal should devote most of the time to what is happening in the classroom. However, the literature reveals that most principals spend little time observing in the classrooms and working with educators to improve instruction (cf 2.2). This, however, should not be the case since the main function of the school principal is to ensure that learners receive quality instruction both inside and outside the classroom (cf 2.2). Principals, therefore, should always provide guidance, support and direction to all stakeholders for the improvement of the school.

Thus, the school principal should not only know what role to perform as instructional leader, but also how to perform that role well. Educators also need to be informed about the involvement of the principal in their activities and this can reduce tension between the principal and educators. They must understand that the principal should always work with them to improve instruction in order to increase learner achievement.

The literature reveals that the role of the principal as instructional leader includes determining objectives, providing curriculum co-ordination, providing didactic leadership, organising and co-ordinating staff development programmes, evaluating educators’ work, co-ordinating enrichment programmes, managing resources, providing remedial work to educators, and creating a positive school climate (cf 2.2.1 to 2.2.9). If the principal can execute these functions and other responsibilities effectively and efficiently, effective teaching and learning will take place in the school. This will lead to the improvement of learner achievement. The school principal, however, should ensure that these functions are always in harmony with the ever-changing needs of the school as well as departmental policies.
5.2.2 Outcomes-based education in South African schools

Outcomes-based education in South African schools was examined by means of a literature study. The emphasis was on the role played by the principal in its implementation. The literature reveals that since the release of the first National Curriculum policy document in December 1995, a debate has raged about the formulation and implementation of the new curriculum policy for South Africa. Outcomes-based education and training have been at the centre of this debate (cf 2.3.3). The literature also reveals that outcomes-based education is not only controversial in South Africa, but also in countries abroad (cf 1.1 & 2.3.3). From the onset, outcomes-based education has had both critics as well as advocates. The critics stated reasons why it is not a workable solution in the South African context (cf 2.3.2). The Committee tasked by Minister Kader Asmal to review the Curriculum 2005 made recommendations to ensure that outcomes-based education is successfully implemented (cf 2.3.3).

Outcomes-based education requires that all stakeholders should be involved in its implementation. But this has not been the case (cf 2.3.3). For example, there is a lack of parent involvement in the implementation of outcomes-based education (cf 1.1, 4.9.1); learners are not always actively involved in the learning and principals do not always perform their role effectively in the implementation of outcomes-based education (cf 2.3.5, 4.7.4.4, 4.8).

Outcomes-based education has not only changed the manner in which educators should teach and learners should learn, but also the manner in which schools should be managed (cf 1.1). This implies that the introduction of outcomes-based education has affected the principal’s instructional role. The literature shows that due to the introduction of outcomes-based education, school principals are confused concerning the implications of the new model for the management of their schools (cf 2.3.5). This confusion impacts negatively on the implementation of outcomes-based education, as principals cannot monitor it effectively.

School principals can only adapt their instructional role to this new model of teaching and learning if they fully understand it. Without this, they cannot perform their role adequately. Principals should also assist other role players, namely educators, learners and parents to understand and perform their roles in the implementation of outcomes-based education effectively and efficiently.
5.2.3 The research design

The necessary background to instructional leadership and outcomes-based education models and theories was provided in Chapter two of this research. It provided a detailed account of the role of the principal as instructional leader (cf 2.2.), as well as outcomes-based education in South African schools (cf 2.3). A qualitative approach (cf 1.6 & 3.2.1) was considered appropriate for an exploratory study of the role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools. Four schools (two primary and two secondary schools) as well as the District office in KwaMashu (a black urban township outside Durban) were identified. Access to these schools and the District office was granted by Regional Representative (North Durban Region) who is known to the researcher (cf 3.3.4). Individual interviews with principals of the four schools (cf 3.3.6.1), a Department of Education official (cf 3.3.6.2), as well as focus group interviews with four groups of educators (cf 3.3.6.3) from the four schools were conducted. The data collected were analysed according to procedures typical of qualitative research and organized according to emerging key themes (cf 3.3.8). These themes relate to policy changes in education (cf 4.4.), the instructional role of principals (cf 4.5) and the implementation of outcomes-based education in the KwaMashu area (cf 4.6). A further synthesis of the key themes was undertaken and main findings integrated with key findings discussed in Chapter two (cf 5.3).

5.3 SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section integrates prior research and theory reviewed in Chapter two with the significant themes uncovered in the qualitative investigation. The findings relate to the role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools.

5.3.1 Policy changes in education

The findings of this study revealed that both principals and educators have limited knowledge of policy and policy changes. This is attributed to the fact that information concerning education policies is not effectively communicated to schools (cf 4.4.1). Participants complained of a number of new changes being introduced within a short space of time (cf 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3). Both principals and educators complain of information overload which contributes to some policies being poorly
implemented or not implemented at all. This frustrates principals and educators and leads to a decrease in morale.

