CHAPTER 1

GENERAL BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Transformation of schools from traditionally non-democratic structures to modern democratic institutions presents a serious challenge to schools. It requires that teachers be empowered by increasing their decision-making powers at school level (Taylor, Thompson & Bogotch 1995:51). The call to transform schools has culminated in the decentralisation of decision-making powers from national, provincial, district to school site level.

This means that the role of principals in schools should also change from that of a supervisor to a collaborator. In the past principals were the centres of power, they would do as they wished but today they have to consult a wide range of individuals and groups before making decisions. If the energy of teachers in schools is used as an agent of change through the building of a collaborative culture, schools can be transformed from being principal-led schools to schools that are led by many (Wagner 1999:42-3). Hierarchical forms of decision making need to make way for more participative forms of site-based decision making.

Teacher participation is a trend that is set to transform 'top-down' approaches, which reduced teachers to tools of implementing policies and decisions without making any meaningful contribution (Bezzina 1997:194). It encourages teachers to improve the quality of their profession and workplace, which may result in a less stressful, more satisfying and motivating environment.

1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Smyth & Shacklock (1998:144) assert that teachers worldwide have been marginalised when it comes to being consulted about changes to education, that is, they have always been left out when it comes to restructuring the context within which teaching occurs. Bohlabela District in Limpopo Province is a rural area that was inherited from the homeland system of the past era where governance of schools was in the hands of school committees. School committees were mainly dominated by principals who had the final say in their proceedings and teachers were mere spectators (Baloyi 2002:1).

It appears as if the call for collaborative governance of schools has not been quickly heeded by school principals in the district. Teacher isolation by school principals in Bohlabela District seems to be rife. This problem, together with many other problems in the teaching profession, has resulted in:

➢ destruction of the culture of teaching and learning in schools within the circuit;
➢ an increased rate of teacher absenteeism;
➢ demoralisation and demotivation of teachers;
➢ poor relations between principals and their subordinates; and
➢ resignation of teachers in extreme cases (Sadtu:1998).

Kumar & Scuderi (2000:1) point out that in many instances policy making is often considered a privilege and jealously guarded by those in authority. Reimers (1997:147) argues that policies are conceived by a certain core of people and implemented in schools in a top-down manner. This view is supported by Frost, Durrant, Head & Holiday (2000:1) who indicate that recent top-down approaches have relegated teachers' roles in strategic planning and decision making to the implementation of externally driven initiatives.

It is against this backdrop that greater collegiality and more active involvement of a wide range of individuals are called for to improve schools (Frost et al 2000).

According to Lilyquist (1998:1) research information suggests that there should be intense involvement of teachers in decision-making processes. In education, policies are made by school governing bodies, administrators and politicians but teachers are rarely part of the processes and their voices are missing (Smyth & Shacklock 1998).

The idea of participation is applied in various parts of the world and particularly in the democratic South Africa (Gerber, Nel & Van Dyk 1998:233). In the democratic South Africa, principals who single-handedly ran schools in the past era are expected to exercise their authority with due regard for the opinions of teachers, parents and learners, who were excluded from such responsibilities in the past (Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen 1998:76-7).

If schools are to succeed in encouraging teacher participation they must redesign their management processes to help teachers to develop the skills and discipline needed for them to participate in order to reap all the benefits of participation (McLagan & Nel 1995). Management processes include all major actions that relate to the formulation and implementation of policies and they are vital for the participation of teachers in the making of site-based decisions.

Teachers work closely with students and have first hand knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses, they are therefore the most invaluable people to develop and implement policies (Kumar & Scuderi 2000:61). Teachers are most closely affected by decisions at school level and they should therefore play a significant role in making the decisions (Wall & Rinehart 1999:50). School systems must be restructured to give teachers more space to participate in school-based decision making, and the teachers who are participating in the process must be given a clear designation of authority and role (Hallinger, Murphy & Hausman 1993:36).

According to Mitchel (1998:120) there is no research-based information that concludes that increased participation leads to increased performance. Beckmann & Blom (2000:2), on the other hand, indicate that research supports a link between participation and commitment.

1.3 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

1.3.1 Importance of the study

The South African Schools Act (Act 84 of 1996) gives all stakeholders the mandate to participate in the governance and management of schools. This legislative mandate has presented principals, teachers, parents and learners with the enormous task of turning traditionally authoritarian institutions into democratic centres where every stakeholder participates actively in their decision making processes (Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen 1997:196).

According to Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen (1997:197) completed research on participation in South Africa suggests that many areas of participation on the managerial domain remain crucial. They further argue that very few research studies worldwide have focused on developing countries, which have had little democratic participation of the population.

It appears like principals are not increasingly allowing their teachers to actively take part in decision making. Teachers in Bohlabela complain, amongst others, about:

➢ being denied opportunities to develop their leadership skills beyond the classroom;
➢ being expected to uphold decisions made by principals without their (teachers') involvement;
➢ not being involved in policy decision making;
➢ being excluded from the drawing of school budgets;

- under representation in some of the schools' structures such as School Governing Bodies (SGB's) and School Management Teams (SMT's);
- their views regarding their schools' daily activities being ignored by autocratic principals and their management teams (SADTU 1998).

Principals who are bent on running schools autocratically, in Bohlabela District and elsewhere, employ some of the following techniques to deny teachers the opportunity to participate (Beckmann & Blom 2000:1):

- creating the impression of consultation while retaining power;
- restricting debate on key or contentious issues;
- setting up restricted channels of participation;
- depriving staff of information; and
- discouraging staff from criticising and challenging decisions.

If they are anything to go by, the foregoing assertions indicate that teacher participation is seriously undermined in schools. It is against this background that teacher participation in site-based management in schools is investigated. The answers provided by this investigation will put participative management in its right context and perspective, and also give suggestions for the management of participation and other related problems in the field of Education Management.

1.3.2 Contribution of the study

The research provides valuable information for both practitioners of education and researchers in:

- the decentralisation of decision making powers from principals to teachers and other stakeholders in schools. In other words the information obtained from the research helps to create the need to legitimise decisions made at school-site level;

➢ exposing the nature of participative management, the extent to which it is put into practice and suggesting new ways to handle it;

➢ giving suggestions on how to encourage increased devolution of responsibility to the level of teachers at school. This may even result in increased professionalism on the part of the staff;

➢ exploring appropriate ways to minimise resistance to participation, to encourage principals to do away with autocratic practices and to invite teachers to increase their contribution in the arena of decision making; and

➢ pointing out the role of participation towards the ownership, oneness and commitment of staff to the improvement of the school.

The research also provides a foundation for researchers who may be interested in doing further investigation on participative management or any other problem related to the field of Education Management in general.

1.3.3 Limitations to the study

McMillan & Schumacher (1993:23) state that knowledge acquired through research is limited by the nature of educational practice and research, methodological limitations and the complexity of educational practices.

The following limitations and hindrances are likely to be encountered in research:

➢ the researcher works with data that do not speak for themselves and consequently he may impose generalisations that are non-existent on the collected data;

➢ the findings may be influenced by the researcher's subjectivity;

➢ interviews are employed in data collection and this method of data collection, although it has many advantages, it is time consuming and costly (Huysamen 1994: 146; Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh 1990:420); and

➢ participants for one reason or another may withhold information from the researcher.

To overcome these shortcomings the researcher:

➢ avoided forging links where none were evident on the collected data;
➢ cited literary sources to support personal views to minimise subjectivity;
➢ set reasonable timeframes within which the interviews were to be conducted to save time and reduce costs; and
➢ assured participants of confidentiality of their information so that they could openly give him information.

1.4 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The participation of teachers in school-based management as outlined in paragraph 1.1 above has become a topical issue in recent years. The research investigated teacher participation in site-based management in schools at Thulamahashe Circuit in Bohlabela District. The research problem was: **to what extent do teachers in schools at Thulamahashe Circuit participate in site-based management?**

To investigate the above-stated problem more effectively the problem was further broken down into the following subproblems:

➢ what are the decision-making ways that are applied by principals in schools?
➢ what kind of decisions do teachers make in schools?
➢ how do School Governing Bodies (SGB's) encourage teachers to participate in school management?
➢ to what extent do principals consult junior teachers with regard to matters of management?
➢ what role do teachers play in the formulation of policies in schools?
➢ what are the management and leadership styles that are applied by principals to encourage teacher participation?

1.5 AIM OF THE RESEARCH

1.5.1 Research aim:

The aim of this research article was to investigate the extent to which teachers in schools at the Thulamahashe Circuit participate in site-based management.

1.5.2 Research objectives:

➢ to investigate the decision making ways applied by principals in schools;

➢ to establish the nature of decisions that teachers make in schools;

➢ to determine the extent to which principals' leadership styles affect teacher participation in decision making;

➢ to establish the role of SGB's in increasing teacher participation in decision making;

➢ to establish the role of teachers in policy formulation in schools; and

➢ to establish the extent to which junior teachers are consulted with regard to management issues in schools.

1.6 CONCEPT ANALYSIS

1.6.1 Teacher participation

Teacher participation is a system of involving teachers in work that has traditionally been done by principals (Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen 1997:196). Teacher participation according to Melcher, (in Taylor et al 1995:51), refers to the extent to which subordinates or other groups who are affected by decisions are consulted and involved in the making of decisions. This research will therefore understand "teacher participation" to mean the involvement and consultation of teachers in the making of decisions that have traditionally been made by principals.

1.6.2 Site-based management

Gaziel (1998:320) defines site-based management as "a system of education management that enhances the autonomy of members at the site level in creating advantageous conditions for participation, improvement, accountability and professional growth". Chan, Ching & Cheng (1997:18), on the other hand, regard site-based management as: decentralisation of power from a central authority to the school site level in order to encourage human initiative, participation and better decision making.

Boyd & Martinez (1997:28) give a more comprehensive definition of site-based management when they define it as: the sharing of authority to make specific school-related decisions, based on the information necessary and sufficient to make them most efficiently and effectively, as well as the distribution of such authority to those in or closely associated with that school, usually on site, and who are most willing and likely to know how to evaluate the relevant data; what to do about the meaning of those data; when, who, and how to do it; and who will evaluate the results of this process and make conforming or reforming decisions, over the long and consistent run.

1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

1.7.1 Research method

Mouton (1996:35) defines research method as the total set of means that researchers employ in their goal of valid knowledge. Cohen & Manion (1994:34), on the other hand, assert that research method refers to a range of approaches used in educational research to gather data which are to be used as a basis for interference and interpretation, for explanation and prediction.

According to Henning (2004:36) "methodology" refers to the coherent group of methods that complement one another to deliver data and findings that reflect the research question and suit the research purpose.

A qualitative approach

In this study the qualitative approach was used. The qualitative approach relies on the skills of an interviewer or observer to gather data whilst the quantitative approach has reliance upon research instruments employed to gather and analyse data (Jary & Jary 1991, in Clark, Riley, Wilkie & Wood 1998:40).

Merriam (2001:5-9) identifies the following assumptions underlying qualitative research:

➢ the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis;
➢ the researcher physically goes to people, site or institution to observe or record data;
➢ it is descriptive in that meaning and understanding is gained through words or pictures; and
➢ the method is inductive in that it builds abstractions from details.

Although the qualitative approach was employed in the investigation it has the following limitations:

➢ qualitative research by its nature can be more demanding than quantitative research (Clark et al 1998:101); the researcher had limited time and resources for undertaking an investigation of this magnitude because of its demanding nature and he therefore covered as many aspects of the research as possible when paying visits to school sites to talk to principals, respondents and school site committees.
➢ the researcher conducted interviews, the procedures involved in conducting them pose serious challenges as the interviewees' responses may not be repeated verbatim in subsequent interviews and may result in questionable veracity (Clark et al 1998:101).

> the researcher was involved with the phenomena being studied and this increased the possibility of human error and bias (Clark et al 1998:101; McMillan & Schumacher 1993:14); the researcher was personally involved in the gathering of data and interpretation without the aid of modern computer software programmes and this may negatively affect the research outcomes. To reduce human error and his bias the researcher reread the interview transcripts several times before drawing conclusions;

> lack of generalisable findings (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:14). The researcher conducted the research in different school sites with different settings, the findings may not necessarily be generisable to other situations apart from the school sites involved. To minimise this, the researcher avoided forging links on the data where they did not exist.

1.7.2 Research design

1.7.2.1 Definition

Mouton (1996:107) asserts that a research design is a set of guidelines and instructions to be followed in addressing the research problem.

Huysamen (1994:20) defines research design as the plan or blueprint which specifies how research participants are going to be obtained and what is going to be done to them with a view to reaching conclusions about the research problem.

McMillan & Schumacher (1993:31) describe research design as an investigation which is used to provide answers to research questions, in other words a research design describes:

> the conditions for conducting a study;
> the conditions under which data will be obtained; and
> how the research is set up, that is, the subjects and the methods that will be used for data collection.

The research design therefore gives an overview of how the actual research is conducted and also determines how the data are analysed. The research design enables the reader to follow and evaluate the researcher's line of reasoning (Strauss and Myburgh 2000:93).

The design for the investigation was carried out as follows:

1.7.2.2 Literature review

An extensive literature review was done for the following reasons (Tuckman 1988:41):

➢ literature provides the researcher with many general perspectives;
➢ it provides the historical context of the phenomenon being studied;
➢ it makes it possible for the researcher to avoid repeating past work;
➢ helps to draw conclusions that can be made available to subsequent researchers and practitioners; and
➢ it also helps to provide a basis for establishing the significance of the problem.

In literature study the researcher mainly used the interpretive paradigm which is well-suited for small-scale non-statistical research where understanding of actions takes preference over causes (Cohen & Manion 1994:39).

1.7.2.3 Case study

The approach of this qualitative investigation was in the form of a case study. A case study is an inquiry in which the main focus is on one phenomenon regardless of the number of sites involved in the investigation (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:375).

1.7.2.4 Data collection strategy

Interviews were used as the main data collecting strategy for this study. Clark et al (1998:132) assert that an interview is a form of research and a method of collecting data

which is at its most useful when it gives researchers insight into how individuals or groups think about their world. In other words an interview gives the interviewer an understanding of meanings that interviewees attach to the issues or situations that are under investigation.

1.7.2.5 Sampling

Sampling is the process of selecting a group of individuals from a larger group that is known as a population (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:159). Three schools were sampled and a total of nine teachers were involved in the investigation.

1.7.2.5.1 Research population

The research population was made up of twenty-eight schools at the Thulamahashe Circuit in the Bohlabela District, Limpopo Province.

1.7.2.5.2 Research subjects

Participants in the study were selected by making use of the purposeful sampling method. Infomation-rich participants were chosen, these are participants that are likely to be knowledgeable about the research phenomenon under investigation (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:378).

1.7.2.6 Research paradigm

According to Glesne (1999:4) a research paradigm is a framework or map that guides a researcher's approach in addressing defined problems. The interpretive paradigm was applied in literature review, data collection, analysis and interpretation sections of the study.

1.7.2.7 Data collection and analysis

In qualitative research data collection and analysis are interactive processes that occur in overlapping cycles (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:383). Data analysis began soon after the first interviews were transcribed.

1.7.2.8 Data interpretation and presentation

A brief account of the entire investigation project was given. A summary of results from the analysis of data was made. The researcher interpreted the results and drew conclusions with regard to whether or not the results answered the research question. Explanation of any deficiencies encountered in the chosen research methodology was made.

Implications of the study regarding future research and practical applications were made. Recommendations were presented in the form of a research report that was made available for further use in the field of Education Management.

1.8 DELIMITATION OF THE FIELD OF STUDY

The research was undertaken in Bohlabela District. Bohlabela District is one of the six education districts in Limpopo Province, South Africa. Bohlabela District is further divided into fourteen circuits. Thulamahshe Circuit is one of the fourteen circuits. Three schools at the Thulamahashe Circuit were randomly selected for the research project. Three teachers from each of the three schools were selected purposively to participate in the study.

