

https://dspace.org/

The role of the Gauteng districts in improving the quality of education: 1994-1998

Tshoane, Margaret

2014-03-28
http://hdl.handle.net10539/14414

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

THE ROLE OF THE GAUTENG DISTRICTS IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION: 1994-1998

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of the Witwatersrand , Johannesburg, in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

Margaret Tshoane
Johannesburg
August 2000

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	(i)
Key Words	(ii)
Declaration	(iii)
Dedication	(iv)
Acknowledgements	(v)
Introduction	**1**
Aim of the Study	2
Rationale	2
Outline of Chapters	4
Chapter 1: Literature Review	**7**
1.1 Introduction	7
1.2 What do we really mean by Quality Education	7
1.3 The Role of Districts in Improving the Quality of Education	15
1.3.1. Possible strategies for districts to improve the quality of education	16
1.4 Challenges that Districts face in their Attempt to Improve the Quality of Education	19
1.5 Policy Implementation	21
Chapter 2 Methodology	**33**
2.1 Introduction	33
2.2 A Case Study of Six Districts in Gauteng	33
2.3 Interviews	34
2.3.1 Limitations of the Study	34
2.3.2 Interviews in Schools	35
2.4 Observation	37
2.5 Limitations	38
Chapter 3 The Context within which the Districts Functioned	**40**
3.1 Introduction	40
3.2 School Profile	40
3.2.1 Teacher Qualifications and Period of Service	40
3.2.2 School Environment	42
3.3 District Profiles	44
3.3.1 Personnel Qualifications	44
3.3.2 Insufficient human and physical resources	46

3.4 Challenges faced by the Gauteng District Officials in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities 48

Chapter 4 Strategies put in place by the Districts to Improve the Quality of Education 55
4.1 Introduction 55
4.2 The District Officials' Duties and Responsibilities 57

Chapter 5 The Role Played the Districts in Improving the Quality of Education 64

Chapter 6 Conclusion and Recommendations 74
6.1 Conclusion 74
6.2 Recommendations 75

Appendices 80

Appendix 1: District officials interviews transcriptions

Appendix 1 (a) 80
Appendix 1 (b) 88
Appendix 1 (c) 98
Appendix 1 (d) 108
Appendix 1 (e) 116

Appendix 2: Schools interviews transcriptions

School A 121
School B 123
School C 126
School D 129
School E 132
School F 135
School G 138
School H 140
School I 143
School J 146
School K 148
School L 150
School M 153
School N 156
School O 159
School P 162
School Q 165
School R 168
School S 172
School T 175

Bibliography 178

Abstract

A number of profound changes occurred in South Africa once the apartheid system was removed. One of the most noteworthy of these changes was the merging of nineteen racially defined education departments into one national department and nine provincial departments. Provinces were divided into regions that were further divided into districts. The focus of this study is on the role played by the Gauteng districts in improving the quality of education after the first democratic elections, period 1994 until 1998. The study starts by underlining the fact that any definition of the concept quality is problematic. It argues that the concept of quality is elusive and that one's definition of quality depends on the context within which the word is used. Characteristics of quality education rather than a definition are given. The challenges faced by the districts in improving the quality of education and implementing policy are discussed. This is followed by a discussion of the context within which the districts functioned and of the strategies they put in place in an attempt to impact positively on education. This discussion leads to an examination of the role of the districts in improving the quality of education. The study concludes by arguing that the districts functioned in a complex situation: some of the district officials were new in office, there was insufficient human and physical resources, lack of proper co-ordination at various levels (national, provincial and district) of education governance, and the state of transition from apartheid to democracy further complicated the issue. This study further concludes by arguing that because of the complexity of the situation within which the district officials functioned, the districts could not play a meaningful role in improving the quality of education.

Key Words

Culture of Teaching and Learning

Districts

Education Policy Making

Effective Schools

Gauteng Department of Education

Policy Implementation

Quality Education

Transition

DECLARATION

I declare that this research report is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree of Master of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other institution.

August 2000

DEDICATION

This study is submitted with special dedication to my daughter, Mathapelo Tshoane and my grandmother Puseletso Mogotsi.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to record my gratitude to the following individuals and institutions for their assistance and encouragement:

-To Professor Michael Cross, for his patient and encouraging supervision.

-To the Human Sciences Research Council for having sponsored this study and for having thereby facilitated all the interviews.

-To the Gauteng Department of education for having made various district officials and schools available for interview purposes

-To the Education Policy Unit at the University of the Witwatersrand for having made its resources available throughout.

-To Console Tleane for his support and technical assistance.

-To Mphela Motimele for having recommended material which proved extremely useful for completion of this study.

-To John van der Vywer for his advice and constructive criticism offered.

-To Puseletso Mogotsi for on-going encouragement as the months went by.

INTRODUCTION

After the establishment of the first democratic government, in South Africa attempts were made to decentralise the previously centralised education system. A devolution of power, as it were, occurred, with control being vested at school level, via provinces and districts, than in the national department of education. Although during the apartheid era there had been some forms of decentralisation, major issues such as examinations and supervision, school organisation, curriculum and teaching methods, teacher recruitment and compensation and all matters involving finance where decided upon at national level (NEPI, 1992). In view of the fact that major education matters were centralised, districts could not directly have much impact on improving the quality of education.

Central to the current government's policy practice are attempts to address issues of democracy, equity, redress, quality, and efficiency. In this light, the kind of decentralisation talked about in the post-apartheid South Africa should be aimed at giving sufficient powers to the districts. Such powers would, hopefully, enable districts to have a direct impact on improving the quality of education.

AIM OF THE STUDY

This study aims to investigate the role played by districts in developing and implementing strategies that may have a positive impact on improving the quality of education. It also looks at the obstacles and difficulties that might have hindered districts from performing their functions, and at how such obstacles could have been avoided. The following issues are dealt with:

i. the efforts undertaken by the districts in helping schools improve the quality of education.
ii. the kind and nature of programmes introduced at district level with regard to quality education.
iii. the powers bestowed upon districts to enable them to have a direct impact on quality education.
iv. the involvement of the districts in education policy making.
v. possible results and long term developments in education.

RATIONALE

South African education in the post apartheid era has been characterised by problems such as teacher strikes, violence in schools, poor matric results, and disparities between former model C schools and black schools in terms of resources. The teacher rationalisation programme was implemented despite

unanswered questions concerning the rationale of the programme and the possible negative impact such rationalisation would have on education. This challenges policy researchers to begin to critically engage policy makers in South Africa about the way in which they overlook context and practicability in the policy process.

The following questions need to be raised: how are education policies related to education practice? What roles do provincial and particularly district officials play in the education policy process? Should such officials only serve to implement policy formulated at national level or should they also be involved in the policy formulation itself?