**Recommendations**

It is recommended that information on education policies should be effectively communicated to all role players. Role players should be given enough time to understand and master these policies. Mechanisms should be put in place to monitor the implementation of these policies, as well as to assist those who might experience problems with these policies. Policy formulators should first ensure that a policy is understood and correctly implemented before introducing another one. As Van Schalkwyk (1988:235) explains the ideal way for any change to take place is in an evolutionary manner. This entails the gradual introduction of change which is good, right, suitable, more desirable and more ideal (cf 4.4.3). People are likely to develop a positive attitude towards change if it takes place in an evolutionary way.

**5.3.2 Role of principals in times of change**

The research also showed that principals do not know which role they should play during a time of rapid policy change in education. It also transpired that principals were unable to fulfill part of their responsibilities because they are occupied with briefing sessions and workshops most of the time. Hence, they complain about the manner in which these changes are being introduced and communicated to them (cf 4.4.2, 4.4.3).

**Recommendations**

To be able to perform his/her responsibilities effectively the school principal should not only understand these responsibilities, but also prioritise them. Duke (1987:279) warns that the ability to do this does not develop overnight. The school principal must accumulate technical skills, acquire professional judgment, and come to understand the local culture. Without this knowledge the school cannot achieve its objectives. In times of change, the principal should be a source of knowledge. The principal should keep his/her staff well informed about the changes being introduced or about to be introduced. However, the principal can only do that if he/she understands these changes. This implies that the principal should be at the forefront of whatever changes are being introduced so
that he/she can provide the necessary guidance and assistance (cf 1.1). To do that, principals need to develop themselves both academically and professionally and encourage educators to do likewise.

5.3.3 The instructional role of principals

This research showed that participants lack a thorough understanding of the instructional role of principals. Principals and educators have different understandings of what instructional role entails (cf 4.5.1). The findings reveal that this lack of understanding affects the performance of this role negatively. Principals do not understand this role despite the fact they have attended courses on instructional leadership (cf Table 4.1 & 4.5.1). It was also found that educators regard the instructional role of the principal to be limited to the provision of resources.

Recommendations

Lack of understanding suggests that more effective workshops and courses for principals on instructional leadership should be organised to ensure that they fulfill their instructional role. Once they are trained in instructional leadership, principals should ensure that educators understand what role the principal should perform so that effective teaching and learning can take place. Before principals can inform educators, they must have personal knowledge about how to be effective supervisors (Bailey & Dyck, 1990:2-3). Moreover, a requirement for educators to be promoted to principalship should be knowledge of instructional leadership.

5.3.4 Changing responsibilities of principals and educators

The findings show that changes taking place in the education system have changed the responsibilities of all role players (cf 4.5.2). The research showed that the educator’s responsibility in outcomes-based education has changed to that of facilitating learning. The educator in outcomes-based education is not a transmitter of knowledge but a facilitator. He/she is there to assist learners to achieve the desired outcomes. Meanwhile, the learner’s responsibility is that of an active participant in the learning process. The research also showed that the responsibility of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education is not clearly defined. The findings show that thus far these changing responsibilities are not adequately executed by the different role players.
Recommendations

In order for the role players to execute their responsibilities, they should be informed about these responsibilities. Each role player should know what is required of him/her.

It is, therefore, recommended that all role players should be trained and supported in order to perform their new roles and responsibilities. Schools should have intensive and ongoing development programmes for educators as well as parents and community members so that they become acquainted with the new responsibilities. Educators and parents should acquire new skills in order to help learners learn effectively. It is also recommended that principals should network with principals of those schools that are performing well. Educators should work as teams and network with educators of other schools. This implies that educators should not rely on their principals; they should also look for information on their own.

5.3.5 Training in outcomes-based education

The investigation showed that effective training in outcomes-based education has not been provided for both principals and educators (cf 4.6.3). This lack of training has a negative impact on the implementation of outcomes-based education in schools. Unless principals and educators receive adequate training, outcomes-based education will not be implemented effectively. Consequently, principals do not understand outcomes-based education, its underlying principles and the terminology used (cf 4.6.3).

The research also showed that although private providers support schools in the implementation of outcomes-based education in terms of training and provision of teaching and learning materials, this support is not sufficient and their activities are not co-ordinated.

Recommendations

For the implementation of outcomes-based education to be successful, every role player should be adequately trained to perform his/her role effectively and efficiently. It is, therefore, recommended that principals and educators should be adequately trained in outcomes-based education. While educators require training to deal with the actual implementation in the classroom effectively,
principals need training to monitor that implementation takes place as expected. Principals need to understand how outcomes-based education should be implemented and what role they should play during the process. This will enable them to manage their schools more effectively.

To ensure that principals and educators receive appropriate training, the Department of Education should form a partnership with institutions of higher learning and use afternoons, weekends and school holidays for in-service training programmes. The Department of Education should make incentives available to principals and educators who undergo these programmes. The Department of Education should also avoid the use of the cascade model of training, as the literature (cf 2.3.4) and the findings (cf 4.6.3) illustrate that this model of training is not effective.