1.9 PROGRAMME OF THE STUDY

The programme of the study was follows:

CHAPTER 1

Chapter 1 gives a general background of the investigation, motivation, statement of the problem and the aim of the research. The key concepts of the investigation are defined and the research field is demarcated.

CHAPTER 2

In this chapter an extensive literature study on teacher participation in school-based management is done.

CHAPTER 3

The research design of the case study is presented.

CHAPTER 4

The collected data are analysed, interpreted and presented**.**

CHAPTER 5

A summary of the research is given, recommendations are made and conclusion of the study is drawn.

1.10 SUMMARY

Chapter 1 introduced the topic to be investigated. The background to the topic was given. The research problem was stated and the research methodology was outlined. Concept analysis on teacher participation in site-based management was done. The chapter also gave a clear demarcation of the study and culminated in a brief exposition of the programme of study. In the next chapter teacher participation in site-based management is given through extensive literature review.

CHAPTER 2

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter a general background to the field of teacher participation in site-based management was given. From the background it became evident that teacher participation in schools is not what it is supposed to be, hence this investigation. Chapter two provides a theoretical framework for the investigation. This is achieved through an extensive review of literature on the topic. The interpretive paradigm, as it was pointed out in Chapter 1, is used in this review of literature.

Site-based management, as it will be exposed in the literature which is reviewed in the chapter, attempts to improve and make schools function better through the nurturing of a professional culture which offers choice, authority and responsibility through more decision-making powers and a more participative structure at school level (Bezzina 1997:194). Site-based management therefore helps teachers, who have been exposed to years of authoritarianism and top-down approaches, to assert themselves professionally.

2.2 WHAT DOES PARTICIPATION IN SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT ENTAIL?

"Teacher participation" and "site-based management" are two concepts that have not been used consistently or unambiguously. They have been given many names like site-based decision making, site-based management, shared decision making, school-based decision-making, participative management, school site management, collaborative governance, collegiality and so on (Beckmann & Blom 2000:1; Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen 1998:73).

It is quite clear that the two concepts may be subjected to a number of interpretations but for the purposes of this investigation they are used in the broadest possible context. They

are therefore used to refer to the decentralisation of authority to the lowest appropriate level in the school where teachers participate in making decisions that affect them (Beckman & Blom 2000:2).

Site-based management is a movement away from the traditional bureaucratic system of management where the running of schools was rested in the hands of the principal (Chan et al 1997:17; Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen 1998:75). It came about as one of the ways for restructuring of the traditional system of management as it seeks to involve teachers in decision-making (Wall & Rinehart 1998:50).

Participation is not only about taking part in decision-making processes but it is also about being valued (Lilyquist 1998:80), teachers feel rewarded when they are part of the decision making process. Deeply woven in the fabric of participation is the assumption that it leads to greater efficiency, effectiveness and better outcomes (Leethwood 1996:93, in Beckmann & Blom 2000:2).

Teacher participation calls for teachers to assume leadership roles in schools and it requires that principals encourage such leadership from teachers (Wagner 1999:42). Participation of teachers in the making of decisions means different things to different people, it can mean anything from solicitation of opinions to a wholesale of redefinition of who makes what decisions in a school district (Shedd & Bacharach 1991:141).

Many principals are reluctant to involve teachers in decision-making because they fear that they may lose control, but participation does not imply reckless involvement as everyone does not have to be involved in everything (McLagan & Nel 1995:111). Site-based management demands that information be shared between the various stakeholders in the decision-making processes (Beckmann & Blom 2000:2).

Bell (1999:59) argues that, "principals cannot manage schools alone nor take the burden of motivating others to achieve objectives and complete tasks without support from their colleagues, they must actively involve them". Most principals are unfortunately caught in

17

the transition between the old authoritarian era and the new participative era, the latter is a crisis for those who want to cling to the past and an opportunity for those who want to move forward (McLagan & Nel 1995).

Teacher participation in site-based management embraces the assumption that it leads to the following three aspects that are deeply entrenched in the plethora of literature on participative management:

2.2.1 Teacher empowerment

Bezzina (1997:196) defines teacher empowerment as "the transfer of decision-making authority of key school issues to people who in the past had looked to an authority to make decisions. He further subdivides empowerment to the following three aspects:

- access to decision-making: this implies that teachers need to be given opportunities to exercise decision-making which goes beyond the classroom. Such involvement means that they are given a greater say in decisions that affect their roles at school;
- status: when teachers are given access to decision-making they look through themselves with respect and dignity. To achieve status teachers need to feel that they are important and that their experiences and expertise are valued and trusted; and
- knowledge: knowledge is power, an increase in one's knowledge increases one's chances of being empowered. Teachers can therefore increase their demands in site–based management if they show knowledge of what they are talking about.

Teacher empowerment according to Frost (in Frost et al 2000:21), inter alia, aims to:

- develop teachers' capacity for curriculum debate;
- develop self-awareness and a sense of professional growth;
- increase teacher ability and motivation to engage in curriculum decision-making;
- increase their capacity for honest self-evaluation;
- develop a critique of educational policies at both local and national levels; and

➢ increase their ability to build and test theories about teaching and learning.

2.2.2 Autonomy

According to Gaziel (1998:322), a school is said to have autonomy if its teachers and the other stakeholders are given a high level of responsibility and authority for making decisions that are related to the school's decision-making like school policy, allocation of resources and so on. Blom (1999:74) argues that autonomy in our schools is not given to teachers as a basic right but as a privilege that is dependent on certain terms and conditions. The argument for movement towards autonomy is that schools that are not compatible with school autonomy have low teacher morale, discourage professional expertise and have a lower sense of teacher commitment.

This trend, which is deeply rooted in site-based management in schools is, therefore, a real movement in present day education (Gaziel 1998). The participation of teachers in site-based decision-making increases their sense of autonomy, status, self-efficacy and professional growth (Wall & Rinehart 1998:53).

Autonomy, according to Gaziel (1998:328-9) has the following outcomes, amongst others:

➢ it improves teachers' sense of commitment to their schools;
➢ it encourages teachers to help and support each other in solving school-related problems; and
➢ it makes schools to perform better than non-autonomous schools.

2.2.3 Accountability

Participation of teachers in site-based management requires that every member of staff must be prepared for their own accountability. The school should therefore be the agency or group that is most interested in accountability (Bailey 1991:139). Teachers are given

real decision making power to the management of the school and this means that there should be greater accountability on their part (Beckmann & Blom 2000:4).

Accountability in its most basic form places limits on the use of power and authority. It keeps people in power from abusing it and prevents diversion of an institution's resources to inappropriate purposes (Houser 1996:18). Macpherson (1996:32) identifies five forms of accountability which teachers in site-based management should take into consideration:

➢ moral accountability: being answerable to those who have placed the teachers in a position of trust;
➢ professional accountability: teachers must be answerable to themselves and their colleagues;
➢ contractual accountability: they must show responsibility to those who have employed them, that is, in terms of their contract;
➢ political accountability: they must show accountability to political decision makers; and
➢ public accountability: they must account to the interests of the public.

Accountability, as it has been outlined above, means that the school enters into free communication with a variety of interest groups and works through dialogue rather than power in order to achieve its (the school) aims and goals (Blom 1999:72).

2.3 AUTHORITARIAN AND PARTICIPATIVE MANAGEMENT THEORIES

2.3.1 The authoritarian mode of management

The authoritarian mode of management has prevailed since people began to organise political, social and economic institutions (McLagan & Nel 1995:1). It is a bureaucratic system of management where schools are controlled from the centre and where authority and power are vested in the hands of a small group of people in a central office (Mosoge

& Van der Westhuizen 1998:74). In this system of management knowledge is seen as a commodity and schools are organised along factory lines (Frost et al 2000:5).

Chan et al (1997:19) argue that schools using this system of management fail to take part in the new era of global competitiveness because of their emphasis of external control and centralised decision-making. The schools that are under this system of management are often run in a top-down manner (Bezzina 1997:194). This system of management is strongly criticised for being counterproductive and dysfunctional, and for having structural flaws that inhibit communication and consensus building (Bannister & Bacon 1999:8).

Teachers in this rigid mode of management feel less responsible and accountable as they do not have the necessary authority and power to affect the behaviour of others (Beckmann & Blom 2000:3). Maintenance of the authoritarian mode of management which requires a hierarchy of decision-making mechanisms impedes motivation (Brouillette (1997:571).

2.3.1.1 Advantages of the authoritarian mode of management

Although they are outweighed by disadvantages, the authoritarian mode of management has the following advantages (Van Wyk & Van der Linde 1997:16):

➢ it is task-oriented and emphasises control and thus suitable when immediate action is called for;
➢ staff receive direct and immediate assistance towards achievement of their goals;
➢ management takes the initiative in coordinating work; and
➢ tasks, situations and relationships are clearly defined.

2.3.1.2 Disadvantages of the authoritarian mode of management (Van Wyk & Van der Linde 1997:17)

➢ one-way communication, information flows from the principal down the organisational ladder;
➢ suppression of teacher initiative and creative thought;
➢ lack of cooperation on the part of teachers; and
➢ leaders in this mode of management use fear, threats and force as tools of exercising control.

2.3.2 The participative mode of management

The participative mode of management is a style of organisational management which recognises the rights of employees individually or collectively to be involved with management in areas of the organisation's decision-making (Bendix 1996:553).

It is a style of management where everyone becomes a responsible partner in the effort to make an institution successful and it requires everyone to broaden his or her competencies. Participative management also attempts to "flatten the hierarchy" that exists in school leadership and to allow horizontal interaction to take place to give teachers real decision-making power with respect to the management of the school (Beckmann & Blom 2000:4).

Participation means that authoritarian management practices are replaced by a system where all employees take part in decision-making (Isabirye 2002:69). McLagan & Nel (1995:3) assert that the shift to participative management is both inevitable and necessary because the issues faced at the workplace are too interwoven and interdependent to be solved by a few people in authority.

2.3.2.1 Advantages of the participative mode of management

➢ it increases employee productivity (Bendix 1996:50; McLagan & Nel 1995:40; Van Wyk 1995:3);

➢ it increases the rate of employees' professional development (Chan et al 1997:37; Kumar & Scuderi 2000:62);

➢ it enhances job satisfaction (Wall & Rinehart 1999:51);

➢ it enhances the personal motivation of employees (Van Wyk 1995:3);

➢ it leads to high performance work practices (McLagan & Nel 1995:28); and

➢ it increases employee commitment and sense of belonging (Chan et al 1997:37; Gaziel 1998:328; McLagan & Nel 1995:40).

2.3.2.2 Disadvantages of the participative mode of management (Bendix 1996:590; Wall & Rinehart 1999:51)

➢ participation is associated with meetings and it is, therefore, a time consuming process;

➢ conflicts may increase with the increase in the number of meetings being held;

➢ it leads to lack of control and may detrimentally affect managerial efficiency;

➢ it is a slow process which is difficult to implement; and

➢ if not properly controlled managers and employees may promote their own agendas.

2.4 THE ROLES OF THE PRINCIPAL AND THE TEACHERS IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT

The roles of the principal and the teachers in school-based management at this stage need to be looked into as each one has a unique and significant role to play in participation.

2.4.1 The role of the principal

According to Campbell-Evans (1993:93-98) a principal, inter alia, must:

- initiate the participation process as well as provide input;
- mediate between different interpretations and preferences;
- have the skills to gather information, generate alternatives and negotiate a consensus;
- have skills of negotiation and compromise; and
- must be skilled in providing and clarifying facts for others.

2.4.2 The role of the teachers

Beckmann & Blom (2000:2), Bakkenes, De Brabander & Imants (1999:172) and Dimmock (1993:37) indicate that teachers have to:

- be ready to address how they intend to share accountability for decisions taken;
- accept equal responsibility for the outcomes of the decisions made;
- coordinate decision-making processes in their capacity as individuals and groups;
- accept that shared decision-making is about agreeing, disagreeing and compromising while respecting the other person's opinion; and
- feel free to communicate and express opinions that may benefit their school.

The foregoing outlines of principals' and teachers' roles in participative management, which are by no means exhaustive, indicate that participation is open to abuse and if applied irresponsibly it may end up yielding negative results e.g. autocratic or laissez-fare styles of management in the worst case scenario. Principals should therefore take full responsibility and accountability for the participation of teachers and other stakeholders in school management through motivation and guidance (Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen 1998:82).

2.5 TEACHERS'S RELUCTANCE TO PARTICIPATE

Teachers are not always ready to use the opportunity to participate in site-based management; the following are some of the reasons for teachers' reluctance to participate (Hallinger, Murphy & Hausman 1993:37):

➢ they believe that shared decision-making is a formality or an attempt to create illusion of teacher influence;

➢ they believe that their influence makes little or no difference;

➢ principals fear that they will lose control and may not necessarily adopt a positive attitude towards participation;

➢ the actuality of realising the potential benefits of participation is very low; and

➢ it is hard for principals to give up their authority and reins of control.

2.6 BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATION

People may have different views about participation but it certainly has benefits for both the teacher and the school. The following are some of the benefits of participation (Kumar & Scuderi 2000:2; Dimmock 1993:5; Clift,Veal, Holland, Johnson & McCarthy 1995:98, Shedd & Bacharach 1991):

➢ it enables teachers become active participants in school management processes;

➢ it leads to a higher level of meaningful involvement by teachers and teacher teams in the decision-making processes;

➢ it accords teachers opportunities for professional development in decision-making skills;

➢ it is a proactive approach to information sharing among teachers and it makes teachers become better decision makers;

➢ it nurtures teachers' creativity and initiative, empowering them to implement innovative reform ideas;

➢ it results in increased trust between senior management and the teachers;

➢ shared decision-making makes decisions more likely to be acceptable and more likely to be implemented because they reflect and serve the interests of the people responsible for putting them into action;

➢ it is good for the school's long-range planning;

➢ it improves the quality of the management's decisions; and

➢ it enhances effectiveness, efficiency and productivity by improving the school's ability to respond rapidly to problems or opportunities in its environment.

2.7 LEADERSHIP IN SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT

Van der Westhuizen (in Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen 1998:78) conservatively defines leadership as the ability of a person to convince, inspire, bind and direct followers to realise common ideals. Lambert (1998:18), on the other hand, gives what she calls a 'constructivist' definition of leadership as: the reciprocal learning process that enables participants in a community to construct meaning toward a shared purpose. According to her the definition leadership encompasses the following assumptions:

➢ leadership is about learning what leads to constructive change;

➢ everyone has the potential and right to work as a leader;

➢ leading is a shared endeavour which serves as the foundation for the democratisation of schools;

➢ leadership requires the redistribution of power and

➢ authority; and

➢ leadership is not a trait, therefore leadership and leader are not the same.

In site-based management leadership is regarded as everyone's work and this does not require any extraordinary qualities or use of authority (Lambert 1998:18). This particular view of leadership, according to Blom (1999:68), is also known as participative leadership and it accepts that a school may have many individuals exercising leadership.

People who assume such leadership roles are known as informal leaders e.g. group leaders and site stewards. Site-based management does, however recognise formal leaders, these are people like principals who have been appointed to power in order to represent and make decisions on behalf of others (McLagan & Nel 1995:91). The

principal may function as a de facto leader in site-based management without being elected to do so. Democratic leaders in group decision-making participate in dialogue as group leaders and encourage decision making without necessarily influencing it. In effect democratic leaders carry out the will of the group (Morse, Berger & Osnes 1997:193).

2.8 IMPLEMENTATION OF PARTICIPATION

2.8.1 Participation strategies

There are various teacher participation strategies that may be employed in the implementation of site-based management e.g. through the use of quality circles, site-based management committees, task teams, green areas etc. For the purposes of this investigation only the first two will be discussed.

2.8.1.1 Quality circles

"Quality" is a small group concept that originated in industrial settings where the quality of the goods produced had to be controlled by special supervisors. The concept was modified to suit educational institutions where it refers to groups of staff members that have been divided into small groups which discuss problems, pass along possible solutions and recommendations to the management of the school (Bailey 1991:86-7). Quality circles operate from the principle that groups are more efficient in problem identification and problem solving than individuals (Van Rensburg 2001:18-5 to 18-6).