The central argument in this study is that successful education at school level relies to a large extent on the effectiveness of districts since districts serve as link between policy makers and policy implementers (in as much as they are policy implementers). They are the link between the national and provincial governance and the schools. If district officials are to execute their roles and responsibilities they should understand the context of each school within their allocated area. They should know the weaknesses and strong points of various schools. They should have good relations with principals and teachers who should be able to discuss their problems with them, (and this should include not only academic problems but problems concerning working conditions

as well). District officials should also intervene where necessary to ensure efficient day to day running of schools. They should also participate directly in educati[illegible]licy making and in this way be able to improve the quality o[illegible]cation offered in schools.

OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS

CHAPTER ONE

Literature Review

This chapter starts off by discussing the concept : quality education. As the concept is elusive, no definition is given. Instead, characteristics of the concept are discussed. Then follows a discussion of possible failures and successes of policy implementation. Consideration is given to the factors that are necessary for successful policy implementation, and of the factors that should be avoided if policy implementation is to succeed.

Arguments advanced in this chapter are that, quality education assumes different meanings at different times. The conceptualisation of quality education in each period is guided by the political, social, and economic needs and goals of a particular country or institution. Furthermore, the chapter argues that the improvement of quality of education depends to

a large extent on the enabling factors and conditions. Such factors and conditions include sufficient human and capital resources, good management and governance, educators and learners' preparedness.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

This chapter looks at the processes by means of which this study was conducted, and considers the 'tools' used, these being interviews and literature. The limitations and constraints of the 'tools' are also discussed.

CHAPTER THREE

This chapter discusses the context within which the districts functioned. The central argument put forward is that the context was not favourable for programmes put in place by the districts to be effectively implemented.

CHAPTER FOUR

Discussed in this chapter are the strategies the district officials put in place to impact positively on the quality of education. Despite the constraints that the districts functioned under, they put in place programmes which could help them impact

positively on education. It is argued that the programmes were rendered ineffective mostly by lack of an enabling environment than by inherent weaknesses in the programmes themselves.

CHAPTER FIVE

This chapter considers the role played by the districts in improving the quality of education. It is argued that the role of the district was quite complex, and that due to the complexity (discussed in details in chapter 3) they could not play a meaningful role in improving the quality of education.

CHAPTER SIX

In this concluding chapter, a summary of what has been discussed in all preceding chapters is given. Then recommendations for districts to consider if they are to maintain their efforts in improving the quality of education follow.

Appendices

Found in the appendices are the results of the fieldwork part of this study.

CHAPTER ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Introduction

The review of relevant literature looks at a number of issues that are linked to the provision of quality education within districts. Acknowledging the fact that the concept of quality education is elusive and contentious, the review starts first by discussing what quality education means. Secondly, it looks at what the role of the districts is in contributing to education. It then examines the controversies and implications around policy implementation. Lastly, it discusses the obstacles that might hinder the districts in their attempts to improve the quality of education. The latter is discussed within the context of the opportunities available to districts to impact positively on the quality of education.

1.2 What do we Really Mean by Quality Education?

Quality education is an elusive concept. An attempt to define what quality education is can only leave a lot of questions unanswered and some issues unaddressed, thereby throwing itself open to criticism. It would appear to be wiser to describe characteristics of quality education than to define it. No

universal definition can clearly capture what the concept entails.

The following have been suggested as reasons for the elusiveness of the concept of quality education: schools are located in varying environmental contexts (developed and undeveloped countries and/or areas); schools are not equally equipped in terms of human and material resources; the norms and values within which schools are located are also different (Reynolds et. al, 1996 & Scheerens, 1992). In one way or another when researchers conduct their studies such factors (as environmental differences and inequality of resources) influence their findings about what quality education is. For instance, a researcher who has conducted his/her study in a developed area will come up with different findings from one who studied in an undeveloped area. The findings might also be influenced by the norms and values of what is perceived to be good education in that particular area. Other factors such as economic growth, employment, and the researcher's interpretation of these factors might also influence the findings (Reynolds et al, 1996 & Scheerens, 1992).

Research projects undertaken on quality education in, for instance, the Netherlands, Britain, Botswana and South Africa, may yield findings which may vary from one another in that the research would have been conducted in different contexts.

However, there are likely to be some characteristics of which appear to be common to these different countries.

A key feature of quality education amongst various authors is its effectiveness (Reynolds et al, 1996; Reynolds & Cuttance, 1992; Hillman et al, 1995). School effectiveness used to be measured by factors such as teacher to pupil ratio; number of books in the library; teacher qualifications and class size (Ridell & Brown, 1991 and Chapman & Carrier, 1990). A view that is held by many researchers is that the smaller the class size the more successful the teaching and learning that takes place (Reynolds & Cuttance, 1992: 8). Likewise, the availability of resources such as a well-equipped library is also viewed as another factor that can enhance quality education (Chapman & Carrier, 1990: 26).

The problem with these views is that they assume that the characteristics of quality education are formulations of universal processes and that schools are homogenous (Carrim & Shalem, 1993: 59-83). They do not take into consideration the fact that, for instance, even if schools have qualified teachers, their positive impact on the quality of education depends on other variables. These may include, for instance, the commitment on the side of both teachers and pupils, the leadership and management of the school, commitment on the side of the district to improve the quality of education, and many other related factors (Rosenholts, 1989; Scheerens & Creemers, 1989). It can

be concluded that factors such as teacher qualifications and number of books in the library are not completely irrelevant. They only become irrelevant when they are not linked to the above mentioned variables. The effectiveness of the books in the library, for instance, is determined by, among other factors, their appropriateness in meeting the needs of the learners (Hanuschek, 1989; Gray, 1990; Hedges et al, 1994).

In South Africa, it is difficult to measure quality education in schools as these do not share resources because of the injustices of the past. However, Carrim & Shalem (1993: 59-83) argue that even where resources are minimal, quality education can still be measured. Quality education in schools should be measured according to how schools utilise their available resources.

If one could agree with this view as postulated by Carrim & Shalem (1993: 59-83), then measuring quality education would not be that much of a problem. However, it would still leave some questions unanswered. For instance, how do we explain a situation where in a school students perform well from grade eight to grade eleven but produce poor matric (grade twelve) results? Can we conclude that quality education is prevalent in such a school? Do we judge the school according to grades that perform well, or do we look at the poor matric results? Furthermore, if we say the school has had quality education due to its good performance in lower grades, how do we prove it to those who use matric

results as a sign of effective schooling? Whatever conclusion we might arrive at, there might still be factors that might render such a conclusion questionable.

For Reynolds et al, (1996:2) effective schools can be measured on the basis of the extent to which they are given resources and means. Such schools should be able to fulfil their objectives without incapacitating those resources and means, and without placing undue strain upon teachers and learners. They further argue that there is nothing like an ineffective school. Rather, people should be able to talk of different degrees of effectiveness, otherwise an ineffective school should not have a place in a society (op cit). In South Africa for instance, (if we are to follow this argument) even schools which produce poor results are to some degree effective because they still have a number of students who pass. They happen only to have a low degree of effectiveness and the degree of effectiveness can be improved. The message that this conveys to South African education is that quality education can be produced everywhere, all schools have potentials to rise beyond their current performance. The schools can improve if they get proper support from the districts in the form for instance, teacher compensation, teacher development, monitoring and physical resources.