Private providers should be encouraged to maximise their support to schools. They should be encouraged to support schools by training educators, supplying them with teaching and learning materials and providing financial support. Their activities should be co-ordinated with the Department’s activities.

5.3.6 Lack of resources and facilities

The investigation showed that there is a lack of resources and facilities necessary to implement outcomes-based education successfully. Schools lack both teaching and learning materials (cf 4.7.1). In the KwaMashu context the lack of resources and facilities is compounded by the fact that the community also cannot provide these resources and facilities. The KwaMashu community has a lack of resources and facilities (cf 4.7.2).

Recommendations

Vakalisa (2000:20-21) maintains that educators occupy a very powerful position with regard to the implementation of the curriculum. However, educators cannot do this without the necessary resources and facilities. It is, therefore, recommended that school principals should acquire skills in financial management of schools which should include more effective ways of obtaining school fees and donations from the community. Principals should co-operate with prominent people in the community, as well as community leaders to approach business people and big companies for financial support and make these resources and facilities available not only at schools, but also to
the community. These people should be persuaded to invest in the education of the children. Once these resources and facilities are available, the principal and his/her educators should constantly encourage and motivate their learners and community members to look after these resources and facilities.

5.3.7 Problems with the implementation of outcomes-based education in the classrooms

The research illustrated a number of problems experienced by educators with regard to the implementation of outcomes-based education in the classroom. Educators listed the following problems they experience in the process of implementing outcomes-based education: the terminology used in outcomes-based education (cf 4.7.4.1); the difficult of assessment (cf 4.7.4.2); large classes (cf 4.7.4.3); lack of support from principals (cf 4.7.4.4); and learners not performing their role (cf 4.8).

Recommendations

To ensure that every role player understands outcomes-based education, it is recommended that simpler, familiar terms should be used instead of the more complex and unfamiliar ones (Chisholm, 2000:50). Role players will only perform their roles constructively in the implementation of outcomes-based education if they are certain of what is required of them. Difficulties with assessment should also be addressed. Principals, educators, parents and learners should be given the necessary training on assessment procedures. Principals, therefore, should look for people with expertise and use schools for developmental programmes. These programmes should be organised that they take the background of each individual group into account. To ensure that outcomes-based education is implemented in manageable classes, it is recommended that the Department of Education should hire more educators and build classrooms where there is a shortage. The findings also showed that there is a lack of support from principals. Educators are only able to implement outcomes-based education successfully if they have full support of their principals, as well as that of the District office (cf 4.7.4.4). Principals can only provide this support if they are adequately trained and know what support to offer to their educators.

To ensure that learners apply themselves to their studies, particularly in the context of outcomes-based education, schools should have clearly formulated codes of conduct for the learners. These
should be communicated to the learners. Learners should be made aware that punitive actions would be taken against them should they fail to do their work. Educators should constantly remind learners of the importance of their education. Killen (1999:11) maintains that learners should know why they are learning what they are learning, recognise value in this learning and believe that they can be successful.

5.3.8 Lack of parent involvement

The role that should be played by parents in the education of their children cannot be overemphasised. For education in general, and outcomes-based education in particular to be successfully implemented there should be a partnership between the educator and the parent. The findings revealed a lack of parent involvement in the education of their children in general, and outcomes-based education in particular (cf 4.5.2, 4.9.1). The lack of parent involvement is more prevalent in secondary schools than primary schools. Moreover, principals and educators are not equipped to involve parents in the implementation of outcomes-based education.

Recommendations

The school needs the support of the parents and the community at large. Therefore, the school principal must ensure that close co-operation between the school and the community is maintained at all times. In order to do this, the principal and his/her staff should acquire skills to work with parents and the members of the community for the benefit of the learners (cf 4.5.2, 4.7.2, 4.8.1).

It is, therefore, recommended that principals and educators should be adequately trained in parent involvement. They should know when and how to involve parents. Once these skills have been acquired, the school should develop programmes to acquaint parents with their roles. Van Wyk (1996:301) indicates that if schools wish parents to be more actively involved in children's learning, a coherent series of learning opportunities should be offered to parents. Parents should be well informed of the importance of their role in the implementation of outcomes-based education. Barriers to parent involvement should be eliminated. Schools should have well formulated and clearly written policies on parent involvement. Van Wyk (1996:296) recommends that the government's policy with regard to parent involvement should be broadened to include all parents, not only those serving the school's governing body.
5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The findings of this study on the role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education suggest the following areas in the search for further knowledge.

Firstly, the use of a qualitative research methodology should be further explored, as it allows participants the opportunity to discuss issues that they consider to be important from their own frame of reference (cf 3.2.1). This methodology is appropriate because it regards the participants as the prime source of information (cf 3.2.1). It is, therefore, recommended that a qualitative methodology be used in a situation where the aim of a study is to determine the perceptions of the participants. A qualitative methodology is also appropriate for the discovery of important areas or themes because it allows participants the opportunity to define the topics and questions to be pursued in larger projects.