2.8.1.2 Site-based management committees

Supporters of school restructuring believe that if schools are to remain in harmony with the communities that they serve they must allow for the participation of all the stakeholders in question, one forum for achieving this is to establish site-based decision management committees. These committees may be directly involved in decision making or serve in an advisory role to the principal (Morse et al 1997:184).

Wall & Rinehart (1999:52) point out that the rationale behind the involvement of these parties in committees is to solve problems and make decisions that were previously the sole domain of management. These committees must, however, be cautious about their decisions as the participants may not have the collective judgement, expertise or training necessary to understand the impact of their decisions on marginalised teachers (Morse et al 1997:184).

The committees must therefore focus on mission-driven objectives rather than territorial imperatives (Banister & Bacon 1999:10). Schools with the majority of the members without grounding in participation should create opportunities for the teachers (even the principal) to receive relevant training (Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen 1998:83).

The following are some of the many areas that could be affected by the above-mentioned strategies in site-based management:

➢ developing new programs;
➢ scheduling;
➢ allocation of resources to meet instructional needs;
➢ determining professional development programmes;
➢ selecting supplemental instructional materials; and
➢ selecting applicants from a pool of pre-screened candidates.

2.8.2 Ways of making decisions

In collaborative processes the people who are expected to implement decisions are expected to have input in the decision-making process (Livingston, Slate & Gibbs 1999:20). According to Parker, (in Greenbaum, Martinez & Barber 1997:176), a decision must satisfy three conditions:

➢ there should be two or more alternative courses of action, but only one must be taken;

➢ the process by which the decision is made must determine the best alternative; and

➢ the alternative chosen must accomplish a particular purpose.

Vroom and Yetton, in McLagan & Nel (1995:112-4) describe four ways of making decisions that are relevant to the participative organisation today:

➢ independently: a decision is made independently when the person who makes it has the necessary information, and when the commitment of others to it is either assured or unnecessary. Independent decisions are usually acceptable in the case of emergencies and technical issues;

➢ consultation: consultation occurs when a decision maker asks others for possible solutions but makes the decision himself or herself. This way of decision-making is appropriate when the decision maker needs more information than he or she has in order to make a good decision;

➢ consensus: decisions that are made by consensus when the decision maker makes decisions with others. Here the decision maker is one among equals and he or she does not use his or her influence to pressure for a particular view. Making decisions by consensus is particularly good when the decisions require the commitment of others to the decisions made; and

➢ delegation: delegation occurs when a person who has the authority to make a decision passes the power and accountability to another person or other persons (group) to make it. A delegative decision can be made independently, through consultation or by consensus depending on what the new decision maker chooses.

2.9 LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION

Chan et al (1997:21) discuss teacher participation in site-based management from the following three levels:

2.9.1 Participation at individual level

This level of participation involves individuals who carry out tasks and make decisions while pursuing the school's goals. This decision making area closely relates to an individual teacher's performance within the classroom e.g.

➢ choice of teaching materials
➢ teaching schedule
➢ classroom activities
➢ preparation of lessons etc.

2.9.2 Participation at group level

This level of participation focuses on the interaction among school members as teams, groups or departments. The decision making area at this level of participation includes issues that mainly relate to functioning of groups e.g.

➢ subject committees
➢ extra curricular activity groups
➢ groups that handle discipline

2.9.3 Participation at school level

The decision-making area at this level includes areas that affect the school as a whole e.g.

➢ school goals
➢ school policy
➢ admission policy
➢ personnel management
➢ school budget

➢ staff development etc.

2.10 PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICIPATION

Participation of teachers in management does not, however, come without problems. The following are some of the problems that are likely to be encountered by schools in their move to change into participatory institutions (Brouillette 1997:571; De Wee 1994:11; Wall & Rinehart 1999:51):

➢ denial of space for teachers by principals to participate in making decisions that critically affect them;

➢ role ambiguity where principals play the role of coordinator, as demanded of them, but remain the system's most senior official in the school;

➢ principals do not like the idea of consulting with junior teachers and being expected to implement decisions determined by groups and not themselves;

➢ teachers feel that decision making processes are slow, difficult and time-consuming, they find their time bound with decisions that have little to do with teaching;

➢ lack of proper regard for teachers, that is, teachers are not seen as active agents who should be encouraged to innovate and bring about change in schools; and

➢ inadequate restructuring of fundamental processes and practices of educational governance.

2.11 CONSEQUENCES OF LITTLE OR NON-PARTICIPATION

Little or no participation in management is undesirable for a school or any other organisation for that matter as the issues that are faced by principals and teachers within a school are too complex to be solved by people in the top management alone. The following is a brief outline of the undesired consequences of little or non-participation (McLagan & Nel 1995:18-19):

➢ a small, elite group "thinks" and determines goals and resource use;

➢ coercion, power over others, threats and fear of loss of position or access;

➢ the few think, and the many either follow orders or constantly rebel and strike;

➢ the top management plans, controls, organises and motivates;

➢ creation of massive problems for future generations; and

➢ it ensures that subordinates implement leaders' vision of the organisation's purpose and goals.

The above outline clearly indicates that little or non-participation in management is detrimental to the success of any organisation as authority will be highly centralised and may consequently lead to power abuse.

2.12 Summary

The chapter gave a theoretical foundation for the investigation of teacher participation in site-based management. From the various expositions it became evident that the involvement of teachers in this recent restructuring initiative is indispensable. It looks like schools will have to embrace this new trend if they have to improve or to remain competitive organisations in future. Chapter 3 gives a detailed methodological approach that was adopted for carrying out the investigation.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter teacher participation in site-based management was looked into through extensive review of literature. The present chapter gives a detailed exposition of the research methodology and design of the investigation as intended by the researcher.

3.2 RESEARCH METHOD AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study understands "method" to mean a way of doing something, and "methodology" to mean the coherent group of methods that complement one another to deliver data and findings that reflect the research question and suit the research purpose (Henning 2004:36).

3.2.1 Quantitative and qualitative approaches

The terms "quantitative" and "qualitative" are used to identify the two different approaches to research (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:14).

3.2.1.1 Quantitative approach

Cresswell (1994:6) identifies the following underlying assumptions about the quantitative paradigm:

➢ the researcher is independent and removed from the phenomena being studied;
➢ the researcher maximises the distance between himself and the phenomena being studied;
➢ the researcher's values are kept out of the study;

➢ the language used is impersonal and formal; and

➢ it uses deductive instead of inductive reasoning to reach conclusions about the research problem.

3.2.1.2 Qualitative approach

The qualitative approach was chosen for this study (cf. 1.7.2 above). Strauss & Corbin (1990:19) define qualitative research as any kind of research that produces findings that are not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification.

Ary et al (1990:445) assert that the qualitative method seeks to understand human and social behaviour from the "insider's" perspective, that is, as it is lived by participants in a particular social setting e.g. school, community or group. The ultimate goal of this method, according to Ary et al (1990:445), is to portray the complex pattern of what is being studied in sufficient detail so that the one who has not experienced it can understand it.

According to Glesne (1999:8) the term qualitative may be used as an umbrella term for various orientations to interpretivist research e.g. researchers often call their work ethnography, phenomenology, case study or a number of other terms. McMillan & Schumacher (1993:14-15) identify the following assumptions about the qualitative paradigm:

➢ reality is constructed through an individual's definition of the situation;

➢ it seeks to understand social phenomena through participants' perspectives;

➢ there is greater flexibility in methods and research process than in quantitative approaches;

➢ the researcher is highly involved with the phenomenon being studied; and

➢ believes that human actions are influenced by situations in which they occur.

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

"Research design" was defined in paragraph 1.7.2.1 above and it is a term that is understood by this study to mean a set of conditions or guidelines for carrying out an investigation that is followed by a researcher in order to provide an answer to the research question. The conditions and setup of this study are explained in detail in subsections 3.3.4-3.3.7 below.

3.3.1 Design process

According to Henning (2004:143-4) in the design process the researcher:

➢ explains why he/she investigates in certain methods and gives the reasons why research were sampled in a particular way;

➢ mentions the methodology of the design;

➢ mentions how the data will be analysed, he/she therefore argues the reasons for analysing data according to a certain paradigm;

➢ defines the data management procedures that will be applied in the study; and

➢ states what he/she will do with the set of analysed data and mention the literature, if any, that will be used in the final interpretation and discussion of the data.

3.3.2 Research paradigm

As it was pointed out in paragraph 1.7.2.6, the interpretive paradigm was applied in data collection, analysis and interpretation sections of the study. Glesne (1999:5) asserts that interpretivistism is based on the assumption that the researcher is dealing with socially constructed realities that cannot be divided into discrete variables, the researcher therefore takes it as his task to understand and interpret how participants construct their world around them.

Data gathered within the interpretive paradigm are primarily descriptive and therefore lays emphasis on insight and not on mathematical logic (Cryer 200:79). The interpretivist research paradigm, according to Henning (2004:21) does not concern itself with applicable rules but seeks to understand people's definitions and understanding of social phenomena.

The interpretive paradigm's main endeavour according to Cohen & Manion (1994:36) is to understand the subjective world of human experience. This study is both non-statistical and small-scale in nature and the interpretive paradigm was used particularly because of this reason.

3.3.4 Data collection approach

The data collection approach for this qualitative study was in the form of a case study.

3.3.4.1 Case study

As it was indicated in paragraph 1.7.2.3 above, a case study is an inquiry in which the main focus is on one phenomenon regardless of the number of sites that are involved in the investigation (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:375). A case study is therefore employed to gain an in-depth understanding of a situation and the meaning for those who are involved. A case study has an end-product that has a rich, "thick" description of the phenomenon under study (Merriam 1998:27). Data collection in this inquiry was done through interviews. The interview is looked into in following paragraphs:

3.3.4.1.1 Interview

Clark et al (1998:132) assert that an interview is a form of research and a method of collecting data that is at its most useful when it gives researchers insight into how individuals or groups think about their world. In other words an interview gives the

interviewer an understanding of meanings that interviewees attach to the issues or situations that are under investigation.

McMillan & Schumacher (1993:423) define an interview as an open–response question to obtain data on how individuals conceive their world and how they explain important events in their lives.

The research interview is a professional conversation that has a purpose to obtain descriptions of the life-world of the interviewee with regard to interpreting the meaning of particular phenomena (Kvale 1996:6)

3.3.4.1.2 Value of interviews

Interviews are often the primary source of data in qualitative research and they have the following advantages (Ary et al 1990:419):

➢ a greater completion rate than other methods e.g. questionnaires;
➢ the interviewer has control over the order in which questions are answered;
➢ the interviewer observes the situation in which the participant is responding;
➢ questions can be repeated in case they are not understood; and
➢ the interviewer can press for additional information where a response seems to be incomplete.

3.3.4.1.3 Limitations of interviews (Mouton 1996:151)

➢ the interview provides information that is filtered through the views of interviewees;
➢ it provides information in a designated place instead of the natural field setting;
➢ the presence of a researcher may result in biased responses; and
➢ not all people are equally articulate and perceptive to situations.

A researcher may minimise 'interviewer bias' by applying some of the following strategies as suggested by Clark et al (1998:134):

➢ repeating questions where interviewees do not seem to understand;

➢ encouraging interviewees to think further through statements like 'could you explain further?, 'tell me more about it' and so on.

➢ allowing interviewees to decide when to continue after they have paused without pressing hard on them.

3.3.4.1.4 Types of interviews

Qualitative interviews may take many forms like the unstructured (informal conversational) interview, semi-structured (interview guide) interview and the structured (open-ended) interview (Hoberg 1999:78). Each of these types of is outlined below:

3.3.4.1.4.1 Unstructured interview

In the unstructured interview, also called the informal conversational interview, questions emerge from the immediate context and are asked in the natural course of events, that is, there is no predetermined set of questions that are posed (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:426). The researcher focuses on the first hand experience of the life-world of the individual rather than on his/her explanations of it (Huysamen 1994:174).

3.3.4.1.4.2 Semi-structured interview

In this approach topics are selected in advance but the researcher decides the wording and sequence of the questions during the interview. This type of interview is found between the unstructured and the structured interview. The interviewer asks the respondents the same questions but may adjust the terminology and the formulation of the questions as the interview develops (Huysamen 1994:145).

3.3.4.1.4.3 Structured (open-ended) interview

In this interview participants are asked the same questions in the same order to reduce the bias of the interviewer (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:426). The interviewer asks the respondent a previously combined set of questions face to face and records the responses of the latter. The interviewer is strictly restricted to the questions, their wording and sequence as they appear in the interview schedule (Huysamen 1994:144).

3.3.4.1.5 Choice of interview type

The structured (open-ended) interview was used for this study. This type interview was selected because of the following reasons:

➢ the structured interview allows the interviewer to be a neutral facilitator of the interview process as the respondents give their responses;
➢ if used strictly according to its methodological principles of neutrality and objectivity it yields information "as it is";
➢ the data yielded by this type of interview are regarded to be credible and believable;
➢ the content of the responses is believed to be the "real thing'' as presented by the participant;
➢ the interviewer avoids asking leading questions that may lead to a "confessional mode" if the respondent is not ready for it; and
➢ the interviewer guides the interviewee without interference (Henning 2004:53).

The structured interview has the following limitations:

➢ the interviewer has little or no freedom to deviate from the schedule (Huysamen 1994:144);
➢ the interviewer needs to be familiar with the interview schedule so that he reads them fluently or asks them from memory (Huysamen 1994:144);

- standardised wording of questions limits the naturalness and relevancy of responses (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:426);and

- the interview process involves an interviewer and a respondent are engaged with each other, therefore the data produced cannot be completely neutral (Henning 2004:54);

To overcome the above-mentioned shortcomings the researcher, inter alia, applied the following strategies:

- did an extensive study of literature on ways to develop good interview questions; this resulted in him (researcher) asking questions that required little or no deviation from the schedule. The questions were designed in such a way that they made sense to both the interviewer and the respondent (Glesne 1999:71);

- familiarised himself with the questions so that he could ask them in a conversational tone without constantly pausing to find what question came next, this helped to keep the respondent's attention focused on the task in hand (Ary et al 1990:420);

- asked questions as clearly as possible to minimise misunderstandings on the part of the respondents, in cases where this happened questions were paraphrased to help the respondents to get the question exactly as it was; and

- adhered to the principles of good interview technique (Clark et al 1998:133) as outlined in paragraph 3.3.4.1.6 below.

3.3.4.1.6 Good interview technique

The researcher did the following:

- requested for rooms that were quiet and conducive enough to encourage the interviewees to respond freely without interruptions from telephones or people coming and going in the middle of the interviews;

- introduced himself to the individual interviewees to give them a general overview of the interview and to inform them about the approximate duration of the interview in order to establish a positive state of mind from the outset;

> took notes as the interviewees were responding to the questions that were asked; and

> avoided leading respondents or putting words into their mouths in order to reduce interviewer bias.

3.3.4.2 Sampling

3.3.4.2.1 Definition

Sampling is the process of selecting a group of individuals from a larger group that is known as a population (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:159).

3.3.4.2.2 Types of sampling

There are two general types of sampling viz. probability and non-probability sampling.

3.3.4.2.2.1 Probability sampling

Probability sampling, according to Clark et al (1998:75), is a sampling technique that gives equal chance to members of a population to be selected. It is the most effective way in which a sample can lead to legitimate generalisations about the population from which a sample is drawn. In probability sampling samples are drawn from a large population in such a way that the probability of selecting each member of the population is known (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:160).

3.3.4.2.2.2 Non-probability (purposive) sampling

Non-probability or purposive sampling is regarded as a sampling technique where the chance of selection for each element in a population is unknown or zero for some elements. It may also be stated that non-probability sampling is everything that probability sampling is not (Clark et al 1998:77).