But what exactly characterises quality education?

Various authors come up with several characteristics of quality education (discussed in detail below) (Elmore, 1996; Levine et. al 1979; Badge, 1985). Whereas there are different viewpoints on what characterises quality education, there are a lot of similarities as well. The popular view seems to be that a district whose schools have quality education prevailing will display some of the following : ((i) quality leadership and management at school level, (ii) commitment to equip learners with basic skills and knowledge (curriculum frameworks), (iii) teacher development and inspection, (iv) alignment/coherence in instructional tools, parental involvement).

Effective Leadership and Management at School Level

Effective leadership and management is one of the factors that generates a collective vision and has clearly defined objectives and goals. This is leadership with a purpose which, involves stakeholders (particularly the community) in the running of the school and promotes accountability to the people it serves (Elmore, 1996; Reynolds & Cuttance, 1992: 30; & Dimmock 1993:5). Districts have to ensure that schools have this kind of leadership and management style.

Commitment to Equip Learners with Basic Skills and Knowledge (Curriculum Frameworks)

Equipping learners with basic skills and knowledge is likely to happen when standards are set for education at district level and these are passed down to the schools. The basic skills and knowledge should then aim at equipping learners with high order skills such as analytical skills and problem- solving skills. Teaching and learning should be more learner-centred than teacher-centred (Ridell & Brown, 1991 & Levine et al, 1979: 63-80).

Teacher Development and Inspection

Districts have to look into questions of teacher development. It should not be assumed that once teachers have qualifications they have all that is required to contribute to quality education. District officials need to visit schools more frequently and observe teaching and learning. In this way they will be able to recognise areas which need improvement and after discussions with teachers give some recommendations and advice (Reynolds et al, 1996: 118; Fullan, 1992 and Dimmock, 1993).

Alignment/Coherence in Instructional Tools

Teaching and learning can be more effective if all the above-

mentioned factors can be approached as an entity or as a system so as to ensure coherence in all instructional tools. Otherwise, if instructional tools are improved without consideration being given to other contextual factors, there will be an imbalance that is counter productive to quality education. For instance, if teacher development cannot be looked at within the context of students' level of performance within the district and within the context of the availability of resources, the development will not be effective (O' Day & Smith, 1993: 250 and Elmore, 1993: 97).

Parental involvement

Involvement of parents in the education of their children is crucial. Once parents are held responsible for factors such as punctuality, attendance and classroom assignments of their children, they are likely be able to see the importance of their role in education. Their involvement will help build a good relationship between themselves and the schools, thereby fostering in the parents a sense of 'ownership' of the school (Levine & Lezotte, 1990 and Badge, 1985). The relationship will help teachers to understand the learners' background better as communication between parents and teachers will be encouraged.

1.3 THE ROLE OF THE DISTRICTS IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

Districts have a major role to play and the state needs them if education policies are to be implemented effectively. Those who argue for a decentralised system tend to emphasise that the central government is too far away from the communities to be able to see what is going on. Coombe (1996) & Elmore (1993), writing on the South African and American contexts respectively, agree that it (central government) may not identify the needs of various communities or if it does, it may not understand them within their proper contexts. Districts exist to address such issues. The national level of governance makes a lot of education policies that are sometimes difficult for people on the ground to understand perhaps due to the language used. Usually the government does not allow itself time to go down and explain such policies to the people (Coombe, 1996: 26). Districts are more suitable to execute this task. Elmore (1993: 103) says that the government cannot reach the entire nation all by itself. Provinces also cannot effectively reach all school communities and this results in some communities getting all the attention, while other communities get no attention at all. This at least what can happen, if districts are not made use of.

1.3.1 Possible strategies for districts to improve the quality of education

In South Africa, given that issues of equity and redress in education have to be addressed, the work performed by districts is even more necessary. Districts can address these issues by giving priority in terms of fund allocation to disadvantaged schools. Since the funds that the districts receive are limited, they can organise schools into clusters and buy resources for them as clusters (Coombe & Godden, 1996:26). This will also promote collaboration among schools.

Organising schools into clusters will be more effective when there is a balance in terms of the allocation of resources. Some of the disadvantaged schools should be grouped with the advantaged schools for purposes of sharing facilities. This can also help where one school within a group of schools has an effective teacher in a particular subject as she/he can be used to help others improve (Coombe & Godden, 1996: 7 and Coombe, 1996: 25). Reflecting on case studies they conducted in Michigan, Spillane and Thompson (1997: 195), argue that in a case where one school has a lot of teachers who are good in one particular subject, when another school has teachers who are relatively poor, an arrangement to exchange can be made. This will ensure that all schools within a district have almost equal resources.

A message that this gives to districts is that they should orientate schools to look not only at the success of their schools but at the success of the entire district.

The willingness to work together in groups can be possible only if districts can take it upon themselves to instil a sense of trust and transparency between and among schools (Spillane & Thompson, 1997:196). Districts should create a good relationship between themselves and individual schools. They should know what the needs, weaknesses and strong points of an individual school are and should discuss them with the school. This will be possible only when districts allocate time to visit schools and observe teaching and learning. Since districts are well placed to know the weaknesses and strong points of other schools, they can then consult with a successful or promising school to help others. They can also inform the struggling schools as to where to get help (Coombe, 1996: 25-26).

Alternatively, a district can arrange a meeting for a cluster of schools to discuss their problems, then come up with *ad hoc* working groups to address such problems. In a case where funds are needed, the schools could inform the districts. This would probably only be done if it is not within the school's capacity to fundraise or if fundraising is going to consume time which would be better spent on teaching and learning (Coombe, 1996: 29).

A good relationship between districts and schools can encourage the community to help the schools. The community should be informed about what is going on in the schools, even about the changes of policies and the introduction of new policies. They should be made to feel part of the schools. Once this is so, they can take up issues of fundraising on behalf of the school. The district should then assist in equipping them with fundraising skills (Coombe & Godden, 1996: 29). The community should not be consulted only when there are problems. Rather, it should be seen as part of the education system. The districts should give the communities a chance to raise their opinions and objections about policies and such objections and opinions should reach the provincial level through the districts (Coombe & Godden, 1996: 8).

Districts have a great deal of potential and they could be doing more to improve education than what they are doing now. The crucial question of the curriculum is something they should be having a greater influence on since they are closest to schools and should know what goes on in schools (Coombe, 1996: 28). They should know more about teacher development than the government knows since they are supposed to visit the classrooms and observe teaching and learning. Their classroom observation and their discussions with teachers should position them to be better informed about how quality assessment can be achieved. They should be able to get ideas on how issues such as assessment can

be improved. Districts should challenge the national education department. They should not wait for it (the state) to call upon them for their views. They should use every opportunity they get to be involved in education policy, and they should not overlook their responsibilities by passing them down to the schools (Elmore, 1993: 116).