Because there is a lack of research on the role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education, many aspects still require more detailed research, such as:

- The role of the principal in translating education policies into practice.
- Strategies to help principals manage instructional programmes.
- Training of school principals in outcomes-based education.
- Strategies to improve parent support in the implementation of outcomes-based education.
- The role of the parent/community in the implementation of outcomes-based education.

5.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The primary goal of this research is to determine the role that the school principal plays or should play in the implementation of outcomes-based education in the school from the perspective of the principals, educators as well as a Department of Education official. This study, however, demonstrates both the strengths and the limitations of such an investigation.

The small size of the sample, typical of qualitative research is the obvious limitation of the study. It cannot support a general theory on the role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education. Obviously, different schools would have disclosed different findings.
This research was designed to be exploratory and descriptive in nature, as a result no attempt is made to generalise or quantify the findings (cf 3.3).

This research was purposefully limited to schools chosen on the basis of accessibility. The participants and schools were also chosen on the basis of their willingness to take part in the research. This implies that different results might be obtained in different situations, for example, if schools that were reluctant to participate were included in the research.

The overview of the existing literature (Chapter two) provided valuable background to the interviews, suggesting that individual interviews with principals (cf 3.3.6.1) and the Department of Education official (cf 3.3.6.2), as well as focus group interviews with educators (cf 3.3.6.3) are suitable data collection strategies in this study. Possible factors that could have influenced the research were included in the statement of subjectivity. Following data analysis, findings were presented according to themes that emerged from the participants’ accounts. Data were presented in descriptive form only and no attempts are made to generalise or quantify the findings.

In spite of these limitations, data gathered from this study yielded key areas (4.2, 4.3 and 4.4) that contributed to a better understanding of the role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in the KwaMashu district. These key areas also indicated aspects in which further research can be done (cf 5.4).

5.6 SUMMARY

Outcomes-based education is being implemented in South African schools. However, role players are not performing their roles as required by outcomes-based approach. This is more prevalent in the previously disadvantaged schools. Principals are not certain of their instructional role in the implementation of outcomes-based education. Likewise, educators maintained that they do not get support from their superiors; as a result they have problems with the implementation of outcomes-based education. Moreover, parents are not well informed of their role in outcomes-based education. A number of obstacles that impinge on the implementation of outcomes-based education in schools identified should be addressed so that every role player will understand his/her role and how to perform that role.
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Appendix A : Letter to the Regional Chief Director

P.O. Box 48906
*QUALBERT*
4078
10 December 2001

The Regional Chief Director
Department of Education and Culture
North Durban Region
Private Bag X 504323
DURBAN
4000

*ATTENTION : DR D. EDLEY*

Dear Sir/Madam

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT A RESEARCH: MY STUDENT NO. 564-011-3

I kindly request permission to conduct a small research project in certain schools in KwaMashu district.

I am currently registered at the University of South Africa (UNISA) for the Master of Education Degree (Education Management). In order to fulfill the requirements for this degree, I am required to undertake a small research project and submit a mini-dissertation related to this.
My proposed research is: "The role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools". This research project requires that I interview the following individuals:

- two primary school principals and four grade seven educators from each school.
- two secondary school principals and four grade eight educators from each school.
- one department (district) official who is involved in the training of school principals.

The information that I will gain will help me develop professionally and I hope that the feedback that I will share with you will, to some extent, contribute to strengthening the role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools. Should you require further information in the process of considering the request, please contact my supervisor, Prof. J. N. van Wyk at (012) 4294346 (work) or (012) 3480700 (home).

I do hope that my request will meet with your favourable consideration.

Thanking you in advance.

Yours faithfully

_S. P. Mazibuko (Mr)_
UNISA student
Mr S P Mazibuko
P O Box 48906
Qualbert
4078

Dear Mr Mazibuko,

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH : NORTH DURBAN REGION


2. You are hereby granted permission to conduct research in Schools in the North Durban Region, as set out in your letter of application. The permission is subject to the following conditions:
   a. No school/person may be forced to participate in the study;
   b. Access to the schools you wish to utilise is to be negotiated with the principals concerned by yourself;
   c. The normal teaching and learning programme of the schools is not to be disrupted;
   d. The confidentiality of the participants is respected; and
   e. A copy of your research findings must be lodged with the Regional Chief Director, upon completion of your studies.
   f. Kindly note further that if you are an educator in the employ of the Department of Education and Culture, KZN, you undertake NOT to utilize teaching time for this research.

3. This letter may be used to gain access to the schools concerned.

4. May I take this opportunity to wish you every success in your research.

Yours faithfully,

Dr D W M Edley
Regional Co-ordinator: Research
For REGIONAL CHIEF DIRECTOR
Appendix C: Letter to school principals

P.O. Box 48906
QUALBERT
4078
15 March 2002

Dear Sir/Madam

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT A RESEARCH: MY STUDENT NO. 564-011-3

I kindly request permission to conduct a small research project in your school.