Probability (random) sampling was used in selection of the three schools from a sample frame of twenty-eight. Non-probability (purposive) sampling was used in the identification of information-rich participants.

3.3.4.2.3 Sampling frame

Babbie & Mouton (2001:174) define a sampling frame as a list of elements composing the study population. The sampling frame of this study was made up of all schools found at the Thulamahashe Circuit. Thulamahashe Circuit has twenty-eight schools.

The following table (Table 3.1) lists all the schools, their EMIS numbers and the names of the settlements where they are located, in no specific order, which comprised the sampling frame:

Table 3.1 List of schools

SCHOOL	EMIS NUMBER	SETTLEMENT
Eric Nxumalo High	914440073	Thulamahashe Township
Godide High	914440233	Rolle Trust
Wisani Primary	914441243	Rolle Trust
Xilongana Primary	914441267	Edinburgh Trust
Mavandla Primary	914440660	Edinburg Trust
Orhovelani High	927441601	Thulamahashe Township
Mafemai Nxumalo High	914440424	Thulamahashe Township
Thulamahashe Primary	914441212	Thulamahashe Township
Bombani High	927440059	Mbumba Trust
Zwide Primary	914441304	Thulamahashe Township
Ezrom Primary	914440189	Zola Trust
Floraphophe Primary	914440202	Rolle Trust
Humulani Primary	914431162	Athol Trust
Mpikaniso Higher Primary	914440752	New Forest Trust
Nghunghunyana High	914440868	New Forest Trust
Mahlambandlopfu Primary	914441434	Thulamahashe Township
Mpithi Primary	914440776	Thulamahashe Township
Magigwana High	914440455	Athol Trust
Songeni Primary	92744115	Mbumba Trust
Soniye Primary	914441168	Rolle Trust
Mzimba High	914440820	Dumphries Trust
Mzilikazi Primary	927441595	Dumphries Trust
Mahuvo High	914440479	Allandale Trust
Charley Mbungele Primary	914440073	Rolle Trust
Ndwandwe Primary	914441946	Dumphries Trust
Sabeka Primary	914441021	Allandale Trust
Malamule High	914440516	Edinburg Trust
Dumphries High	927440141	Dumphries Trust

Only three schools were sampled to take part in the investigation. The three schools were chosen by making use of the simple random sampling method. The simple random sampling method is a subset of the probability sampling technique where subjects are selected from a population where all elements have the same probability of being selected (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:161).

The names of the schools were put in a hat where three names were drawn. This was done in order to choose a sample that was unbiased (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:167).

3.3.4.2.4 Research population

Ary et al (1990) define population as "those people about whom one wants to learn something". The research population for this study was made up of a total number of nine teachers, three teachers from each of the three schools that were sampled by the procedure outlined in 3.3.4.2 above. The nine teachers were interviewed in their respective schools.

3.3.4.2.5 Choice of research subjects

Participants in the study were selected by making use of the purposeful sampling method (cf. paragraph 1.7.2.5.2 above). Cresswell (1994:148) points out that the idea of qualitative research is to purposefully select participants without attempting to select them randomly.

Information-rich participants were chosen. Information-rich cases, according to Patton (1990, in Glesne 1999:29 and Merriam 1998:61), are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance.

3.3.4.3 Gaining access

Access refers to the acquisition of consent to go wherever the researcher wants, to talk to whomever he wants and to do all this for whatever period of time he/she needs to satisfy the research purposes (Glesne 1999:39).

The data collection activities of this study took place in schools, the gatekeepers[1] for these institutions are the circuit manager and the various school principals. Permission was applied for from both the circuit manager and the principals of the three schools to conduct interviews. Letters to this effect were written and delivered personally by the researcher. Permission was granted to the researcher either verbally or telephonically by the various gatekeepers.

3.3.4.4 Research conditions

Permission for the use of empty classrooms or offices that were quiet and not overcrowded was applied for from the principals of the schools where the research interviews were to be conducted. The interviews were conducted during normal working days and where possible the educators were interviewed during their free periods. This was done to avoid disturbance of lessons in the participating schools.

3.3.4.5 Research language

According to Babbie & Mouton (2001:238) in a multilingual society like South Africa it is important that respondents are interviewed and answer questions in a language they feel comfortable. The interview questions were asked in English and the interviewees were to respond in English but in cases where the respondents felt free to express their ideas in their home language they were allowed to do so.

---

[1] Persons who must give their consent before one enters a research site (Glesne 1999:39)

Clarification of questions in their home language was only to be done on the request of the interviewees. Where questions were answered in the respondent's home language the researcher translated to English and tried as much possible to achieve a high level of lexical equivalence (Babbie & Mouton 2001:238).

3.3.4.6 Duration of the study

The researcher used the interview method to collect data in this study. One of the limitations of the method is the fact that interviews are time-consuming because of the appointments that have to be arranged to suit both the interviewer and the respondents, the time that is taken by the interviews and the number of visits that may be made to the respondents' workplace or home to conduct.

The researcher's intention was to complete the interviewing process in a period of about six weeks, including the time for delays, rescheduling of the interviews, cancellations and so on. Glesne (1999:34) points out that it is a basic given that things take longer than planned in qualitative research. The interviewer continued as long as it took until all the required data were collected.

3.3.5 Data collection

3.3.5.1 Research sites

Thulamahashe Circuit is found in Bohlabela District, a predominantly rural area in the south eastern corner of Limpopo Province. The circuit has twenty-eight schools that are spread over an area of about 60km². The researcher personally visited all the sampled school sites to deliver application letters, to acquaint himself with the interviewees and to conduct interviews with the various participants.

3.3.5.2 Roles of the researcher

The researcher played the following roles in the study:

3.3.5.2.1 Permission from the circuit office

The researcher wrote a letter of application to the Thulamahashe circuit manager to secure permission to conduct research in the selected schools. The letter (Annexure E) briefly specified:

➢ the school sites to be visited;
➢ the objectives of the study;
➢ research subjects;
➢ the duration of the data collection procedures;
➢ protection of the research subject's rights; and
➢ the researcher's institution (McMillan & Schumacher 1993: 412).

3.3.5.2.2 School site visits

The researcher paid personal visits to the three sites to inform the principals that their schools had been randomly selected for the research. Letters (Annexure F) of application to conduct research in their schools were hand delivered to the principals, these letters also requested for permission of release of teachers to participate in the research. The letters had detailed information about:

➢ the objectives of the study;
➢ research subjects;
➢ the duration of the data collection procedures;
➢ protection of the research subject's rights; and
➢ the researcher's institution (McMillan & Schumacher 1993: 412).

3.3.5.2.3 Choice of research participants

As it was pointed out in paragraph 3.3.4.2.4 above the study was comprised of research participants that were selected purposively by the researcher. According to Huysamen (1994:44) researchers rely on their experience, ingenuity and/or previous research findings to select participants by means of purposive sampling. The researcher relied on his experience as a teacher to deliberately obtain names of participants for the study. The various site committees or any willing teachers were requested to assist in the identification process. Once the participants had been identified; the researcher, in line with proper research ethics, followed the following procedures:

➢ approached the potential participants;
➢ introduced himself;
➢ informed them about the pending study;
➢ informed them about their selection;
➢ requested them to participate in the project;
➢ briefed them about the objective of the study;
➢ gave them information about the duration of the study;
➢ arranged dates and times that suited the participants' social and work commitments (Clark et al 1998:133); and
➢ visited the participants two more times to acquaint them with the research topic before the interviews commenced.
➢ in the process wrote each respondent a personal letter which requested for their participation in the project and personally delivered them(Annexure G);
➢ in turn the respondents were requested to sign letters of informed consent(Annexure G);

3.3.5.3 Interviewer attributes

The interviewer at all times adhered to the following useful attributes when conducting interviews (Glesne 1999: 83):

> anticipatory: he looked forward to the interview and reflected much about the specifics of the interview beforehand e.g. the material that was to be assembled for the interview, the way in which the participants would be called and so on;

> alert to establish rapport: he showed interest in what the respondents had to say. By establishing good rapport between himself and the respondents he was more than likely to get detailed answers to his questions;

> non-directive: the researcher wanted to learn about the respondents' experiences, views and beliefs, he was therefore non-directive and let them provide the answers to his questions;

> naïve: the researcher set aside his assumptions and assumed a learner's role. He therefore became a learner and let the respondents enjoy the satisfaction of being interviewed; and

> patient: The researcher concentrated on being patient in order to get complete answers from the respondents without using probes.

3.3.5.4 When conducting the interviews (Huysamen 1994:145; McMillan & Schumacher 1993:253-4):

> the interviewer was dressed in accordance with existing norms, that is, in more or less the same way as the respondents;

> the interviewer was relaxed, friendly, pleasant and appeared interested as much as possible to the welfare of the respondents;

> the researcher used an interview guide (Annexure E) which contained a detailed sequence of questions that were to be covered by the interview;

> he asked questions and recorded answers verbatim by means of a tape recorder;

> descriptive notes of the interview setting were taken and the researcher continued taking notes throughout the interview process;

> respondents were given sufficient time to respond to questions, questions were repeated where respondents did not seem to understand;

> at all times the researcher avoided asking leading questions; and

> after all the questions had been answered the respondents were thanked for their effort.

3.3.6 Data analysis

3.3.6.1 Definition

McMillan & Schumacher (1993:480) define qualitative data analysis as a "systematic process of selecting, categorizing, comparing, synthesizing and interpreting to provide explanations of the single phenomenon of interest"

Babbie & Mouton (2001:490), on the other hand, regard qualitative data analysis as all forms of analysis of data that was gathered using qualitative techniques regardless of the paradigm used to govern the research.

3.3.6.2 Data analysis procedures

In qualitative research data collection and analysis are interactive processes that occur in overlapping cycles (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:383). Analysing qualitative data is an eclectic activity as there is "no right way" of doing it (Tesch 1990:96; McMillan & Schumacher 1993:464). Vithal & Jansen (1997:7) correctly point out that data collection and analysis is an iterative process because the researcher repeatedly moves back and forth through the data rather than in a simple linear direction.

Cresswell (1994:153) asserts "data analysis requires that the researcher be comfortable with developing categories and making comparisons and contrasts", he identifies the following procedures to analyse qualitative data:

> data collection, sorting into categories, formatting of the information into a story and writing the qualitative text simultaneously;

- reduction and interpretation of the data in order to obtain "a larger, consolidated picture";

- identification of the coding procedure to be used in the formation of themes or categories. Categories of information are formed from the collected data and these categories form part and parcel of the story to be told by the researcher; and

- grounded theory, where the researcher operates inductively beginning with an individual case or cases and then moving to a general theory.

The above guidelines are acceptable but they may prove difficult to apply to research situations by an inexperienced researcher more especially when it comes to generating theories from the data. Glesne (1999:130-144) and McMillan & Schumacher (1993:480), on the other hand, suggest data analysis procedures that are "user friendly" to a novice researcher i.e. they are easy to understand and follow. These procedures were used as a guideline for analysing the collected data of this study and they are outlined in paragraphs 4.3.1-4.3.2 below.

3.4 TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE RESEARCH

The researcher in this study was the main instrument of data collection, analysis, interpretation and presentation. This in itself may threaten the 'validity' and 'reliability' of the research outcomes. To increase the trustworthiness of the research the researcher:

- discussed the interview questions and procedures with his colleagues to explore his topic as well as his subjectivity before the interviewing process started;

- increased his alertness to his own biases and subjectivity by continuously checking before, during and after the interviews if what they yielded was what they were and not the researcher's preconceived opinions;

- conducted interviews in multiple research sites (three schools) on the same theme;

- used structured (open-ended) interviews in quiet offices which were conducive to natural flow of ideas from the respondents; and

- ➢ spent some time at the different research sites building relationships with the respondents and conducting interviews.

3.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Research code of ethics is concerned with researchers' desire and attempt to respect the right of others (Glesne 1999:115). In line with acceptable codes of ethics the researcher:

- ➢ obtained research participants' voluntary informed consent: the participants were informed about the research objectives and the method of recording their responses (Huysamen 1994:179);
- ➢ informed them about their freedom to withdraw from the study at any point without penalty (Glesne 1999:114);
- ➢ assured respondents' confidentiality and protection of their privacy by codenaming participants and the research sites (McMillan & Schumacher (1993:399);
- ➢ planned and conducted the research in such a way that results obtained did not offer misleading information (Ary 1990:480)

3.6 SUMMARY

In this chapter the research methodology and design of the study have been defined and described. Various research methods were discussed, their merits and demerits given and a choice of research method for the study was made and substantiated. The research paradigm and the data collection strategy were also revealed. In the following chapter the collected data are analysed, interpreted and research findings given.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 3 gave a detailed exposition of the research methodology and design of the investigation as intended by the researcher. In this chapter the collected data are analysed, presented and research findings are given. The researcher follows the research methodology that was given in Chapter 3 in order to arrive at his research findings. A rich, thick description of the data is given. "Rich, thick description of data" refers to the complete, literal description of the phenomenon under study (Merriam 1998:30).

4.2 SETTING FOR INTERVIEWS

The interviews were conducted on different days for the various respondents. The respondents were interviewed at their respective schools in places that were allocated by the principals of the schools. The interviews were conducted in English and the interviewees responded in English except for two interviewees who chose to respond to the questions in a combination of English and Xitsonga. A tape recorder was used in all the interviews.

The interviewer used an interview schedule to ask them similar open-ended questions in the same sequence in order to reduce his bias as much as possible (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:426). The questions were repeated where the respondents did not understand the questions or did not hear the questions properly.

4.3 DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis is a process of making sense out of the data that have been collected, which involves consolidating, reducing and interpreting what people have said, it is therefore a

process of making meaning (Merriam 1998:178). Data analysis was divided into two stages namely, early data analysis and later data analysis. Both stages of data analysis were carried out simultaneously with data collection, which is a continuous process in qualitative research; this enabled the researcher to shape and focus the study as it proceeded (Glesne 1999:130).

4.3.1 Early data analysis

The researcher transcribed the interviews verbatim after each day's interviews and kept the transcripts on a computer file. Responses from the three interviewees in each school were put together under one transcript and numbered. There are three interview transcripts from the three schools (Annexures B, C and D). Responses to one question were grouped together under the question that was asked and the coded names of respondents together with their responses were written below the question.

The interview data were organised, reflected and coded preliminarily in order to get an overview of what they had to tell him. According to Rubin & Rubin (1995:238) coding refers to the process of grouping interviewees' responses that brings together similar ideas or themes.

The researcher went through the collected data and notes that were taken during interviews several times in order to understand what the data had to tell him, that is, to get a clear understanding of what the interviewees were trying to tell him (Rubin & Rubin 1995:235). The data were coded for categories, that is, organised into units of meaning or categories, these were then broken down into smaller subcategories (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:486).

4.3.2 Later data analysis

4.3.2.1 Identification of categories and subcategory codes

The researcher used inductive analysis to select, categorise, compare and interpret the collected data (McMillan & Schumacher 1993:480). This procedure requires that the researcher must avoid imposing categories or patterns from the data but allow them to emerge from the data.

The data segments were further coded for frequency. Coding for frequency, according to Babbie & Mouton (2001:492), requires that the researcher note the number of times a particular code appears. The main categories appear in the left columns and the category names in the right columns in the tables with coded data. Coded subcategories appear in the left hand columns below the main categories and in the right hand columns, renditions of different respondents about a particular theme were put together in the form of the respondent's code name. The researcher reread the transcripts from the interviews to be sure that all the emerging categories represented information that were grounded within the data (Rubin & Rubin 1995:249).

4.3.2.2 Patterns from the interviews and interpretation

4.3.2.2.1 Decision-making in schools

Q: Tell me about the decision-making ways that are applied by the principal in your school

R: S01T01

[ATR] Sometimes the principal may come up with a decision that he has made on his own, followers have to implement it because it is a directive from the higher office and higher authority, sometimes the SMT meets take decisions and such decisions have to be

implemented by the teachers in the lower ranks, no questions asked, you don't have to ask anything, "it is policy, it is a directive". Sometimes an issue comes from the SGB decision taken by the SGB but people have to implement, they should do one, two, three... or observe one, two, three... Those are the three ways in which decisions may come.