1.4 CHALLENGES THAT DISTRICTS FACE IN THEIR ENDEAVOURS TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

Elmore (1993: 103) says an acknowledgement has to be made that districts work within particular constraints which might be a reason for them not to deliver as expected. Districts are expected to implement policies that they never participated in making and they are not given enough funds and training to implement them. This is what O' Day and Smith (1993: 250) call 'lack of vertical and horizontal coherence' at various levels of education governance. By this they mean that there is no alignment between the national, the provincial and local levels of government. The national government formulates policies and expects other levels lower down in the hierarchy to implement these without proper support in the form of funds and training. It also expects them to do so without involving them in other stages of policy making such as in policy formulation and policy adoption.

Writing about Michigan context, Spillane and Thompson (1997: 187) argue that policy makers (who in this case would be at the national l of education governance) should take it upon themselves to teach the implementers (who in this case would be at the district level and schools) about how to go about implementing policy. Since the district officials do not participate in the initial stage of policy making, they might not understand certain policies themselves, and this might explain why they end up leaving some issues, such as the curriculum to the teacher in the classroom. Elmore (1993: 113), referring to the American context, says that curriculum issues are a difficult enterprise and it is not surprising when districts overlook them and concentrate on issues that are not directly linked to education such as budgets, pupil behaviour, and parents' complaints.

Elmore (1993: 98) argues that districts receive no motivation from top leadership i.e., from those working at provincial and national levels. The top leadership is concerned with the schools. Rewards are given to schools, not to districts, so the districts suffer (Elmore, 1993: 98). Districts seem not to have sufficient powers to exercise over schools. This might be a reason why they find it difficult to organise them into clusters and make them share facilities.

In South Africa the problem goes beyond refusal to share resources. Some schools, particularly former Afrikaans schools, would be unwilling to admit black pupils, and it usually takes a long time before such matters are resolved (***True Love***, August 1998). The inability of districts to intervene in such matters demonstrates that they (districts) have few practical powers.

1.5 Policy implementation

Since this research is basically about successes and failures of policy implementation, it becomes imperative for the concept of policy implementation to be discussed. The concept of policy implementation raises a number of arguments and concerns. The following questions for instance can arise: When is a policy or innovation ready for implementation? Who should be involved in the implementation process? How best can the process be monitored? How often should it be assessed?

Fullan (1992: 21) argues that the main concern of implementation is what happens in practice. Implementation is about the characteristics of the actual change and the factors and processes that are at play to influence change. The ways in which people at the implementation stage grapple with new ideas, programmes, activities, structures, policies, are crucial during the process of implementation. Why certain implementation strategies fail and why others succeed also becomes important

when we try to understand what implementation is. Fullan (1992:26) further argues that the success of implementation depends on the combination of a variety of factors. For example, in education, factors such as the make-up of the local district, the preparedness of principals and teachers at school level, the availability of resources, etc. are crucial for implementation to be successful and effective. No single factor can be responsible for successful policy implementation.

Policy implementation becomes problematic once policy-making is detached from or not informed by what goes on at the level at which implementation should take place (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973:143). For policy makers to be more effective, continual monitoring has to take place. Availability of resources, strategic planning, the setting of timelines, etc. can be rendered futile if monitoring is not done regularly. Chapman (1990:197) claims that monitoring implementation must be carried out in order to detect needed changes in the program designs, to identify logistical weaknesses that threaten the success of the program, to train, to police and to provide an incentive to implementers. While monitoring may be undertaken to serve more than one of the above purposes, not all of these purposes can simultaneously serve as reasons for monitoring. In fact, Chapman (1990:196) argues that there are conflicts between some of these reasons for monitoring.

Monitoring can serve as some form of incentive. In the South African context for instance, when teachers know that their efforts to implement curriculum 2005 are monitored, they may feel that what they are doing is important. Therefore, they might put more effort into being creative and into following the teaching guidelines supplied to them knowing that someone will be coming to say "well done" or "you need to improve certain areas".

It is crucial for policy-makers to actively involve those they consider as policy implementers in the early stages of policy-making. Such an involvement assists in creating a sense of ownership. It facilitates a clearer understanding of the concepts involved (Huberman and Miles, 1984; and Fullan, 1992). A mistake usually committed by policy-makers is that they expect policy implementers to own policies overnight even before they can engage rigorously with the content and implication of the policy text. It can be argued that policy ownership is a process and people tend to readily own something when they have participated in the making of it (ibid.).

Writing from within an American context, Hargreaves (1989) & Fullan (1991) say that one of the most common hindrances to policy implementation or even to change is resistance. In the education field in general and particularly in schools, teachers who have been in the teaching profession for a long time find it difficult to change their way of teaching. They feel they cannot

change their methods of teaching which, to them are effective and with which they are comfortable. Having to change the methods is like changing the structure of the building by breaking it, having to then build all over again using a new plan. The situation becomes a complicated in that not only does the working environment have to be kept stable, but also people's professional lives have to be protected in the process of effecting change (Hargreaves, 1989 and Fullan, 1991).

Fullan (1992:25) argues that coupled with resistance is the pressure experienced by policy implementers, particularly if they did not participate in the process of policy-making at its early stages. The pressure becomes a hindrance in that the implementers find themselves having to implement a policy they are not really familiar with. Along the process, implementers might find themselves not knowing whether they are on the right track or not. This is particularly the case when not enough support is received from higher authorities. In this sense pressure becomes negative (Fullan, 1992:25).

Fullan (1992:25) further argues that pressure in policy implementation could be made into something positive if more support is given to implementers. It would be positive in that the more people feel pressurised about something, the more they want to have it done. With support, the necessary things get done quickly and effectively. Pressure without support can result in

policy implementation being a failure. This becomes the case when people who have been in the system before decide to leave and are replaced by those who might not have the requisite capacity to be policy implementers or who are not well-versed with policy matters (Fullan, 1992:25).

Policy implementation involves alterations in behaviour and beliefs. Before new policies are introduced players already have their own beliefs about how things should be done, what should be done when, how and by whom. For instance, the school governing body (SGB) system was introduced less than four years ago into the South African schools system (Department of Education, 1996). It gives more powers to the SGB than used to be the case. Now, if players' beliefs are not dealt with, the implementation of the SGB's powers and functions might cause conflict and problems in schools. As possible power struggles between various authority figures develop, more skills become necessary. As Fullan (1992:22) has said, players at implementation level need new skills, new perceptions, positive attitudes, commitment, for them to effect new changes.

The policy environment should be taken into consideration for policy to be implemented successfully. The level of policy understanding by all stakeholders involved is critical. The context of where the policy is to be implemented needs to be considered (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973:143). For instance, in

schools the stability of the culture of teaching and learning will determine the pace of policy implementation. The resources (human and physical) are also important in ensuring effective policy implementation. If there are insufficient human resources (which, could be called understaffing), the implementation of new policies will draw heavily on the already limited time of the available staff. They will have to cover more work and the time constraints will come as a hindrance to the success of policy implementation (Kogan, 1975: 59).