I am currently registered at the University of South Africa (UNISA) for the Master of Education Degree (Education Management). In order to fulfill the requirements for this degree, I am required to undertake a small research project and submit a mini-dissertation related to this.

My proposed research is: “The role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools”. This research project requires that I interview you and four grade seven/eight educators. I, therefore, appeal for your co-operation and time as well as that of those four educators in order to conduct these interviews. You will decide the date and suitable time. I also request that the interviews be tape recorded in order to save time and to ensure that I do not miss certain things during our conversation. However, I assure you complete anonymity and confidentiality of your responses.

The information that I will gain will help me develop professionally and I hope that the feedback that I will share with you if you want me to do So will be of great help to you and your staff. Should you require further information in the process of considering the request, please contact my supervisor, Prof. J. N. van Wyk at (012) 4294346 (work) or (012) 3480700 (home).
I enclose a letter from the Regional Office Representative which grants me permission to undertake this research study.

I do hope that my request will meet with your favourable consideration.

Thanking you in advance.

Yours faithfully

S. P. Mazibuko (Mr)
UNISA student
Appendix D : Letter to educators

P.O. Box 48906
QUALBERT
4078
15 March 2002

Dear Sir/Madam

I kindly request permission to interview you as part of my small research project that I am conducting.

I am currently registered at the University of South Africa (UNISA) for the Master of Education Degree (Education Management). In order to fulfill the requirements for this degree, I am required to undertake a small research project and submit a mini-dissertation related to this.

My proposed research is: "The role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools". This research project requires, inter-alia that I interview four grades seven and eight educators who are in the process of implementing outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools. I, therefore, appeal for your co-operation and time to conduct this interview with you. You will decide the date and suitable time. I also request that this interview be tape recorded in order to save time and to ensure that I do not miss certain things during our discussion. However, I assure you complete anonymity and confidentiality of your responses.

Should you require further information in the process of considering the request, please contact my supervisor, Prof. J. N. van Wyk at (012) 4294346 (work) or (012) 3480700 (home).

I do hope that my request will meet with your favourable consideration.

Yours sincerely

S. P. Mazibuko (Mr)
UNISA student
Appendix E : Letter to the Superintendent of Education Management

P.O. Box 48906
QUALBERT
4078
15 March 2002

The Superintendent of Education Management
KwaMashu District Office
Private Bag X 055
KWAMASHU
4360

Dear Sir/Madam

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT A RESEARCH: MY STUDENT NO. 564-011-3

I kindly request permission to interview you as part of my small research project that I am conducting.

I am currently registered at the University of South Africa (UNISA) for the Master of Education Degree (Education Management). In order to complete the requirements for this degree, I am required to undertake a small research project and submit a mini-dissertation related to this.

My proposed research is: "The role of the school principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools". This research project requires, inter-alia that I interview one Department official who is in charge of the process of implementing outcomes-based education in KwaMashu schools. I, therefore, appeal for your co-operation and time to conduct this interview with you. You will decide the date and suitable time. I also request that this interview be tape recorded in order to save time and to ensure that I do not miss certain things during your discussion. However, I assure you complete anonymity and confidentiality of our responses.
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The information that I will gain will help me develop professionally and I hope that the feedback that I will share with you will, to a certain extent, contribute to strengthening the role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education in their schools. Should you require further information in the process of considering the request, please contact my supervisor, Prof. J.N. van Wyk at (012) 4294346 (work) or (012) 3480700 (home).

I enclose a letter from the Regional Office Representative, which grants permission to undertake the research study.

I do hope that my request will meet with your favourable consideration.

Thanking you in advance.

Yours faithfully

S. P. Mazibuko (Mr)
UNISA student
Appendix F

PERSONAL INFORMATION: PRINCIPAL

A. PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name:
Age:
Gender:
Qualification:
Years of experience as educator:
Years of experience as principal:

B. TRAINING FOR PRINCIPALS

General training for principalship:
Training course/s on instructional leadership:
Who offered the training?
Training course for OBE:
Number of training course/s for OBE:
Who offered the training?
Appendix G

PERSONAL INFORMATION: EDUCATOR

A. PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name:
Age:
Gender:
Qualification:
Years of experience as educator:
Grade taught:
Years of experience in OBE:

B. TRAINING FOR OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION

Training course for OBE:
Number of training course/s for OBE:
Who offered the training?
How was the training offered?
Development programmes available at your school:
Who offered these programmes?
Appendix H

PERSONAL INFORMATION: SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

A. PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name:
Age:
Gender:
Qualification:
Years of experience as superintendent of education management:

B. TRAINING COURSES

Number of training course/s for principals on instructional leadership:
Who offered the training on instructional leadership?
Years of experience as OBE co-ordinator:
Number of training course/s for principals on OBE:
When the training for principals on OBE was offered:
Who offered the training for principals on OBE?
Who offered the training for educators on OBE?
Appendix I

INTERVIEW GUIDE : PRINCIPALS

This guide was used only to ensure that important issues are included in the discussion. At no time was the interview guide used to dictate the course of the discussion and all participants were allowed to raise issues which were of concern to them.