R: S01T02

[ATR] He decides alone, sometimes when he feels like he does consult teachers.

R: S01T03

[CLT] If there is a problem which warrants his attention he does not simply solve the problem alone. If it is a minor problem he calls the site steward and some members of the SMT where the problem is solved. He does not simply take a decision alone. If it is a decision that needs the SGB, the SGB is the one body that takes the decision. For example we usually have a crisis of the school fees, we know that we need money in the school but because the parents do not afford to pay the amount which is needed it is the SGB that has to decide together with the parents on this issue. That is why I say the principal does not take his decision to be the final one he involves other decision makers.

R: S02T01

[CLT] He does consult teachers with regard to making decisions as long as the decisions are not related to the financial matters of the school.

R: S02T02

[ATR] He does not have enough support within himself, as I indicated he is a lone man at the moment. He is operating as a principal but his support is gone. It becomes very problematic for him because he presently does not have an HOD or deputy or

subordinates within the management structure. So he needs to think and take decision within himself without consulting anyone and when it comes to delivering the decisions that he has taken alone to the teachers there is a gap that he is faced with and that becomes a bit of a problem.

R: S02T03

[ATR] Most of the decisions in the school are made by the principal himself and we as teachers are told what to do. Most of them do not come as a result of consultation between him and the staff.

R: S03T01

[ATR] Teachers are not given enough opportunities to participate in decision- making, he makes decisions and expects us to implement them.

R: S03T02

[ATR] Sometimes he decides autocratically, and the teachers grumble to show that they are not happy with such decisions. He once decided to introduce [mentions the subject] without informing teachers and teachers were very angry. I also remember another time when he came early to school and most teachers were late, he came to me and took the gate keys and locked the gate and they were stranded outside... The teachers were again furious with that decision.

R: S03T03

[ATR] On decision making, for obvious reasons, he has the final say. With the SMT they do debate a lot before they come with decisions. With teachers, they are only informed of decisions that have been taken. Like I said previously sometimes teachers are only allowed to make decisions on minor issues but not the major ones.

Table 4.1 Category and subcategory codes

CATEGORY	WAYS OF DECISION-MAKING IN SCHOOLS
SUBCATEGORY CODE	**FREQUENCY**
ATR	S01T01 S01T02 S02T02 S02T03 S03T01 S03T02 S03T03
CLT	S01T03 S02T1

4.3.2.2.2 Decisions that are made by teachers in schools

Q: What kind of decisions do teachers make in your school?

R: S01T01

[CLT] They make decisions on issues of the general management of the school, on issues of resources because they have to put up with resources, they take decisions on the learning teaching requirements of the school, they also take decisions on issues of discipline because those are the issues that are very close to their hearts Issues of discipline, the learning teaching resources that they need. These two are the important ones and maybe their relationship with the kids they make decisions on how they relate with the kids and how they relate with the parents because we had a problem here some

time ago, there was a gap between the parents and the teachers, the teachers were one group the kids and the parents were one group so it was teachers versus the parents and the kids so such a situation was very bad one that we had, so we had to win the parents over to our side so that we could deal with the kids in a more professional way.

R: S01T02

[EXC] Teachers who make decisions are those who are always with the principal. Most decisions come as orders that have to be carried out, ordinary teachers do not.

R: S01T03

[MDC] If there are going to have a...we are going to have a sporting activity in the school we check our activities and we check our time. If there is a competition that is going to take place and we see that we don't have enough time we take decisions on that one. In the issue of syllabus we do have a committee where teachers are involved. After hours the teachers have extra time where they help the learners. They also help them in the morning and in the afternoon.

R: S02T01

[EXC] This is channelled into individual teachers because we do make decisions as teachers but as I said there are teachers who are regarded as superior to the others, they can make a particular decision that is taken into consideration.

R: S02T02

[EXC][MDC] I can't quite say what decisions exactly because decisions are made on a day to day basis but there are some places where we are left out, we do not participate in decision making we are just informed, but we do make decisions based on the allocation of subjects someone has to do this, we do sit down as teachers to make minor decisions

that are not quite influential within the school. But in bigger decisions like the financial matters of the school all these, I think you know what I mean, are not happening.

R: S02T03

[MDC] Hmm... The only decisions that they make revolve around the school timetable and time allocation in the school.

R: S03T01

[EXC] We don't make many decisions the principal does.

R: S03T02

[MDC] They make decisions on discipline, the smooth running of the school, they only take major decisions through the permission of the principal or when the principal is not near. But not major ones like expelling a learner.

R: SO3T03

[MDC] Important ones no, I don't think we make such decisions. The important ones are usually made by the SMT, we only make minor decisions.

Table 4.2 Category and subcategory codes

CATEGORY	DECISIONS THAT ARE MADE BY TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS
SUBCATEGORY CODE	FREQUENCY
EXC	S01T02 S02T02 S02T01 S03T01
CLT	S01T01
MDC	S01T03 S02T02 S02T03 S03T03

4.3.2.2.3 Role of SGB's in encouraging teacher participation in school-based management

Q: How does the school governing body (SGB) encourage teachers to participate in school management?

R: S01T01

[SGNR] I don't think the SGB has a direct role in encouraging the teachers. They are not relevant in encouraging teachers.

R: S01T02

[SGNR][SGSP] The SGB does not encourage teachers. The SGB only acts as a problem-solving body but apart from that its role in the school is minimal. It only comes when teachers or learners have problems. Its main focus is on problems. It mainly complains about teachers not teaching or complaining about this and that. In fact the SGB of the school discourages teachers.

R: S01T03

[SGPR] What I know they normally do is that the SGB encourages us to help kids during that time give us the mandate to be with those learners. So they do encourage us in everything that we do. Even in sporting activities it does support us.

R: S02T01

[SGNR][RBST] As I indicated before we do have a governing body but the final say is always from the principal. Even if he doesn't put it directly as his final say but because he is in the governing body he always encourages it to make decisions that suit him. So I would not say the governing body is encouraging teachers to take part in the management of the school.

R: S02T02

[SGNR][SGSP] Very little, I can say, because I am still worried about the operation of our SGB, they are not operating the way they should. They are operating as problem solvers but not as "developmentalists" so to say, because they should be people who are trying to develop the school but they only come to the school when there are problems.

R: S02T03

[SGNR][SGSP] It does not encourage the teachers we only see them when there are problems in the school.
R: S03T01

[SGNR] I have never heard anything from the SGB encouraging teachers to participate in management.

R: S03T02

[SGSP] When there are problems it comes to the school to solve them.

R: S03T03

[SGNR] Let me say they do not encourage teachers. I have never heard them encouraging teachers. The governing body liaises more with the principal than with the teachers.

Table 4.3 Category and subcategory codes

CATEGORY	ROLE OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES (SGB'S) IN ENCOURAGING TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT
SUBCATEGORY CODE	**FREQUENCY**
SGNR	S01T01 S01T02 S02T01 S02T02 S02T03 S03T01 S03T03
SGPR	S01T03
SGSP	S01T03 S02T02 S02T03 S03T02
RBST	S02T01

4.3.2.2.4 Consultation of junior teachers with regard to management issues

Q: To what extent does the principal consult junior teachers with regard to matters of management?

R: S01T01

[PCI][SMG] I think the principal is very democratic because from time to time he is engaged in informal consultative process with junior teachers and such a consultation is likely to impact on the decision that is going to be taken and more so that he is a male and when he consults with the male junior teachers he is likely to implement their decision.

R: S01T02

[PCI] He does not dwell much on formalities, when he wants something done he approaches a particular individual who may be relevant in carrying out the task. He avoids calling all of us to meetings because he says we always give him a tough time so he avoids being angered by us.

R: S02T01

[DNC] He has only begun now that his SMT is out of the school but under normal circumstances he does not consult them.

R: S02T02

[LMC] Minimally so, if this interview is honest because in terms of management issues, I don't think we are... Not that we are not consulted but it is minimal based on the idea that it does not concern junior teachers because it is irrelevant to their scope of work.
R: S02T03

[DNC] He does not consult junior teachers.

R: S03T01

[DNC] I have never seen him consulting them, yes I have never seen him consulting them. Actually he does not consult them.

R: S03T02

[PCI] The principal may sometimes consult you 'strategically' in a manner that you won't know he is consulting or he may otherwise call us to a meeting.

R: S03T03

[DNC]I don't think he consults them. There are times when you find him talking to the senior ones saying, 'don't let the juniors see you doing one, two, three, you must be exemplary'. Usually with junior teachers I don't think there is any consultation unless if the matter is directed to them but if it is directed to them, not really.

Table 4.4 Category and subcategory codes

CATEGORY	CONSULTATION OF JUNIOR TEACHERS WITH REGARD TO MANAGEMENT MATTERS
SUBCATEGORY CODE	**FREQUENCY**
DNC	S02T01 S02T03 S03T01 S03T03
PCI	S01T01 S01T02 S03T02
LMC	S02T02
SMG	S01T01

4.3.2.2.5 Formulation of school policies and the role played by teachers in their formulation.

Q: Tell me, how was the policy of the school formulated?

R: S01T01

[XTC] A group of teachers, just a group, selected, got together, mandated by the SGB and staff, to formulate a policy. It was presented to the SGB and people commented on it.

R: S01T02

[NVSP] I have never seen such a document. I have only once heard the principal telling male learners not to wear dreadlocks but I do not know where he had got that from.

R: S01T03

[XTC] We were called to a meeting where a draft policy was presented. All teachers were there and we went through each and every item on the draft e.g. time for starting school, school uniform.

R: S02T01

[DNPF] I don't have any idea on that because I only joined the school after the policy was formulated. But along the way we did have sessions where the policy of the school was amended but I don't have more information on that.

R: S02T02

[DNPF] It was through delegation, certain teachers were delegated but it was not given enough time for issues to be debated on how things should be. It was formulated based on pressure that it was wanted somewhere. I still remember this one.

R: S02T03

[NVSP] I am not aware of any policy, I only hear about it when the principal says "this is the policy of the school" but exactly how it was formulated I don't know. Maybe it was formulated before I arrived at the school, I don't know.

R: S03T01

[NVSP] [Laughs] I don't know, I have never seen or read it, I asked one teacher about its existence and I never got an answer because the things that are happening here would not happen if the school had a policy. I was wondering if the school had a policy or not because if it had one, teachers and learners would not behave the way they are behaving right now.

R: S03T02

[XTC] That is a tough one. All teachers were called to a staff meeting where a committee was elected to deal with the formation of the school policy. From there each teacher was given a copy to read and we came together and amended it. That is how it was formulated. But there is a new one that is on the principal's desk that has been formulated by the SMT, it will be released not long. But we have a committee that will look into it.

R: S03T03

It was drawn by the management, they got copies from other schools and compiled it. After that it was given to teachers to scrutinise.

Q: What role did teachers play in the formulation of the school policy?

R: S01T01

[CLT] Their role was: when it came back as a document they looked at it, commented on it.

R: S01T02

[DNPF] I said I do not remember any school policy.

R: S02T01

[XTC] I don't have an idea but when we had a sitting for the amendment of the policy teachers were involved in that because they were required to give inputs and some of the clauses on the policy of the school they were also required to go and formulate statements that would be included in the school policy but apart from that I am not well informed.

R: S02T02

[XTC] Not quite much as I have already indicated. Not all teachers were involved in the formulation some teachers were, but not many teachers gave their inputs on how this thing should be done.

R: S02T03

[DNPF] I don't know.

R: S03T01

[DNPF] I really don't know because I am not even sure that it exists.

R: S03T02

[XTC] They [teachers] had a bit of trust in the SMT. They thought the SMT was good enough to draw the policy because the SMT was democratically elected, they trust the SMT.

R: S03T03
[XTC]They only...I would not say edited, they only read through, if ever there were additions they made them. The biggest role was with the management and not the teachers.

Table 4.5 Category and subcategory codes

CATEGORY	HOW SCHOOL POLICY WAS FORMULATED
SUBCATEGORY CODE	**FREQUENCY**
NVSP	S01T02 S02T03 S03T01
XTC	S01T01 S01T03 S03T02 S03T03
DNPF	S02T01 S02T02
CATEGORY	TEACHERS' ROLE IN POLICY FORMULATION
SUBCATEGORY CODE	**FREQUENCY**
XTC	S02T01 S02T02 S03T02 S03T03
DNPF	S01T02 S02T03 S03T01 S03T03
DSMT	S03T02 S03T03

4.3.2.2.6 Principals' leadership and management styles

Q: What leadership traits does the principal show in your school on a day-to-day basis?

R: S01T01

[DMC] I think he has a style of ... an "all inclusive...", very participatory style in which all teachers are given opportunity to take part in decision-making. There is a site steward from the union, and then there is everybody, not everybody belongs to the union. I see from time to time the management of the school talks to the union people on issues that relate to the day to day administration of the school, and sometimes we all gather and take a decision with consensus where everybody is allowed to take part and influence the decision that is being taken. So in answering the question I may say the leadership style is such that everybody is given an opportunity to take part, influence the decision-making, air their views ... at the end of the day I see people owning up the decisions that have been taken… it is very easy to implement such things because everybody owns it.

R: S01T02

[ADC] The principal is "on and off", he is sometimes autocratic and sometimes he seems to be democratic. He is a difficult person to understand. Sometimes he consults with teachers when something is to be done and sometimes he gives instructions that cannot be questioned.

R: S01T03

[DMC] I think eh…. I think….. I think he is a good manager because he is able to be at school on time. Sometimes when he encounters a problem he deems it fit to. I don't expect something more from him because he is doing well.

R: S02T01

[ADC] Time changes everything, let me say, when I first came to the school there was a difficulty his (principal's) relationship with the teachers was not good. I remember one time we were locked out of the school gate because we came late to school I believe as a teacher that should not happen to because I may have my own reasons for being late for school on a particular day. I would say as time changes he is gradually becoming a democratic leader whilst initially he was autocratic.

R: S02T02

[ADC] He is using different styles of management everyday. On a Monday he might be democratic. On a Tuesday he may be autocratic. Actually there is no direct trait that he is always using. Sometimes he is very democratic and he likes people to come to him, sometimes he does things the way he thinks. But I like his openness, sometimes he is very open to ideas, that is, I can personally go to his office and talk to him about the problems that I see within the school. But what is needed is to say: let us transcend what one does to the group, if one can do this let us all do it. But he is very open person that is what I like about him.

R: S02T03

[ADC] Our principal is sometimes okay sometimes he manages the school badly. He speaks a lot about democracy and change, sometimes he applies it sometimes he goes alone without consulting anybody. The way our school is managed is different from other schools. We had an incident where we agreed to start school at half past seven but to the teachers' surprise the principal changed the time to seven o'clock without consulting anybody. When asked about this unbecoming move he told us it was too hot for the school to start at half past seven and that was not discussed with us. He always talks about change all the time but he doesn't get affected by the change. Sometimes when we

complain about this tendency he manages the school well for two weeks or and later reverts to his old ways, sometimes he tells us "don't forget that I am an old man".

R: S03T01

[ATR] I am not satisfied in terms of the way he manages the school. The way I see it some teachers' opinions are not taken into consideration.

R: S03T02

[ADC] He is very democratic and straightforward but sometimes as a leader sometimes you have to be autocratic if things do not go well. Sometimes you have to be rigid, he is good in doing follow up on issues. He encourages learners and teachers a lot. He has a good relationship with his teachers.

R: S03T03

[ADC] He usually decides on his own without taking advice from anybody but sometimes he tries to accommodate us.