Dimmock (1993) & Wilby (1986) drawing from conclusion surveys done in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, USA and the United Kingdoms caution us about the effect of teacher unions involvement in policy implementation. The reaction of teacher unions to the implementation of some policies that might not be in favour of some teachers raises concern, and suggests some strategies to be employed on implementing such policies. The question is the extent to which the teacher unions should be involved in policy-making. If they are fully involved, would the process not be manipulated in accordance with the unions' own political interests? If they are only partially involved or not involved at all, would the unions not become a hindrance to the success of policy implementation? (Dimmock, 1993 & Wilby, 1986: 63-72). In South Africa, for instance, the teacher rationalisation policy caused a serious conflict between the government and teacher unions. This resulted in a national

teacher strike. According to the government the policy was relevant in that it aimed at ensuring better education for all and at minimising costs spent on education personnel. For teacher unions the policy was found to be problematic in that it leaves some teachers either with a temporary teacher status or uncertain about their permanent status (Chudnovsky, 1998: 26-29).

The policy-makers' vision of addressing issues of equity on grounds of race, gender, disparities, disabilities, etc. makes the education department vulnerable to criticisms and accusations. Schools which had to adapt to changes to demonstrate their non-racist, non-sexist, character by sharing their resources with disadvantaged schools could become uncooperative and criticise without acknowledging the efforts done by the districts, thereby serving more as fault-finders (Chapman, 1990 and Hargreaves, 1989). Such uncooperative tendencies can slow down the pace of implementation, as along the way there are cases of discrimination that would need to be resolved, thereby delaying the implementation process.

When enough power is not given to people who are close to implementation, the pace of the process becomes slower. In education for instance, the pace will be slowed down if the districts and schools do not have sufficient powers to decide on certain matters relating to policy implementation.

The tension between ensuring continuity whilst at the same time attempting to bring fundamental reform is often evident in policy implementation (Chapman, 1990 & Hargreaves, 1989). The fact is, in any reform process not everything can be discontinued. Certain things will be carried through from the past and might last for years after the institution of reform even though they are not necessarily compatible with reform, whilst others will endure for a while and then discontinue as the policy implementation occurs. Ball (1990: 3) argues that in policy-making "discontinuities, compromises, omissions and exceptions are also important. Sometimes they are of prime importance".

Friedman (1995: 1-21)) argues that in many countries the design and subsequent implementation of policies is done without sufficient research about the intended beneficiaries, about the options that can best achieve certain objectives, or about the actual impact of the programs implemented. This might result in available resources being wasted in that without the basic information prioritisation of basic needs of the population is difficult, if not impossible. In many countries, no serious attention is given to the impact of policies on efficiency, effectiveness and equity. The lack of attention to detail, and potential consequences particularly, can also be the result of policy-makers not being directly affected by the inefficiency of implementation (Friedman, 1995: 1-21). People who are often directly affected by the consequences of bad policies (policies

which do not take into consideration the context of implementation) are those closer to implementation. In this case such people would be stakeholders (parents, teachers and learners) at school level

Friedman (1995: 1) argues that policy-makers might know what they would like to achieve, but they might lack the sufficient know-how required to realise their goals. It is for this reason that policy makers need researchers to obtain an in-depth knowledge of the environment in which they operate if they are to make informed policies. Jansen (1998:56) argues that education policies fail due to an "… over-investment of the state in the **political symbolism of policy rather than its practical implementation.** Social policy carries a broader symbolic significance than its simple technocratic ends…".

Policy implementation has to be accompanied by sufficient professional development. Furthermore, other stakeholders who are directly involved in or affected by, the process should receive training when necessary. There should be the development of a training academy for districts together with the creation of a school environment which fosters continual training (Hogwood and Gunn, 1984; and Chapman and Carrier, 1990).

Apart from school level, policy implementation relies to a great extent on the willingness and commitment of the principals. If

principals do not possess the necessary skills everything can be held up (Jansen, 1998:56; Hogwood & Gunn, 1984; and Chapman & Carrier, 1990). It is argued in Education Development & Management (1994) that what sometimes contributes to some principals' inefficiency and ineffectiveness is the fact that principals are not trained as professional managers. They have been promoted from teacher level to become Heads of Department, and then to principals without adequate preparation and induction for their final positions.

There are people who are central to policy implementation (in schools for example, these would be principals and teachers), without whom the process will not occur at all. To ensure the participation of such stakeholders, the state must have strong and endowed with enough organisational and institutional capacity and resources to be able to manage viable systems and governance. In addition, the state must show commitment by mediating between different groups and must assist in the empowerment of the weakest civil society groups (Keane, 1989: 31-41).

Pressmann and Wildavsky (1973:46) argue that the success of policy implementation depends upon linkages between different organisations and departments at the local level. This being the case, such linkages have to produce a degree of cooperation and rapport between agencies. Should this be achieved, commitment and cooperation on the part of within different stakeholders will be

engendered. Jansen (1998: 58) argues that sensible policy formulation and successful policy implementation depend on a political commitment.

For policy implementation to be effective different roles need to be clearly identified. All participants in the implementation process should know job descriptions of all stakeholders so that people know exactly where to go when seeking advice. The participants should know with whom to lodge their complaints and should know who will take responsibility should delivery not take place (Fullan, 1992; and Dimmock, 1993). Hogwood and Gunn (1984: 205) advise that in moving towards implementation there should be detailed specification of the tasks to be performed by each participant, together with clear indication of the sequence in which such tasks are to be performed.

There is a need for indicators of quality and efficiency to be decided upon prior to implementation. Indicators should include the basic resources or requirements to make a policy successful. In education, indicators would be the timeous supply of textbooks, workbooks and curriculum guidelines (Gray & Hannon, 1986: 23-33). The involvement of skilled/informed/ trained teachers in curriculum-related issues and/or lesson delivery should not be overlooked and would be another such indicator. The pass and failure rate of learners per grade in each year should be monitored, so that support can be given more to schools which

struggle without completely neglecting successful schools (ibid.). When there are benchmarks in place, assessment and evaluation of improvement becomes less difficult.

In conclusion, the literature review leads one to assert that the improvement of quality education depends to a large extent on the enabling factors and conditions for education policy implementation. Sufficient human and capital resources, good management and governance, educators (office and classroom-based) and learners' preparedness are crucial if the implementation of education policies is to be successful. Once such factors are in place, issues of monitoring, professional development, setting of indicators for quality and efficiency, and clear job descriptions can be realised with less difficulty.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

2.1 Introduction

This study was made possible through data gathered from interviews and an extensive review of literature. In this chapter, the method used is presented in more detail. First, the chapter discusses the selection of districts which served as case studies for this study. It then looks at interviews held with all stakeholders who participated in the study. Finally, it discusses the way in which schools were selected for interview purposes.