A. EDUCATIONAL CHANGES

- What is your feeling about the educational changes that are being introduced?
- How do these changes affect you as a school principal?
- How does the Department of Education ensure that you keep abreast with the changes that are taking place in the education system?

B. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

- What do regard as your main responsibilities as the school principal?
- What do you understand by the concept instructional leadership?
- What do you regard as your instructional role as the school principal?
- How did the introduction of outcomes-based education affect your instructional role?
- What training have you been offered on instructional leadership?
- If you could get more training: what area/s would you like to get it in?

C. PRINCIPAL AND OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION

- What do you understand by the concept outcomes-based education?
- What was your attitude towards outcomes-based education when you implemented it for the first time?
- What changes in your school can you attribute to the introduction of outcomes-based education?
- How does your school involve parents in the implementation of outcomes-based education?
• How do you support educators in their instructional task?
• How do you support educators in the implementation of outcomes-based education?
• What role do the Non-Governmental Organisations play in the implementation of outcomes-based education in the KwaMashu district?
• What training were you offered on outcomes-based education?
• How was that training offered?
• How satisfied are you with that training?

D. CONCLUDING REMARKS

• If you were to make suggestions about what is presently taking place in the education system, what suggestions would you make?
• How do you see your future as a school principal?
Appendix J

INTERVIEW GUIDE : EDUCATORS

This guide was used only to ensure that important issues are included in the discussion. At no time was the interview guide used to dictate the course of the discussion and all participants were allowed to raise issues which were of concern to them.

A. EDUCATIONAL CHANGES

• What is your feeling about the educational changes that are being introduced in the country?
• How does the Department of Education ensure that you keep abreast with the changes that are taking place in the education system?

B. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

• What is the instructional role or should be the instructional role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education?
• How does the principal support you in your instructional activities or in the implementation of outcomes-based education?
• How do the other members of the management team (principal, deputy principal and heads of departments) support you in your instructional activities or in the implementation of outcomes-based education?

C. OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION

• What do you understand by the concept outcomes-based education?
• What was your attitude towards outcomes-based education when you first implemented it?
• What problems did you experience when you implemented outcomes-based education for the first time?
• How did the principal support you to overcome those problems?
• How has outcomes-based education changed your role as an educator?
• How does the Department of Education support you in the implementation of outcomes-based education?
• What training were you offered on outcomes-based education?
• How was that training offered?
• How satisfied are you with that training?
• How does your school involve parents in the implementation of outcomes-based education?
• How do the Non-Governmental Organisations support you with implementing outcomes-based education?

D. CONCLUDING REMARKS

• What other things would you like to share with me?
• How do you see your future as an educator?
Appendix K

INTERVIEW GUIDE : SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

This guide was used only to ensure that important issues are included in the discussion. At no time was the interview guide used to dictate the course of the discussion and all participants were allowed to raise issues which were of concern to them.

A. EDUCATIONAL CHANGES

- How does the district office ensure that principals are kept abreast with educational changes taking place in the country?
- How do you feel about the changes that are being passed on to the principals?
- What is the attitude of the principals towards these changes?

B. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

- What do you understand by the concept instructional leadership?
- What role should the principal as instructional leader play?

C. OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION

- What is your role as an OBE official in the district?
- What training programmes are available to help school principals cope with outcomes-based education?
- How satisfied are with the manner in which they manage the implementation of outcomes-based education?
- How do you feel about the current position of outcomes-based education in the district?
- How does the district support and ensure that these educators (schools) are able to implement outcomes-based education effectively?
- How does the district help schools that experience problems with the implementation of outcomes-based education?
- How does the district office ensure that schools have enough teaching and learning materials to enable them implement outcomes-based education effectively?
• How do you involve the Non-Governmental Organisations in the process of implementing outcomes-based education?

D. CONCLUDING REMARKS

• What other things would you like to share with me?
Appendix L

INTERVIEW BETWEEN S. P. MAZIBUKO (RESEARCHER) AND EDUCATORS FROM SCHOOL C

Pseudonyms have been used to protect the identity of educators.

Researcher I would like to find out from you: what is your feeling about educational changes that are being introduced in the country?

Lindiwe My worry is the number of changes that are taking place in education in South Africa. Really, there are too many changes and we are expected to implement all of them at once.

Zinhle That’s true. Nothing is being implemented because we don’t know where to start. All the time principals attend workshops and they always come back with something new and we are expected to implement all these things. But there is no time for implementation.

Researcher Why do you say there is no time?