Table 4.6 Category and subcategory codes

CATEGORY	PRINCIPALS' MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP STYLES
SUBCATEGORY CODE	**FREQUENCY**
DMC	S01T01 S01T02
ATR	S03T01
ADC	S01T02 S02T01 S02T03 S02T02 S03T02 S03T03

Table 4.7 Code reference

CODES	MEANING
ATR	Principal decides alone without consulting teachers/The principal is the only decision maker
DMC	The principal allows teachers to have their voice in decision making
ADC	Principal combines both autocratic and democratic leadership and management styles
NS	Not sure of the principal's management and leadership style
ORD	Decisions given to teachers in the form of instructions that have to be taken without question or debate
NFI	Teachers excluded on matters involving finance
LIV	Teachers not actively involved in decision making
X	Number of times a subcategory appears e.g. X 2 means that the subcategory has been expressed twice by the same respondent

SGNR	The SGB does not play a role in encouraging teachers
SGPR	The SGB does play a role in encouraging teachers
SGSP	SGB only goes to school to solve problems
RBST	SGB rubberstamps principal's decision
DNC	Principal does not consult junior teachers
PCI	Principal consults junior teachers informally
LMC	Principal has limited consultation with junior teachers
SMG	Principal consults similar gender junior teachers
MDC	Teachers are mainly involved in making minor decisions
EXC	Teachers not afforded the opportunity to make decisions in the school
DNK	Respondent does know the answer to the question that has been asked

CLT	Teachers are involved in decision making
NVSP	Teachers have never seen or read the policy. Teachers either played no role or they were less involved in formulation of the policy
XTC	Not everybody was involved in formulating the policy, it was conceived by few individuals and imposed on the whole staff
DNPF	Not aware how policy was formed/ not aware of the role played by teachers in policy formulation or not sure if policy exists
DSMT	Policy was drawn by the School Management Team
PRG	Group of teachers, usually similar in gender with the principal that helps him/her in decision making
PTL	Principal takes sides when issues are debated
S01T01	Teacher 1 from school 1
S01T02	Teacher 2 from school 1
S01T03	Teacher 3 from school 1

S02T01	Teacher 1 from school 2
S02T02	Teacher 2 from school 2
S02T03	Teacher 3 from school 2
S03T01	Teacher 1 from school 3
S03T02	Teacher 2 from school 3
S03T03	Teacher 3 from school 3

4.8 ABBREVIATION TABLE

Abbreviations	Meaning
Q	Question
R	Response
SGB	School Governing Body
SGB's	School Governing Bodies
SMT	School Management Team
SMT's	School Management Teams

4.4 FINDINGS

The above analysis and interpretation of data revealed the following findings:

➢ **Decision-making in schools is still in the hands of principals;**
➢ **Teachers are left out when it comes to making important decisions and they are only allowed to make minor decisions;**
➢ **School Governing Bodies do not play a significant role in encouraging teacher participation in school-based management;**
➢ **Junior teachers are generally not consulted in matters relating to management;**
➢ **Teachers have little knowledge of how policies in their schools were formulated or the existence thereof;**
➢ **Principals' management and leadership styles vary on a day-to-day basis.**

4.5 DISCUSSION OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.5.1 Finding 1: Decision-making in schools is still in the hands of principals

The new dispensation in education requires that all stakeholders be involved in decision-making. This dispensation calls for shared decision-making by all in order to enhance the empowerment of principals, teachers and learners so as to make the school a more satisfying workplace and productive learning environment (De Wee 1994: 12).Site-based management implies that teachers should be given more decision-making power and they must be more involved with issues which were the concern of the principal only (Beckmann & Blom 2000:2). Access to decision-making further boosts the status of teachers and helps them to look on themselves and their colleagues with appropriate respect and dignity (Bezzina 1997:197)

The following subcategories emerged inductively from the data under the major category "WAYS OF DECISION MAKING IN SCHOOLS":

➢ Decision making in schools is done solely by principals;

➢ Teachers are ordered to implement decisions that have been made by principals;

➢ Teachers excluded from making decisions that involve financial matters of the school; and

➢ Teachers are less involved in school based decision making;

➢ Principals assisted in decision making by their groups;

Most of the teachers that were interviewed mentioned that their principals single-handedly took decisions and brought them to teachers to implement without consultation (cf. 4.3.2.2.1). The implementation process according to the teachers comes in the form of instructions that have to be carried out without question.

Respondent S01T01 asserted "Sometimes the principal may come up with a decision that he has made on his own, followers have to implement it because it is a directive from the higher office and higher authority...such decisions have to be implemented by the teachers in the lower ranks, no questions asked, you don't have to ask anything, "it is policy, it is a directive".

Respondent R: S02T03 summed up this behaviour when she said "Most of the decisions in the school are made by the principal himself and we as teachers are told what to do. Most of them do not come as a result of consultation between him and the staff".

Schools at Thulamahashe Circuit are still hierarchical in terms of their decision-making mechanisms and managed through a top-down approach with principals on top of the hierarchy.

4.5.2 Finding 2: Teachers are left out when it comes to important decisions and are only allowed to make minor decisions

The hallmark of site-based management is the empowerment of teachers to make decisions about how the school should operate, this means that teachers must be given

delegated authority in making decisions (Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen 1998:80). In Thulamahashe schools teachers are allowed do make minor decisions like subject allocation or on sporting activities but major decisions like finances of the school are mainly the principal's and his/her group's territory.

The following subcategories were identified under the category "DECISIONS THAT ARE MADE BY TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS" (cf. 4.3.2.2.2):

➢ Teachers make minor decisions in schools;
➢ Major decisions only taken through principals' permission;
➢ Finances are only in the principals' domain;

When asked about the kind of decisions teachers make in his school one respondent, respondent S02T02 said: "... decisions are made on a day to day basis but there are some places where we are left out, we do not participate in decision making we are just informed, but we do make decisions based on the allocation of subjects someone has to do this, we do sit down as teachers to make minor decisions that are not quite influential within the school. But in bigger decisions like the financial matters of the school all these, I think you know what I mean, are not happening".

Teachers are not allowed to make important decisions without the principal's permission, this was pointed out by respondent S03T02 when he said "They make decisions on discipline, the smooth running of the school, they only take major decisions through the permission of the principal or when the principal is not near..."

4.5.3 Finding 3: School Governing Bodies (SGB's) do not play a significant role in encouraging teacher participation in school-based management.

Section 20(9) of the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 gives mandate to the governing body of a school to support the principal, learners and staff of the school in the performance of their professional functions (South African Schools Act 1997:2A-19).

The school governing body is supposed to be a school's main partner in leading and managing a school, that is, neither principals, SMT's nor SGB's can perform their functions without the support of the other (Department of Education 2000:32). SGB's in the sampled schools only go to a school when there is a problem to be solved.

All teachers, except one, indicated that the SGB's in their schools played very little or no role at all in encouraging teachers to participate in site based management. The teachers varied in their points of emphasis with regard to the lack of encouragement from their SGB's, that is, some regarded the SGB as being irrelevant in encouraging teachers while other teachers that were interviewed indicated that the SGB's in their schools act as problem-solving bodies.

The following subcategories were identified under the major category "ROLE OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES (SGB'S) IN ENCOURAGING TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT" (cf. 4.3.2.2.3):

➢ They rubber stamp principals' decisions;
➢ They go to schools only when there are problems; and
➢ The SGB is irrelevant when it comes to encouraging teachers to participate in school management

When asked about SGB encouragement on teacher participation in site-based management respondent S01T01 said "I don't think the SGB has a direct role in encouraging the teachers. They are not relevant in encouraging teachers". Respondent S02T01 pointed out that principals also influence decisions made by SGB's when he said "As I indicated before we do have a governing body but the final say is always from the principal. Even if he doesn't put it directly as his final say but because he is in the governing body he always encourages it to make decisions that suit him. So I would not say the governing body is encouraging teachers to take part in the management of the school".

Respondent S02T02 summarised by saying, "Very little, I can say, because I am still worried about the operation of our SGB, they are not operating the way they should. They are operating as problem solvers but not as "developmentalists" so to say, because they should be people who are trying to develop the school but they only come to the school when there are problems".

4.5.4 Finding 4: Junior teachers are generally not consulted in matters relating to management

The pre-1994 school was hierarchically structured with the principal at the top, the deputies below, teachers below them and learners at the bottom (Department of Education 2000:27), but the new policy framework requires that all stakeholders, including teachers, be given opportunities to play a role in managing and leading schools.

Under the major category "CONSULTATION OF JUNIOR TEACHERS WITH REGARD TO MANAGEMENT MATTERS" the following subcategories emerged (cf. 4.3.2.2.4):

➢ Principals avoid consulting junior teachers on management issues;
➢ Junior teachers only consulted informally by principals;
➢ Principals have limited consultation with junior teachers; and
➢ Principals consult same gender juniors;

In Thulamahashe, school principals avoid consulting their subordinates on management issues, have limited consultation or instead they consult junior teachers informally. Respondent S03T01 said it all when she said "I have never seen him consulting them, yes I have never seen him consulting them. Actually he does not consult them". Respondent S01T01 confirmed the issue of informal consultation and gender bias on the part of principals in schools when he said "... from time to time he is engaged in informal consultative process with junior teachers and such a consultation is likely to impact on

the decision that is going to be taken and more so that he is a male and when he consults with the male junior teachers he is likely to implement their decision".

4.5.5 Finding 5: Teachers have little knowledge of how policies in their schools were formulated or the existence thereof

School-based management is another way to maximise teachers' role as policy makers and the success of school policy implementation depends largely in the active involvement of teachers in policy making (Kumar & Scuderi 2000:62). School policy formulation was dealt with under the broader category "Formulation of school policies and the role played by teachers in their formulation". This category was further was divided into two categories namely, "How school policy was formulated" and "Teachers' role in policy formulation".

4.5.5.1 The following subcategories emerged under the category "HOW SCHOOL POLICY WAS FORMULATED" (cf. 4.3.2.2.5)

➤ Teachers are not aware of policies in their schools;
➤ Teachers do not know how policies in their schools came into existence;
➤ Policies were conceived by few individuals and adopted; and
➤ Policies were formulated in a hurry.

4.5.5.2 The following subcategories emerged under the category "TEACHERS' ROLE IN POLICY FORMULATION" the following subcategories emerged (cf. 4.3.2.2.5):

➤ Teachers did not play a role in the formulation of policies in their schools;
➤ Policies were conceived by few individuals and adopted; and
➤ Policies were formulated by School Management Teams (SMT's).

Teachers indicated unawareness or little knowledge of how policies in their schools were formulated or the existence thereof. Teachers therefore did not play a significant role in the formulation of policies in their schools or they had to endorse exotic policies that were drafted elsewhere.

Some respondents had never seen policy documents of their schools and were not even sure if such documents existed. Respondent S01T02 said "I have never seen such a document. I have only once heard the principal telling male learners not to wear dreadlocks but I do not know where he had got that from" and respondent S03T01 answered "I don't know, I have never seen or read it, I asked one teacher about its existence and I never got an answer because the things that are happening here would not happen if the school had a policy. I was wondering if the school had a policy or not because if it had one, teachers and learners would not behave the way they are behaving right now".

In some instances school policies were drafted elsewhere and teachers were only expected to comment on them, the exotic nature and confusion of such policy formulating procedures was illustrated by one respondent (S02T01) who said "I don't have an idea but when we had a sitting for the amendment of the policy teachers were involved in that because they were required to give inputs and some of the clauses on the policy of the school they were also required to go and formulate statements that would be included in the school policy but apart from that I am not well informed". Respondent S03T03 directly confirmed the exotic nature of policies in schools when he stated "It was drawn by the management, they got copies from other schools and compiled it. After that it was given to teachers to scrutinise".

4.5.6 Finding 6: Principals' leadership and management styles vary on a day-to-day basis

The new education paradigm calls for participation of all stakeholders in everyday leadership and management of schools. The principal, however, has the ultimate task of

making sure that decisions are taken and tasks are completed. The management styles and leadership styles of principals in the three schools can be placed in a continuum which runs from being autocratic to being democratic but these vary from day to day as it will be seen in the excerpts below.

The following subcategories emerged from the category "PRINCIPALS' LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT STYLES" (cf. 4.3.2.2.6)

➢ Principals combine autocratic and democratic management and leadership styles; and
➢ Principals not fully affected by change.

Respondent S02T02 pointed out this dual leadership and management behaviour on the part of principals when he said "He is using different styles of management everyday. On a Monday he might be democratic. On a Tuesday he may be autocratic. Actually there is no direct trait that he is always using. Sometimes he is very democratic and he likes people to come to him, sometimes he does things the way he thinks..."

Principals of Thulamahashe schools are trapped in the era of transformation where they would like to cling to power whilst embracing collaborative management and leadership as exemplified by respondent S02T03 when he said "Our principal is sometimes okay sometimes he manages the school badly. He speaks a lot about democracy and change, sometimes he applies it sometimes he goes alone without consulting anybody. The way our school is managed is different from other schools. We had an incident where we agreed to start school at half past seven but to the teachers' surprise the principal changed the time to seven o'clock without consulting anybody. When asked about this unbecoming move he told us it was too hot for the school to start at half past seven and that was not discussed with us. He talks about change all the time but he doesn't get affected by the change himself. Sometimes when we complain about this tendency he manages the school well for two weeks or so and later reverts to his old ways, sometimes he tells us "don't forget that I am an old man".

Respondent S03T02 concurred with respondent S02T03 when he said "Sometimes he decides autocratically, and the teachers grumble to show that they are not happy with such decisions. He once decided to introduce [mentions the subject] without informing teachers and teachers were very angry. I also remember another time when he came early to school and most teachers were late, he came to me and took the gate keys and locked the gate and they were stranded outside... The teachers were again furious with that decision".

4.6 SUMMARY

This chapter analysed and interpreted the patterns of the data that were collected in the three schools that were involved in the study. The data were also presented and findings given. This section prepared the study for the next stage of the investigation where the researcher establishes whether or not the findings provide answers to the research question. Chapter 5 gives the researcher's conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 4 the collected data were analysed, presented and research findings given. This chapter is the final section of the research project where the investigation is summarised, recommendations are given and conclusion is drawn.

5.2 SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH

In this study the researcher set out to answer the research question that was asked in Chapter 1 (General background and motivation for the study). The research question was: **to what extent do teachers in schools at Thulamahashe Circuit participate in site-based management?**

In order to investigate the problem more effectively the problem was further broken down into the following subproblems:

- ➢ What are the decision-making ways that are applied by principals in the schools?
- ➢ What kind of decisions do teachers make in schools?
- ➢ How do School Governing Bodies (SGB's) encourage teachers to participate in school management?
- ➢ To what extent do principals consult junior teachers with regard to matters of management?
- ➢ What role do teachers play in the formulation policies in schools?
- ➢ What are the management and leadership styles that are applied by principals to encourage teacher participation?

Chapter 2 gave a detailed literature review on teacher participation in site-based management in schools. Various aspects of site-based management like benefits, leadership, the roles of teachers and principals and two management theories were reviewed.

In Chapter 3 the methodological grounding of the research was given where the qualitative research method and the interpretive paradigm were chosen in order to guide the researcher on his path towards answering the research question. The interview method was selected as the research tool to be used in collecting the qualitative data through a case study of three schools at Thulamahashe Circuit.