2.2 A Case Study of Six Districts in Gauteng

An application to be granted access to schools and districts was made to the Gauteng Department of Education. Gauteng Department of Education consists of three regions, Southern, Central and Northern regions. Two districts were selected at random from each region in order to obtain a broad picture of what goes on in the entire province. Three schools per district on average were selected for the interviews (the selection process is discussed later).

2.3 Interviews

In a wider context, interviews can be used to achieve various goals. An interview can be defined as;

> a two-person conversation initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research relevant information, and focused by him on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction, or explanation. (Cannell and Kahn, 1968 in Cohen and Manion, 1994: 271)

Interview questions were semi-structured to allow for more probing into relevant issues. The interviewer found the method used appropriate for the kind of questions and issues looked at for this study.

2.3 1 Interviews with district officials

For the purpose of this study, districts were given names district 1 to 6. This was done for reasons of confidentiality. The study aligns itself with the suggestion made by Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (1992) that researchers preserve the confidentiality of all information received and of the identity of research participants. Information should only be disclosed with the consent of the participants (interviewees).

In districts 1 and 2, interviews were conducted with heads of the teaching and learning unit (the unit responsible for matters related to the classroom and its practices), heads of the

auxiliary services unit (the unit responsible for providing psychological services in schools)and heads of the development unit (the unit responsible for the physical environment of the school). In district 3, 4 and 5, interviews were conducted with the heads of the teaching and learning unit only.[1]

The focus of the interview was on policy concerning the roles and responsibilities of district officials, concerning programmes and or strategies the officials put in place to improve the quality of education, and concerning the context within which district officials functioned.

2.3.2 Interviews in schools

On average, three schools per district were visited for interviews (20 schools in all). In each district, an attempt was made to strike a balance between primary schools and high schools and between historically white and historically black (African/coloured/Indian) schools. In some districts, this balance could not be achieved as the district officials determined which schools could be visited and which could not. This did not affect collection of data however, as the sufficient information was obtained from the district officials about the

[1] The head of the teaching and learning unit in district 6 was unfortunately not available at the time of interview.

type of schools which could not visited. The only drawback is that the information could not be triangulated with the schools.

Where the researcher had freedom of choice, schools were selected at random. (No school could be visited without the permission of the district officials, and the researcher had received orders from the provincial level to let districts decide which schools to visit).

The district officials revealed that their focus in terms of offering support was on public schools, and not on private schools. As a result, no private school was visited for interviews. This does not affect the study in that the researcher aimed to evaluate the role played by the districts in schools, and the schools not supported by the district would not have any bearing on the results of district support.

School selection table[2]

School Name	School Level	School Nature	Predominant Race
District 1	1 High School 2 Primary Schools	Township Township & City	African Coloured & White
District 2	2 High Schools 2 Primary Schools	Township Schools Township & City	African African & White
District 3	1 High School 1 Primary School	Squatter Camp Squatter Camp	African African
District 4	2 High Schools 2 Primary Schools	Township & City Township & City	African & White African & White
District 5	2 High Schools 2 Primary Schools	Township & City Township & City	African & White African & White
District 6	2 High Schools 2 Primary Schools	Township Township	African African & Coloured

2.4 Observation

In schools, observation was done in the principals' offices, in the classrooms and around the school yards. Note was taken of security provision, noise levels, movements of staff and pupils

[2] All township schools visited were prior to 1994 (apartheid era) and during the time of the visit populated by blacks (Africans & coloureds) only. All city schools visited were prior to 1990 populated by white learners only, In 1992, city schools were converted into state aided Model C schools, and started admitting black learners. The schools are no longer called Model C, they are now state aided public schools.

outside the classrooms during lesson hours, and cleanliness inside principals' offices and around school yards.[3]

At district level, it was mainly the availability of resources (computers, printers, photocopiers, fax machine and telephone) which was observed. The rationale behind focussing the observation on the resources was based on the assumption that the more resourced district offices are, the more efficient they should be. The observations were confined to the office of the district officials interviewed only.

2.5 LIMITATIONS

The researcher did not have an entirely free choice of schools in some districts, and was given particular names of schools to visit. (The researcher had hoped to visit two historically white schools and two historically black schools per district). The researcher negotiated a choice of areas from which to select schools, instead of being given fixed names of schools. Whilst this was agreed to in some districts, that was not the case in other districts. The rationale behind the negotiation was for flexibility and inclusivity purposes, i.e. to be able to select from a variety of schools ensuring that all school types were visited.

---

[3] The factors mentioned are perceived to be important elements in the establishment of a culture of teaching and learning. "... adequate and decent facilities do create a positive environment, affect the working conditions of staff and influence the learning environment" (Chisholm & Vally 1996: 13)

In districts where fixed names were given, the researcher visited black schools only. However, as said earlier on, the only effect that fixed names had on this study is that the information gathered from the districts about some white, coloured and Indian schools could not be verified with the schools.

Although the researcher probed for more information during interviews, not a great deal more information was forthcoming. This was often because of time constraints on the part of district officials. This did not greatly affect the collection of data, as the researcher ensured that the most crucial questions were covered within the time allocated for the interview. In districts where more than one district official was interviewed, the policy was that questions which had not been clearly responded to by one official would be emphasised with the next official.

Not all data gathered from the interviews appears in the appendices. This was because some of the researcher's notes are an interpretation of what the officials said, not the exact words they uttered. Data gathered from them is, nevertheless, reflected in this study.

CHAPTER THREE

The Context within which the Districts functioned

3.1 Introduction

The efficiency and effectiveness of an institution relies to a large extent on the context within which it functions. An institution needs enabling factors and a conducive environment to pursue its mission successfully. This chapter looks at the context within which Gauteng districts function. First, it discusses the profile of the schools by looking at teacher qualifications, resources and the environment at the schools. Second, it focuses on the profile of the districts by discussing issues such as qualifications, training and resources at district level. Finally, it looks at the constraints placed upon the districts in their attempts to carry out their roles and responsibilities.

3.2 School Profile

3.2.1 Teacher qualifications and period of service

In terms of qualifications, most teachers had diplomas or degrees in education. Whilst all teachers in former Model C schools had the necessary qualifications, this was not the case with some Black schools, particularly at primary school level. In these schools, there were teachers who had no qualifications but who

had been in the teaching profession for more than 5 years. Such teachers had matric and were studying part time to upgrade themselves.

Most of the teachers in the township schools where interviews were conducted had received teacher training during the apartheid era, and the kind of training offered then was not satisfactory (Swartz, 1994). Some teachers acknowledged during interviews that they needed in-service training. With the challenges of OBE, they realised that the kind of training they received did not prepare them to be full professionals. One official said:

> to the whole system of education what needs to happen is to have mechanisms in place to see to it that teachers are retrained. The past institutions were training teachers to further the goals of the apartheid regime. Teachers need to be provided with new knowledge (Appendix 1(b)).

Friedrich and Wechsler (1997) and Hogwood & Gunn (1984) argue that policy implementation has to be accompanied by sufficient professional development. They further argue that there should be the development of a training academy for each district together with the creation of a school environment that fosters continuous training.