Zinhle Because there are too many things that we are expected to implement at a short space of time. They do not even check whether we do understand these things or not.

Researcher Who are they?

Zinhle The Department of Education

Researcher How does the Department of Education ensure that you keep abreast with the changes that are taking place in the education system?
Thobile
The District office starts by work-shopping principals who then pass the information from the workshops to us. But principals do not have enough time to pass this information to us because they are always away in workshops. In fact, by the time the principal calls us to a meeting to update us there is too much that he has to pass on to us.

Sandile
That’s where the problem starts because it becomes difficult for us to understand these things. When we try to explain our position to the principal, the principal would tell you that these things are coming from above so we can’t question them.

Researcher
You complain about a number of changes and one of these is the introduction of outcomes-based education, tell me: what do you understand by the concept outcomes-based education?

Sandile
I think outcomes-based education requires that learners should think for themselves and should not rely on educators. It discourages a situation whereby the educator is the only source of information.

Lindiwe
Yes, I agree with Sandile. I think outcomes-based education means that the learner should be actively involved in the learning situation; unlike in the old curriculum where the learner was passive and the educator did everything.

Researcher
Tell me: what was your attitude towards outcomes-based education when you implemented it for the first time?

Thobile
It is difficult to say. But most of us had a positive attitude towards it when it was introduced. But young educators who have just started teaching were even more excited about it.

Researcher
Why was that the case?

Thobile
I’m not sure. But I think it’s because they are new in the field and they are
still experiencing things.

Lindiwe  I think educators who have been teaching for years were skeptical and some did not want to change their way of teaching.

Researcher  What do you say Zinhle?

Zinhle  I must be honest, guys: I had mixed feelings. Much as I was looking forward to it I did not know what to expect from it.

Sandile  But for me OBE is not that different from the old curriculum. I think the major changes are the assessment procedures and the terminology used and that now the emphasis is on the involvement of the learner in the learning situation. But our learners find it difficult to cope because they are expected to do the work themselves and the educator is just there to guide them. So how can you play an active role if you do not understand what you are required to do?

Thobile  I disagree with Sandile. There has been a drastic change. Now we are facilitators. We speak of Learning Areas not subjects and these Learning Areas have been integrated. In the past there was very little integration of different subjects.

Researcher  What problems did you experience when you started implementing OBE for the first time?

Zinhle  Problem number one was the terminology used. We struggled and still are struggling to understand the terms used in OBE. We also have a shortage of supporting materials such as textbooks, charts et cetera.

Lindiwe  Most schools do not have enough resources. Learners do not pay school fees. For me personally, overcrowding was also a big problem. But I think the major problem was the issue of resources.
Researcher: How did the principal support you to overcome these problems?

Zinhle: I think there is very little that the principal can do. The school has a problem of funds, as parents don’t pay school fees. I am sure the principal is willing to help us but without money there is very little that he can do.

Sandile: Yes, Zinhle is right. There is very little that the principal can do. Principals cannot force learners to pay school fees. The Department does not allow principals to do that. So we are working under difficult circumstances.

Researcher: Why do you say that?

Sandile: You see, here in our school most learners have not paid school fees. So the problem is still there.

Thobile: Another problem is that our learners are not motivated. Whether you are talking about outcomes-based education or the ordinary class, I mean the class that still follows the old syllabus; learners do not want to learn. I’m talking about our learners in generally; they are not willing to learn. For example, you ask learners to bring along the newspapers the following day they won’t do that. They do not even bother themselves by going to their neighbours and ask for old newspapers. They deliberately not bring along these newspapers.

Zinhle: Indeed, indeed Thobile. There are plenty newspapers here at school which are supplied by the Department, but these learners do not even ask for them.

Researcher: Tell me: how has outcomes-based education changed your role as educators?

Lindiwe: A lot. Now I do not stand in front of the learners and do most of the talking while learners are listening. Now I’m a facilitator and it is the learners who do most part of the work. I’m just there to support and give them direction. But this is very difficult for most of the learners.
Zinhle, you look uncertain about this: what do you say?

Yes, Lindiwe is right. Our role has changed. Learners are now actively involved almost in all activities that are taking place in the classroom. But there is also too much paperwork. We have to make sure that we fill in these papers so that when an official comes he/she can see that a particular thing has been done even if that thing was not done well.

Outcomes-based education is a new concept: how does the principal support you in its implementation?

The principal is trying. He tries to make resources available to us. But you see, the school has limited funds so these resources are not enough at all.

I think there is very little that the principal can do. He does not understand OBE. The only thing he does is to encourage us to look for help outside and also to work as a team.

What about the other members of the management team, like the deputy principal and the heads of departments? How do they support you?

Oh! They are just like us. They know very little about OBE. So it is really not easy for them to help us.

Everyone is struggling with this OBE thing. So it is difficult to help others.

Why do you say that?