The collected data were transformed, analysed and findings given in Chapter 4. The data were coded through inductive analysis in order to avoid enforcing connections between them but to allow them to "speak for themselves". A rich, thick description of the data was given. The analysis and interpretation of the data revealed the following findings:

- ➢ **Decision-making in schools is still in the hands of principals;**
- ➢ **Teachers are left out when it comes to making important decisions and they are only allowed to make minor decisions;**
- ➢ **School Governing Bodies do not play a significant role in encouraging teacher participation in school-based management;**
- ➢ **Junior teachers are generally not consulted in matters relating to management;**
- ➢ **Teachers have little knowledge of how policies in their schools were formulated or the existence thereof; and**
- ➢ **Principals' management and leadership styles vary on a day-to-day basis.**

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The literature study on site-based management and the investigation of the three schools warrant the following recommendations:

- ➢ School principals must be trained in order to gain a firm grounding in site based management, this will encourage them to have a positive attitude towards change and embrace it so that they can encourage teachers to become active participants in site based decision-making;
- ➢ All SGB members need to undergo intensive training in order to gain both academic and professional knowledge on issues of governance (Masinga 2000:47);
- ➢ Teacher empowerment is one way in which the school can grow and learn, in service workshops on empowerment must be conducted by the Department of Education or any organisation that has interest in education in order to equip teachers and principals on this post-modern trend;
- ➢ Schools must set up participatory structures which will help all stakeholders in schools to work towards achieving their schools' goals e.g staff development teams, sub-committee for dealing with diversity and so on (Department of Education 2000:27);
- ➢ School management team members must be actively involved in encouraging teachers to take part in school-based management instead of allowing principals to run schools single-handedly;
- ➢ Management and leadership styles of principals and SMT's must be in such a way that they allow for real participation of teachers in decision-making and not mere tokenism; and
- ➢ In future policy formulation teachers together with the other stakeholders in schools must be involved so that teachers are not reduced teachers to tools of implementing policies and decisions without making any meaningful contribution (Bezzina 1997:194, cf. paragraph 1.1).

5.4 CONCLUSION

The aim of this research article was to investigate the extent to which teachers in schools at the Thulamahashe Circuit participate in site-based management. This was done through posing a research question that was answered in Chapter 4 when raw data were analysed. The research concludes that participation of teachers in site-based management in schools at Thulamahashe Circuit is limited. This conclusion is supported by the research findings given in paragraph 5.2 above.

The conclusion warrants suggestion of the following topics for further research:

5.4.1 Teacher empowerment in school-based management

Teachers' limited empowerment in collaborative management and capacity building of schools needs to be investigated.

5.4.2 Relationship between principals, SMT's, teachers and learners with regard to implementing site-based management in schools

The lack of coordination among these stakeholders tends to weaken the case for participation in school-based decision making and therefore warrants further research.

5.4.3 Principals' responsibilities in encouraging teachers to actively participate in site-based management in schools.

There are indications that teachers are not encouraged to actively participate in decision-making in school reasons for this lack of encouragement need to be investigated.

5.4.4 The role of SGB's in the implementation of site-based management in schools

It looks like SGB's have not yet occupied their central position in schools, which is supporting principals, learners and teachers in carrying out their tasks; this needs to be investigated.

5.4.5 The role of site-based decision making in improving schools

Site-based management is a fairly recent trend in institutions and the extent to which its application can lead to improvement in schools warrants to be researched.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C. & Razavieh, A. 1990. *Introduction to Research in Education.* Fourth Edition. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Babbie, E & Mouton, J. 2001. *The Practice of Social Research*, contributions by Vorster, P & Prozesky, B. South African Edition. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Bailey, W. J. 1991. *School-Site Management Applied*. Lanchaster: Technomic Publishing Co., Inc.

Bakkeness, I., De Brabander, C. & Imants, J. 1999. *Teacher Isolation and Communication Network Analysis in Primary Schools.* Educational Administration Quarterly, 35(2).166-202.

Baloyi, H.G. 2002. *Exploring the Experiences of Parents Serving in a Rural School Governing Body*. Master of Arts Dissertation. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Bannister, G. & Bacon, P. A. 1999. *From Competitive to Collaborative Governance*. Trusteeship, 7(2). 8-13

Beckmann, J. L. & Blom, M. A. 2000. *Thoughts on Accountability and Democratic School Management*. South African Journal of Education, 17(4). 196-202.

Bell, L. 1999. *Leadership, Management and the Challenge of Change,* in *Teacher Professionalism and the Challenge of Change*, edited by Graham, J. University of East London Studies in Education Number 1. Staffordshire: Trentham Books.

Bendix, S. 1996. *Industrial Relations in South Africa*. Third Edition. Kenwyn: Juta & Co, Ltd.

Bezzina, C. 1997. *Restructuring Schools in Malta.* International Journal of Educational Management, 11(5). 194-202.

Blom, M. A. 1999. *Democratic Personnel Management: A Case for Teacher Participation*. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Boyd, L. A. & Martinez, Y.G. 1997. *School-Based Decision Making,* in *Ethics and Decision Making in Local Schools: Inclusion, Policy, and Reform*, edited by Paul, J. L., Berger, N. H., Osnes, P. G., Martinez, Y.G. & Morse, W. C. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Brouillette, L. 1997. *Who Defines "Democratic Leadership"?: Three High School Principals Respond to Site-Based Reforms.* Journal of School Leadership, 7(6). 569-591.

Campbell-Evans, G. 1993. *A Values Perspective on School-based Management,* in *School-based Management and School Effectiveness*, edited by C. Dimmock. London: Routledge.

Chan, M., Ching, Y. & Cheng, Y. 1997. *Teacher Participation in Decision Making: The Case of SMI Schools in Hong Kong*. Educational Journal, 25(2). 17-42.

Clark, M., Riley, M., Wilkie, E. & Wood, R. C. 1998. *Researching and Writing Dissertations in Hospitality and Tourism*. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Clift, R. N., Veal, M. L., Holland, P., Johnson, M. & McCarthy, J. 1995. *Collaborative Leadership and Shared Decision Making*. New York: Teacher College Press.

Cohen, L. & Manion, L. 1994. *Research Methods in Education*. Fourth Edition. New York: Routledge.

Cresswell, J. W. 1994. *Research Design: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cryer, P. 2000. *The Research Student's Guide to Success Second Edition*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Department of Education. 2000. *School Management Teams: Managing and Leading Schools*. Pretoria: Department of Education

De Wee, K. 1994. *Teacher Participation in the Management of Schools*: Rejoinder. Educumus, 40(2). 10-13

Dimmock, C. 1993. *School-based Management and Linkage with Curriculum,* in *School-based Management and School Effectiveness*, edited by C. Dimmock. London: Routledge.

Frost, D., Durrant, J., Head, M. & Holiday, G. 2000. *Teacher-Led School Improvement*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Gaziel, H. 1998. *School-Based Management as a Factor in School Effectiveness*. International Review of Education, 44(4). 319-333.

Gerber, P.D., Nel, P. S. & Van Dyk, P. S. 1998. *Human Resources Management*. Halfway House: International Thomson Publishing Ltd.

Glesne, C. 1999. *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An introduction*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Greenbaum, S., Martinez, Y. G., & Barber M. I. 1997. *Culture and School-Based Policy Issues,* in *Ethics and Decision Making in Local Schools: Inclusion, Policy, and Reform*,

edited by Paul, J. L., Berger, N. H., Osnes, P. G., Martinez, Y.G. & Morse, W. C. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Hallinger, P., Murphy, J. & Hausman, C. 1993. *Conceptualising School Restructuring: Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions,* in *School-based Management and School Effectiveness*, edited by C. Dimmock. London: Routledge.

Henning, E. 2004. *Finding Your Way in Qualitative Research*, with Van Rensburg, W & Smit, B. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Hoberg, S. M (Ed). 1999. *Education Management: Research Methodology*, MEDEM 2-R Study Guide. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Holstein, J. A. & Gubrium, J. F. 1997. *Active Interviewing, in Qualitative Research Theory Method and Practice*, edited by D. Silverman. London: Sage Publications. 113-129.

Houser, S.1996. *Accountability: What Tribal Colleges Can Teach and Learn*. Tribal College, 8(1):18-41

Huysamen, G. K. 1994. *Methodology for the Social and Behavioural Sciences.* Halfway House: Southern Book Publishers.

Isabirye, A.K. 2002. *Employee Participation in Post-Apartheid South Africa as a Tool for Global Competitiveness*. Master of Arts Dissertation. Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaans University.

Kumar, D. D. & Scuderi, P. 2000. *Opportunities for Teachers as Policy Makers*. Kappa-Delta-Pi Record, 36(2). 61-64.

Kvale, S.1996. *Interviews: An introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lambert, L. 1998. *How to Build Leadership Capacity*. Educational Leadership, 55(9). 17-19.

Lilyquist, J. G. 1998. *Are Schools Really Like This? Factors Affecting Teacher Attitude toward School Improvement*. New York: Plenum Press.

Livingston, M. J., Slate, J. & Gibbs, A. 1999. *Shared Decision Making: Beliefs and Practices of Rural School Principals*. Rural Educator, 21(1). 20-26.

Macpherson, R. J. S. 1996. *Educative Accountability: Theory, Practice, Policy and Research in Educational Administration*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Masinga D, M. 2000. *The Community and the School Governing Body's Relationship in Two Bushbuckridge Schools: A Research Essay*. Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaans University.

McLagan, P. & Nel, C. 1995. *The Age of Participation: New Governance for the Workplace and the World*. Randburg: Knowledge Resources.

McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. 1993. *Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction*. Third Edition. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Merriam, S. B. 1998. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education: Revised and Expanded from Case Study Research in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S B. 2001. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education: Revised and Expanded from Case Study Research in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mitchell, S. 1998. *Reforming Educators: Teachers, Experts, and Advocates*. London: Praeger.

Morse, W.C., Berger, N.H. & Osnes, P.G. 1997. *Group Dynamics and Ethical School-Based Decision Making in Ethics and Decision Making in Local Schools: Inclusion, Policy, and Reform*, edited by Paul, J. L., Berger, N. H., Osnes, P. G., Martinez, Y.G. & Morse, W. C. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Mosoge, M. J. & Van der Westhuizen, P. C. 1997. *Teacher access to decision making in schools*. South African Journal of Education, 20(1). 196-202.

Mosoge, M. J. & Van der Westhuizen, P. C. 1998. *School-based Management And School Effectiveness: implications for the New Roles of Principals and Teachers.* Koers, 63 (1- 2). 73-87.

Mouton, J. M. 1996. *Understanding Social Research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Reimers, F. 1997. *Changing Schools Through Participatory Knowledge Management in El Salvador: Can Education Systems Learn?,* in *From Planning to Action: Government Initiatives for Improving School-level Practice*, edited by D. W Chapman, L.O. Mahlck & E. M. Smulders. France: Pergamon.

Republic of South Africa. 1996. *South African Schools Act*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Rubin, H J & Rubin, I S. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data.* Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks.

SADTU. 1998. *Commissions* (from the Annual General Meeting of the South African Democratic Teachers' Union: Thulamahashe Branch held in February 1998).

Shedd, J. B & Bacharach, S. B. 1991. *Tangled Hierarchies: Teachers as Professionals and the Management of Schools*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.

Smyth, J. & Shacklock, G. 1998. *Re-Making Teaching: Ideology, Policy and Practice*. London: Routledge.

South African Schools Act 84 0f 1996, in *Education Law and Policy Handbook*. 1999. Kenwyn: Juta & Co, Ltd.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques.* London: Sage Publications.

Strauss, J. & Myburgh, C. P. H (Eds). 2000. *Research Methodology*, Study Guide 81416: B.Ed. EDUCATION, TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT. Melville: Rand Afrikaans University.

Taylor, D. L., Thompson, B. & Bogotch, I. E. 1995. *A Typology of School Climate Reflecting Teacher Participation A Q-technique Study*. Research in the Schools, 2(2). 51-57

Tesch, R. 1990. *Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools.* New York: The Falmer Press.

Tuckman, B. W. 1988. *Conducting Educational Research. Third Edition*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.

Van Rensburg, R. 2001. *Participation and Progress: Labour Relations in South Africa.* Service Issue 3. April 2001: Butterworths.

Van Wyk, C. 1995. B Ed: Module Educational Management; Study Unit 5, *Participatory Management in Education*: Tutorial Letter 106/1995, ON451-F. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Van Wyk, C. & Van der Linde, C. H.1997. *Educational Management: Principles of Educational Management*; B Ed Module Study Manual 2 for ONB451-F, Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Vithal, R. & Jansen, J. 1997. *Designing Your First Research Proposal: A Manual for Researchers in Education and Social Sciences.* Landsdowne: Juta & Co. Ltd.

Wagner, D. 1999. *"Make Disciplices of All Nations", in Teacher Leadership: Long in Coming, Coming on Strong*. Momentum, 30 (4). 42-46

Wall, R & Rinehart, J. R. 1998. *School-Based Decision Making and the Empowerment of Secondary School Teachers*. Journal of School Leadership, 8(1). 49-64.

ANNEXURES

Annexure A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction: Good morning; or afternoon [Mentions name of respondent]. Thanks for having granted me permission to interview you. I would like to reassure you that I will stick to all the ethical codes of conduct with regard to conducting research as stated in my application letter and your letter of informed consent.

The interview questions:

1. Tell me about the decision-making ways that are applied by the principal in your school.

2. Tell me, how was the policy of your school formulated?

3. What role did teachers play in the formulation of the school policy?

4. What kind of decisions do teachers make in your school?

5. How does the school governing body (SGB) encourage teachers to participate in school management?

6. To what extent does the principal consult junior teachers with regard to matters of management?

7. What leadership traits does the principal show in your school on a day-to-day basis?

Conclusion: Thank you for your time, I hope your responses to the questions will contribute a lot to this research project.

TRANSCRIPT 1
Dates: 23, 27 and 28 July 2004
SETTING: SCHOOL 1

Q: Tell me, how was the policy of your school formulated?

R: S01T01

A group of teachers, just a group, selected, got together, mandated by the SGB and staff, to formulate a policy. It was presented to the SGB and people commented on it.

R: S01T02

I have never seen such a document. I have only once heard the principal telling male learners not to wear dreadlocks but I do not know where he had got that from.

R: S01T03

We were called to a meeting where there a draft policy was presented. All teachers were there and we went through each and every item on the draft e.g. time for starting school, school uniform. The learners too will also be given an opportunity to go through the draft policy.

Q: What role did teachers play in the formulation of the school policy?

A: S01T01MB

14. Their role was: when it came back as a document they looked at it, commented on it, and issues that they felt were not there while they wished to have were totally amended.

R: S01T02

14. I said I do not remember any school policy.

R: S01T03

For example the time, teachers were given an opportunity to give their views about the time for starting school that would suit them and the learners. With regard to the school uniform teachers just decided that the original school uniform should be used so that parents do not waste money in buying new school uniform. Teachers were highly involved in the formulation of the policy of the school because who are affected by the policy.

Q: What kind of decisions do teachers make in your school?

R: S01T01

They make decisions on issues of the general management of the school, on issues of resources because they have to put up with resources, they take decisions on the learning teaching requirements of the school, they also take decisions on issues of discipline because those are the issues that are very close to their hearts Issues of discipline, the learning teaching resources that they need. These two are the important ones and maybe their relationship with the kids they make decisions on how they relate with the kids and how they relate with the parents because we had a problem here sometimes ago, there was a gap between the parents and the teachers, the teachers were one group the kids and the parents were one group so it was teachers versus the parents and the kids so such a situation was very bad one that we had, so we had to win the parents over to our side so that we could deal with the kids in a more professional way.

R: S01T02

Teachers who make decisions are those who are always with the principal. Most decisions come as orders that have to be carried out, ordinary teachers do not.

R: S01T03
Hmm…. The only decisions that they make revolve around the school timetable and time allocation in the school.

Q: How does the school governing body (SGB) encourage teachers to participate in school management?

R: S01T01

I don't think the SGB has a direct role in encouraging the teachers. They are not relevant in encouraging teachers.

R: S01T02

The SGB does not encourage teachers. The SGB only acts as a problem-solving body but apart from that its role in the school is minimal. It only comes when teachers or learners have problems. Its main focus is on problems. It mainly complains about teachers not teaching or complaining about this and that. In fact the SGB of the school discourages teachers.

R: S01T03

What I know they normally do is that the SGB encourages us to help kids during that time give us the mandate to be with those learners. So they do encourage us in everything that we do. Even in sporting activities it does support us.

Q: Tell me about the decision-making ways that are applied by the principal in your school.