All principals had diplomas or degrees. Most of them had been in the teaching profession for more than twenty years, whilst few had been in the profession for slightly less than 20 years but for more than 10 years. The period of principalship in schools

varied. In former Model C primary schools, it ranged from four (4) to six (6) years. In predominantly coloured schools, it ranged from one (1) to four (4) years. In African township schools it ranged from four (4) to fourteen (14) years. In former model C secondary schools it ranged from four (4) to five (5) years.

The educators' period (including the principals) in the teaching profession ranged from 2 to 38 years. In former model C primary schools, it ranged from seven (7) to twenty five (25) years. In predominantly coloured schools, it ranged from fourteen (14) to thirty one (31) years. In African schools, it ranged from three (3) to thirty eight (38) years. In African township schools it ranged from five (5) to twenty eight (28) years.

3.2.2 School environment/conditions

The conditions of learning varied from one school to another. There was marked disparity between the schools, with former Model C schools being better off, as far as an environment conducive to teaching and learning was concerned. They were followed by some coloured schools, and last in terms of the environment came African schools. Aspects of the environment considered ranged from the teacher- pupil ratio in the classrooms to resources and to the general atmosphere in the schools.

In former Model C schools teacher-pupil ratio ranged from 1:32 to 1:40, whilst in predominantly Coloured schools it ranged from 1:40 to 1:44, and in African township schools it ranged from 1:36 to 1:57 at primary school level. In secondary schools, the ratio ranged from.1:36 to 1:40 in former model C schools, whilst in African schools it ranged from 1:37 to 1:70. Some of the ratios outlined above far exceeds the Department of Education's recommendations on the number of learners each teacher should teach in a classroom. According to the Department, a classroom should consist of 40 learners at primary school level, and 32 at secondary level.

Primary schools were generally better resourced, except for the fact some schools were more resourced than others. Most of the schools (including African Schools) had basic resources such as photocopying machines, telephones, and fax machines. In predominantly coloured schools and former Model C schools, there were computers, printers and some sporting facilities. Equally equipped in terms of resources were former Model C secondary schools with all facilities mentioned above. The same cannot be said about most (predominantly) African secondary schools. In most cases their resources consisted of chalk, chalkboard, few textbooks and the teachers themselves. Depending on how far a school was involved in fundraising activities, and depending on

the level of parent involvement, some African secondary schools had been able to purchase some necessary resources such as, fax machine, photocopying machine and television sets.

The general atmosphere in all former model C schools gave an impression of an environment conducive to teaching and learning. The quietness in the schools during school hours, the cleanliness of the school yards, the security of the schools (with some having electric fences and intercoms at the main entrance) were some of the external indications giving such an impression. This cannot be said of African secondary schools. The schools were generally noisy and filthy. Learners were observed roaming around the school premises during school hours. Security was not as tight as in the former Model C schools.

3.3 District Profiles

3.3.1 Personnel Qualifications

All of the district officials interviewed had occupied their positions since 1996 and 1997. Whilst some officials had been principals before having been promoted to positions of district officialship, others had moved from other positions within the district to the ones they were occupying at the time they were interviewed. In terms of qualifications, all officials

interviewed had a matric, a degree in education, and more than five years of teaching experience.

Lack of specialisation in particular subjects and particular grades poses a serious problem in terms of service delivery, especially in as far advising teachers on particular methods and content of teaching is concerned. For instance, it was revealed that most of the district officials who were already in the Department of Education had specialised at secondary school level: this meant that their efficiency at primary school level was questionable. As expressed by one district official,

> … It is only about three people who know exactly what is going on in the primary schools, and we have about 300 schools to attend to. What we do is, we train everybody to meet the challenges of the new curriculum.(Appendix 1(a))

Furthermore, it became clear that there were many district officials who had specialised in humanities related subjects, whilst there was a dearth of officials who had specialised in mathematics, science and commercial subjects. One official said:

> There is lack of speciality in areas such as mathematics and commercial subjects. When such issues are raised with the head office, the response is, there is no money … . The person that the head office has sent to us from the college is not relevant for our needs.(Appendix 1(c))

The following is how another district official expressed it:

> For instance, the gentleman who has been appointed for mathematics has to oversee science and biology. All his life he has been a secondary school teacher, now he has to deal with the foundation phase as well. Besides curriculum 2005 he has to deal with numeracy. The difficulty here is that he has to guide teachers from grades 1-3. How do you guide and advise a teacher who has more expertise than you

> do? Within the district people haven't actually been appointed according to their expertise. So people end up concentrating on what they are comfortable with. You find all eight officials wanting to work with secondary schools, but out of compulsion they do workshops in primary schools, but they are not confident (Appendix 1(c)).

To assist them in coping with their new positions, some training (which most officials described as helpful) was arranged by the Gauteng Department of Education. The training incorporated educational management development, education governance and curriculum issues (Curriculum 2005). The officials revealed that whilst there are sufficient funds to take them through their training, the funds are insufficient to help them to implement the training in schools. The cascade model which, was used to reach the schools has proved to be ineffective, leaving schools unclear of what is required of them.

3.3.2 Insufficient human and physical resources

The districts did not have sufficient resources to cater for the schools they were dealing with, nor did they have sufficient resources to cater for their own administrative work. The lack of resources included an insufficient number of computers, insufficient transport and too few photocopiers. This meant that a situation developed in which they could not do their work properly. For instance, sometimes when district officials were expected to go out to schools, they could not do so because of lack of transport.

This problem was expressed in the following way by a district official:

> We have the financial budgetary constraint, for instance, when a school asks for a copy of something, what happens is we receive one copy from the province and we have to print 18 times per school, and that is not budgeted for. The province simply gives you a copy and say you should distribute it to 125 schools. We only become fortunate if a school has resources, then we simply give them one copy to photocopy for themselves and give to their learners. We only have one vehicle to transport district members to various places (Appendix 1(c)).

Another official said:

> … right now there is only one computer functioning in the whole district and it is not even in a good condition … (See Appendix 1 (a)).

Writing from an American perspective, Elmore (1993) considers lack of funds and lack of training to be the major negative factors as far as effective policy implementation is concerned. Lack of sufficient personnel was considered by all officials to be a serious problem. For example, they would start programs and fail to follow up on them, they would perform duties which fell outside of their field of expertise, they could not visit schools as frequently as was desirable. In one district, instead the required staff of 28, only 12 officials were employed, meaning that the 12 had to do work requiring person power of 28 people (see appendix 1 (d)).

This was clearly evident in the words of a district official:

> We are understaffed with 8 people instead of 24, even head office is understaffed. One person has to deal with a lot issues. We have good policies in place, but the problem is

with implementation and delivery due to resource constraints (see appendix 1(c).

3.4 Challenges faced by the Gauteng district officials in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities.

The South African Schools districts' way of functioning is complex, making the review of their role in improving the quality of education rather difficult. Given this complexity it becomes imperative to review their role in improving the quality of education within the context in which they function.