Let me come in before Sandile responds. No one is well trained in this OBE thing. As a result, we don’t know whether we are right or not. Even the management team is confused.

Yes, that’s what I wanted to say. You see, here at our school you go to the
member of the management team to ask for something and he/she will tell you that he/she knows nothing about what you are talking. You see my wife and I teach the same grade but she is in another district. You know what happened? I asked her to assist me with my work the other night, she couldn’t. She said in their district they are doing something different from what we are doing in this district. Just imagine they are doing their own different thing. But we teach the same grade. How do you explain this to the parent who does not know what is happening at school? How can districts so close to each other use different assessment procedures?

Zinhle

What I can say is that the Department should have started by upgrading schools in townships and in the rural areas before introducing OBE. Just like here in our school there is no photocopier, no overhead projector. Meanwhile, OBE requires that the school should have these things. Without resources it is not easy to implement OBE. So even if the management team wants to support us they can’t because the school doesn’t have the necessary resources.

Researcher

Tell me: what is or should be the role of the principal in the implementation of outcomes-based education?

Lindiwe

I would say the principal should help educators by getting them the necessary resources. I think that is the only support that the principal can offer us because he can’t help us with the subject matter. In other words, I mean the principal can’t tell me how should I teach my subject. Principals do not understand OBE and they seem to be having a negative attitude towards it.

Thobile

I think I must add that the principal is in a very difficult position because he is the head of the school so he must know what is happening in the school. At the same time he does not understand this OBE thing. As a result, the principal gets frustrated.

Sandile

The problem is that whenever you go to the principal to ask for something he would tell you that there is no money so you end up not being helped.
Does the management team know exactly what you are supposed to do?

No. Not exactly. As we have already told you we are all struggling. None of us knows what exactly we are supposed to be doing. I'm saying this because whenever you attend a workshop you get something new. So we are no longer sure of what we are doing.

You know what, guys? I think principals are the people who should have been trained first. As it is they don't know what role they should play. Really, I feel sorry for them because they are supposed to be leading us but now they are not sure of what we are doing. One of our colleagues recently said, “In OBE, blinds are leading the blinds”. For me principals are just frustrated like us.

What about the Department of Education? How does the Department support you in the implementation of outcomes-based education?

Well, our district, I mean the KwaMashu district introduced the system of facilitators. But the problem is that even these facilitators are not clear about what we should do as educators.

All what the Department is doing is to come up with new changes all the time. But no one is checking if these things are being implemented or not and what problems we as educators are experiencing. No wonder many educators are stressed out.

The Department seems to be confused, just like us.

You complain about school fees not being paid. Tell me: how does your school involve parents in the implementation of outcomes-based education?

Parents are just lost. You must remember that the majority of these parents are not well educated. As a result they rely on us. If we are confused, parents, obviously have to be lost. But I must point out that up now we never have a
formal meeting with the parents to inform them about this OBE thing.

Zinhle  
But even if we can call them to the meeting they won’t attend. They are not interested in the education of their children. You know what? I recently gave my class homework and one girl did not do it. When I asked her why she did not do my work she said her mother asked her to look after her younger sister until very late. When she tried to do the work at night the mother complained that she was wasting the candle.

Lindiwe  
Yes, Zinhle is right. Most parents are not interested in the education of their children. If parents were interested they would have paid school fees and we would not have a problem of the teaching and learning materials.

Researcher  
Tell me: how do the Non-Governmental Organisations support you with the implementation of outcomes-based education?

Sandile  
I would say they are helping us, to some extent by giving us some of the material that enables us to teach. When I compare the material that we get from the NGOs with the material we get from the Department, I find the material from the NGOs much better and useful.

Thobile  
Yes, I can say NGOs are very useful and their workshops are far better than the ones that are organised by the Department.

Zinhle  
Ikhwezi organises workshops for us and we find these workshops more informative and fruitful.

Researcher  
Before concluding: what other things would you like to share with me?

Lindiwe  
My worry is this OBE thing. Really, I don’t see this thing succeeding. This thing has been revised several times but we still have problems with it. I think the Department is wasting money for nothing. The Department should have used this money to upgrade our schools.
Zinhle

That’s true. I think Lindiwe is correct. As it is we still do not know what is going to happen to the grade nines next year. You ask the principal about this he will tell you that he also does not know. So how do you plan for the following year in a situation like that?

Researcher

Yes, Thobile: what do you say?

Thobile

Not much, except to say that I think that Lindiwe and Zinhle are correct. What do you say Sandile?

Sandile

(Shake his head) Honestly, I think the Department should learn to prioritise. You can’t waste money on OBE knowing that educators are still not well trained. I think the Department should retrain educators and principals thoroughly before introducing changes.

Researcher

Lindiwe: what do you say?

Lindiwe

Well, what I was going to say has been said. But I really feel that educators are frustrated because of what is happening in the education system. You see many educators are contemplating leaving the teaching profession right now.

Researcher

Thank you very much for sharing this information with me.