R: S01T01

Sometimes the principal may come up with a decision that he has made on his own, followers have to implement it because it is a directive from the higher office and higher authority, sometimes the SMT meets take decisions and such decisions have to be implemented by the teachers in the lower ranks, no questions asked, you don't have to ask anything, "it is policy, it is a directive". Sometimes an issue comes from the SGB decision taken by the SGB but people have to implement, they should do one, two, three… or observe one, two, three... Those are the three ways in which decisions may come.

R: S01T02

He decides alone, sometimes when he feels like he does consult teachers.

R: S01T03

If there is a problem which warrants his attention he does not simply solve the problem alone. If it is a minor problem he calls the site steward and some members of the SMT where the problem is solved. He does not simply take a decision alone. If it is a decision that needs the SGB, the SGB is the one body that takes the decision. For example we usually have a crisis of the school fees, we know that we need money in the school but because the parents do not afford to pay the amount which is needed it is the SGB that has to decide together with the parents on this issue. That is why I say the principal does not take his decision to be the final one he involves other decision makers.

Q: To what extent does the principal consult junior teachers with regard to matters of management?

R: S01T01

I think the principal is very democratic because from time to time he is engaged in informal consultative process with junior teachers and such a consultation is likely to impact on the decision that is going to be taken and more so that he is a male and when he consults with the male junior teachers he is likely to implement their decision

R: S01T02

He does not dwell much on formalities, when he wants something done he approaches a particular individual who may be relevant in carrying out the task. He avoids calling all of us to meetings because he says we always give him a tough time so he avoids being angered by us.

R: S01T03

On issues of management every quarter there is a meeting which deals with management issues but in issues where an individual teacher has a problem the teacher is called by the principal regarding the matter. Sometimes the HOD's do come and hep teachers in case of problems.

Q: What leadership traits does the principal show in your school on a day-to-day basis?

R: S01T01

I think he has a style of ... an "all inclusive...", very participatory style in which all teachers are given opportunity to take part in decision-making. There is a site steward from the union, and then there is everybody, not everybody belongs to the union. I see from time to time the management of the school talks to the union people on issues that relate to the day to day administration of the school, and sometimes we all gather and take a decision with consensus where everybody is allowed to take part and influence the

decision that is being taken. So in answering the question I may say the leadership style is such that everybody is given an opportunity to take part, influence the decision-making, air their views ... at the end of the day I see people owning up the decisions that have been taken… it is very easy to implement such things because everybody owns it.

R: S01T02

The principal is "on and off", he is sometimes autocratic and sometimes he seems to be democratic. He is a difficult person to understand. Sometimes he consults with teachers when something is to be done and sometimes he gives instructions that cannot be questioned.

R: S01T03

I think eh…. I think….. I think he is a good manager because he is able to be at school on time. Sometimes when he encounters a problem he deems it fit to. I don't expect something more from him because he is doing well.

TRANSCRIPT 2
SETTING: SCHOOL 2
Dates: 3, 11 and 18 July 2004

Q: How was the policy of your school formulated?

R: S02T01

I don't have any idea on that because I only joined the school after the policy was formulated. But along the way we did have sessions where the policy of the school was amended but I don't have more information on that.

R: S02T02

I was through delegation, certain teachers were delegated but it was not given enough time for issues to be debated on how things should be. It was formulated based on pressure that it was wanted somewhere. I still remember this one.

R: S02T03

I am not aware, I only hear about it when the principal says "this is the policy of the school" but exactly how it was formulated I don't know. Maybe it was formulated before I arrived at the school, I don't know.

Q: What role did teachers play in the formulation of the school policy?
R: S02T01

I don't have an idea but when we had a sitting for the amendment of the policy teachers were involved in that because they were required to give inputs and some of the clauses

on the policy of the school they were also required to go and formulate statements that would be included in the school policy but apart from that I am not well informed.

R: S02T02

Not quite much as I have already indicated. Not all teachers were involved in the formulation some teachers were, but not many teachers gave their inputs on how this thing should be done.

R: S02T03

I don't know.

Q: What kind of decisions do teachers make in your school?

R: S02T01

This is channelled into individual teachers because we do make decisions as teachers but as I said there are teachers who are regarded as superior to the others, they can make a particular decision that is taken into consideration.

R: S02T02

I can't quite say what decisions exactly because decisions are made on a day to day basis but there are some places where we are left out, we do not participate in decision making we are just informed, but we do make decisions based on the allocation of subjects someone has to do this, we do sit down as teachers to make minor decisions that are not quite influential within the school. But in bigger decisions like the financial matters of the school all these, I think you know what I mean, are not happening.

R: S02T03

Hmm…. The only decisions that they make revolve around the school timetable and time allocation in the school.

Q: How does the school governing body (SGB) encourage teachers to participate in school management?

R: S02T01

As I indicated before we do have a governing body but the final say is always from the principal. Even if he doesn't put it directly as his final say but because he is in the governing body he always encourages it to make decisions that suit him. So I would not say the governing body is encouraging teachers to take part in the management of the school.

R: S02T02

Very little, I can say, because I am still worried about the operation of our SGB, they are not operating the way they should. They are operating as problem solvers but not as "developmentalists" so to say, because they should be people who are trying to develop the school but they only come to the school when there are problems.

R: S02T03CA

It does not encourage the teachers we only see them when there are problems in the school.

Q: Tell me about the decision-making ways that are applied by the principal in the school

R: S02T01

He does consult teachers with regard to making decisions as long as the decisions are not related to the financial matters of the school.

R: S02T02

He does not have enough support within himself, as I indicated he is a lone man at the moment. He is operating as a principal but his support is gone. It becomes very problematic for him because he presently does not have an HOD or deputy or subordinates within the management structure. So he needs to think and take decision within himself without consulting anyone and when it comes to delivering the decisions that he has taken to the teachers there is a gap that he is faced with and that becomes a bit of a problem.

R: S02T03

Most of the decisions in the school are made by the principal himself and we as teachers are told what to do. Most of them do not come as a result of consultation between him and the staff.

Q: To what extent does the principal consult junior teachers with regard to matters of management?

R: S02T01

He has only begun now that his SMT is out of the school
but under normal circumstances he does not consult them.

R: S02T02

Minimally so, if this interview is honest because in terms of management issues, I don't think we are…. Not that we are not consulted but its minimal based on the idea that it does not concern junior teachers because it is irrelevant to their scope of work.

R: S02T03

He does not consult junior teachers.

Q: What leadership traits does the principal show in your school on a day-to-day basis?

R: S02T01

Time changes everything, let me say, when I first came to the school there was a difficulty his (principal's) relationship with the teachers was not good. I remember one time we were locked out of the school gate because we came late to school I believe as a teacher that should not happen to because I may have my own reasons for being late for school on a particular day. I would say as time changes he is gradually becoming a democratic leader whilst initially he was autocratic.

R: S02T02

He is using different styles of management everyday. On a Monday he might be democratic. On a Tuesday he may be autocratic. Actually there is no direct trait that he is always using. Sometimes he is very democratic and he likes people to come to him, sometimes he does things the way he thinks. But I like his openness, sometimes he is very open to ideas, that is, I can personally go to his office and talk to him about the problems that I see within the school. But what is needed is to say: let us transcend what one does to the group, if one can do this let us all do it. But he is very open person that is what I like about him.

R: S02T03

Our principal is sometimes okay sometimes he manages the school badly. He speaks a lot about democracy and change, sometimes he applies it sometimes he goes alone without consulting anybody. The way our school is managed is different from other schools. We had an incident where we agreed to start school at half past seven but to the teachers' surprise the principal changed the time to seven o'clock without consulting anybody. When asked about this unbecoming move he told us it was too hot for the school to start at half past seven and that was not discussed with us. He always talks about change all the time but he doesn't get affected by the change. Sometimes when we complain about this tendency he manages the school well for two weeks or and later reverts to his old ways, sometimes he tells us "don't forget that I am an old man".

TRANSCRIPT 3
SETTING: SCHOOL 3
Dates: 12, 14 July and 1 September 2004

Q: Tell me, how was the policy of the school formulated?

R: S03T01

[Laughs] I don't know, I have never seen or read it, I asked one teacher about its existence and I never got an answer because the things that are happening here would not happen if the school had a policy. I was wondering if the school had a policy or not because if it had one, teachers and learners would not behave the way they are behaving right now.

R: S03T02

There it is tough. All teachers were called to a staff meeting where a committee was elected to deal with the formation of the school policy. From there each teacher was given a copy to read and we came together and amended it. That is how it was formulated. But there is a new one that is on the principal's desk that has been formulated by the SMT, it will be released not long. But will have a committee which will look into it.

R: S03T03

It was drawn by the management, they got copies from other schools and compiled it. After that it was given to teachers to scrutinise.

Q: What role did teachers play in the formulation of the school policy?

R: S03T01

I really don't know because I am not even sure that it exists.

R: S03T02

They [teachers] had a bit of trust in the SMT. They think the SMT is good enough to draw a policy because the SMT was democratically elected, they trust the SMT.

R: S03T03

They only...I would not say edited, they only read through, if ever there were additions they made them. The biggest role was with the management and not the teachers.

Q: What kind of decisions do teachers make in your school?

R: S03T01

I don't know.

R: S03T02

They make decisions on discipline, the smooth running of the school, they only take major decisions through the permission of the principal or when the principal is not near. But not major ones like expelling a learner.

R: SO3T03

Important ones no, I don't think we make such decisions. The important ones are usually made by the SMT, we only make minor decisions.

Q: How does the school governing body (SGB) encourage teachers to participate in school management?

R: S03T01

I have never heard anything from the SGB encouraging teachers to participate in management.

R: S03T02

When there problems it comes to the school to solve them.

R: S03T03

Let me say they do not encourage teachers. I have never heard them encouraging teachers. The governing body liaises more with the principal than with the teachers.

Q: Tell me about the decision-making ways that are applied by the principal in your school.

R: S03T01

Teachers are not given enough opportunities to participate in decision- making, he makes decisions and expects us to implement them.

R: S03T02

Sometimes he decides autocratically, and the teachers grumbling to show that they are not happy with such decisions. He once decided to introduce [mentions the subject] without informing teachers and teachers were very angry. I also remember another time when he came early to school and most teachers were late, he came to me and took the

gate keys and locked the gate and they were stranded outside... The teachers were again furious with that decision.

R: S03T03

On decision making, for obvious reasons, he has the final say. With the SMT they do debate a lot before they come with decisions. With teachers are only informed of decisions that have been taken. Like I said previously sometimes teachers are only allowed to make decisions on minor issues but not the major ones.

Q: To what extent does the principal consult junior teachers with regard to matters of management?
R: S03T01

I have never seen him consulting them, yes I have never seen him consulting them. Actually he does not consult them.

R: S03T02

The principal may sometimes consult you 'strategically' in a manner that you won't know he is consulting or he may otherwise call us to a meeting.

R: S03T03

I don't think he consults them. There are times when you find him talking to the senior ones saying, 'don't let the juniors see you doing one, two, three, you must be exemplary'. Usually with junior teachers I don't think there is any consultation unless if the matter is directed to them but if it is directed to them, not really.

Q. What leadership traits does the principal show in your school on a day-to-day basis?

R: S03T01

I am not satisfied in terms of the way he manages the school. The way I see it some teachers' opinions are not taken into consideration.

R: S03T02

He is very democratic and straightforward but sometimes as a leader sometimes you have to be autocratic if things do not go well. Sometimes you have to be rigid, he is good in doing follow up on issues. He encourages learners and teachers a lot. He has a good relationship with his teachers.

R: S03T03

He usually decides on his own without taking advice from anybody but sometimes he tries to accommodate us.

Annexure E: Letter to the Circuit Manager

<div align="right">

P. O. Box 1238

Thulamahashe

1365

08 June 2004

</div>

The Circuit Manager

Private Bag X 1317

Thulamahashe

1356

Dear Sir

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

ID No   :   6611116091081

Persal No   :   81022949

Student No   :   596-236-5

I hereby apply for permission to conduct research in schools at your circuit. I am currently registered for an M Ed Degree in Education Management at UNISA.

My research topic is: **Teacher Participation in Site-based Management in Schools: A Case Study**.

A sample of three schools at the circuit will be involved in the research. The three schools will be selected by means of the simple random sampling method. The research procedures, inter alia, involve:

- applying for permission from principals of the three schools that will be selected;
- selection of three teachers in each school by means of the purposive sampling method where I will identify teachers that will be interviewed. I will request site committee members or any member of staff to assist me in the selection process.
- obtaining informed consent from the selected teachers to participate in the research process.
- interviewing the three selected teachers;
- interviewing them during working hours but preferably during their free periods; and
- in cases where the selected teachers do not have any free periods, I will arrange with the individual teachers to have them interviewed at times that will be convenient to them.

I intend to conduct interviews from 20 July to 31 August 2004.Interviews will last approximately one-three days per school.

I would be thankful if you could grant this permission.

Yours faithfully

_____

Khoza S F

P. O. Box 1238

Thulamahashe

1365

08 June 2004

The Principal

XXXX School

Private Bag X

Thulamahashe

1356

Dear Sir or Madam

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

ID No   :   6611116091081

Persal No   :   81022949

Student No   :   596-236-5

I hereby apply for permission to conduct research at your school. I am currently registered for an M Ed Degree in Education Management at UNISA.

My research topic is: **Teacher Participation in Site-based Management in Schools: A Case Study**.

A sample of three schools at the Thulamahashe Circuit will be involved in the research. Your school is one of three schools that have been selected by means of the simple random sampling method.

The research procedures, inter alia, involve:

- selection of three teachers at your school by means of the purposive sampling method where I will identify teachers that will be interviewed. I will request site committee members or any member of staff to assist me in the selection process.
- obtaining informed consent from the selected teachers to participate in the research process.
- interviewing the three selected teachers;
- interviewing them during working hours but preferably during their free periods; and
- in cases where the selected teachers do not have any free periods, I will arrange with the individual teachers to have them interviewed at times that will be convenient to them.

I intend to conduct interviews from 20 July to 31 August 2004.Interviews will last approximately one-three days per school.

I have also asked for permission to conduct this research from the circuit manager.

I would be thankful if you could grant this permission.

Yours faithfully

_____

Khoza S F

Annexure G**:** **Letter to potential participant**

P. O. Box 1238

Thulamahashe

1365

08 June 2004

XXXX School

Private Bag X

Thulamahashe

1356

Dear Sir or Madam

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO INTERVIEW YOU

I hereby apply for permission to interview you at your school. I am currently registered for an M Ed Degree in Education Management at UNISA.

My research topic is: **Teacher Participation in Site-based Management in Schools:**
A Case Study.

You are one of three teachers in your school that will be interviewed.

Your name has been selected by means of the purposive sampling method where I supposed you could be 'rich' with information that pertains to my study.

In line with accepted research ethics I hereby undertake:

- to keep your name confidential at all times by coding it (your name) and your responses on transcription of the recorded tapes;
- not to subject you to any physical or emotional harm;
- to allow you to withdraw from the research process any time you feel like doing so without being penalised as your participation is on a voluntary basis;
- to use your responses for research purposes only;
- erase the recorded tape after I have transcribed all your responses;
- to arrange to have you interviewed at a time that will be convenient to you; and
- to make interview results available to you on request;

I have also asked for permission to conduct this research from both the principal and circuit manager.

I would be thankful if you could grant me this permission.

Yours faithfully

_____

Khoza S F

Annexure H: Letter of informed consent

To Whom It May Concern:

INFORMED CONSENT

I _____(full names of participant), hereby agree to take part in the research project that is undertaken by Mr S F Khoza. My participation is based on the following conditions:

➢ I have the right to withdraw from the study at any point without penalty;

➢ My participation is voluntary and the researcher has given me all information about the research project;

➢ I am not be exposed to any physical or emotional risk;

➢ My name shall remain confidential at all times and it shall only appear as a code in the research project;

➢ My answers to the questions shall only be used for research purposes;

Yours faithfully

_____

SIGNATURE