It will be seen that the restructuring of the districts was not done immediately after 1994, the new structure only started to function after 1995 [See appendix 1(a)-(e)]. It can safely be said that even now almost all districts are still in a process of transition. At the time the district officials were interviewed (late 1998 and early 1999) the districts did not yet have a policy clearly defining their roles and responsibilities.

Fullan (1992: 21-25) argues that in the American context the complexity of transition is that it brings with it a lot of new programs to be put in place at the same time. Almost all district officials revealed that one of the problems they were faced with in the delivery of services is as one interviewee put it:

> The problem we are faced with is that there are a lot of programs taking place at the same time, restructuring of the department, new curriculum - which involves training of teachers, redeployment of teachers … . Due to many changes

you find that things you planned the previous month, you have to undo the following month (Appendix 1 (d)).

The complexity can again be seen in the fact that in the process of improving the quality of education, they have to take into consideration the question of addressing equity and redress in schools. As a result, the district tend to focus mainly on black schools, far less on previously whites only schools.

To strike a balance between the advantaged and the disadvantaged schools, some of the resources previously allocated to former Model C schools or whites only schools have to be shared with other schools. The problem is experienced where the advantaged schools are not always co-operative in rendering assistance. Chapman (1990) & Hargreaves (1989) argue that this kind of attitude slows down the pace of implementation, as some of the advantaged schools feel discriminated against and therefore resort to a role of being ultra critical. Interviews with district officials revealed that some of the Model C schools were not positive about the assistance that the officials could offer.

Few of the African township schools were negative, but their attitude was based on lack of resources. Most former Model C schools felt that there was nothing that the districts contributed to their schools. They (Model C schools) felt that district officials wasted time with " ... unnecessary seminars" (appendix 2, school L & P).

Furthermore, with the introduction of the new curriculum, whose implementation of which had to start at the foundation phase i.e. Grade One, in 1998, the districts' efforts in primary schools were directed towards the foundation phase. Even the provision of textbooks concentrated on the foundation phase and more assistance was given to foundation phase teachers. In the process, the monitoring of quality education was to some extent neglected at higher grades of primary schools. Most teachers, principals and district officials revealed that in many cases the visits made by the officials to the schools were for the purposes of monitoring the implementation of outcomes-based education (OBE)

South Africa is one of the countries which still regard matric results as an indicator of the state of education. Decline in the results signifies poor quality and improvement signifies better quality. As a result, at high school level most attention is given to the improvement of matric results. Interviews conducted for this study revealed that most of the resources given to high schools were aimed specifically at the improvement of matric results. In the process, the intermediate phase was neglected.

The officials admitted that the focus of their efforts had been primarily the foundation phase and the Grade 12 level. The officials said that the intermediate phase was supported through

the school teams, but that there were no specific programs in place for these intermediate phases.

South African schools have a history of not being on good terms with district officials because of the manner in which they were treated by the previous inspectors. They resisted classroom visits and this attitude still prevails. As a result, the current district officials cannot always visit the teachers and learners in their classrooms. One official said:

> We do not go into classrooms due to the previous defiance campaign. But, teachers do call us to come and help them with certain subjects particularly at matric level. That is how we enter classrooms and teach although we do not have enough capacity on some subjects (Appendix 1(d)).

This of course raises the question of how the culture of teaching and learning can be monitored without regular classroom visits and without regular observation of the very act of teaching and learning? It is difficult to work out how to advise teachers to improve their teaching methods if the teachers have never been seen teaching.

Districts worked under time constraints, because they would often receive documents or circulars late from the province. Even when the circulars involved crucial policy issues, officials would be given thick documents to read and comment on within a short space of time. This was despite the fact that they had other programs

to look at. This resulted in district officials taking the circulars late to schools:

> one thing I need to raise is that the Gauteng Department of Education (GDE) has a tendency of submitting documents late to us, and expect us to make comments and recommendations within a very short period of time, like in a week's time. How do you play a meaningful role and make sensible comments if you are not given enough time to do so? (Appendix 1 (e)).

Lack of clear job descriptions for the officials complicated matters. In the words of one official:

> we do not have all final documents outlining our job descriptions yet. I am doing a lot of things, some of which are not related to my unit (Appendix 1(a)).

Friedrich and Wechsler (1997), and Hogwood and Gunn (1984) stress the significance of clear job description of all participants of policy implementation. They further argue that there should be a clear specification in complete detail and perfect sequence of the tasks to be performed by each participant.

Districts are not actively involved in the initial stages of policy-making processes. However, they play a major role at the implementation stage despite the fact that some of the policies are not clear to them. This is what O'Day and Smith (1993:250) would call lack of vertical and horizontal coherence and/or alignment at various levels of governance. However, district officials revealed that although they are not active participants

in policy formulation at its initial stage, they are broadly consulted on every issue,

> Most of the programs start at national levels then the province get drawn in, then the districts until the schools are reached - consultation is made widely with all these levels ..., but of course there are some systematic shortcomings (Appendix 1(d)).

Basing their arguments on data gathered from some case studies done in Michigan, Spillane and Thompson (1997: 187) argue that when district officials do not participate in the initial stage of policy-making, they tend to leave some issues to the teacher in the classroom. In the South African context, teachers revealed that some district officials were not informed about the workshops they themselves offered. Teachers complained that some of their requests for clear explanations were ignored. In the words of one teacher:

> the officials are helpful only in as far as inexperienced teachers are concerned. Otherwise they are learners themselves. The workshops they provide are simply a waste of time (Appendix 2, school L)

In the final analysis, it can be seen that prevailing circumstances made it difficult for the districts to carry out their duties efficiently. One constraint gave rise to other constraints for example, understaffing gave rise to insufficient time to visit all schools, and this also imposed a restriction on the frequency of the visits to the schools. Lack of sufficient resources impacted negatively on the pace of policy implementation. Not only did district officials fail to monitor

policy implementation in schools, they experienced problems with their own administrative work. The late delivery of circulars and important documents from head office via the regions down to districts disrupted the district officials who would then have to change their plans to accommodate the demands of the higher authorities. This, in turn, tended to lead to disorganisation in schools as principals would have to carry out particular duties with little forewarning. This often occurred with regard to attendance at workshops/meetings, and organisation of their school governing bodies for a workshop or seminars.

While coping with such problems the district officials had still to come up with strategies of impacting positively on the quality of education. The following chapter discusses the strategies put in place by the districts to improve the quality of education in schools.

CHAPTER FOUR

STRATEGIES PUT IN PLACE BY THE DISTRICTS TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter looks at the efforts made by the districts to ensure that there is a sound culture of teaching and learning in schools. The roles and responsibilities of district officials are discussed. Then follows an outline of the programmes put in place and a discussion of the challenges surrounding the implementation process of the programmes.

4.2 The District Officials' Duties and Responsibilities

Although the district officials revealed that *policy* with regard to their roles and responsibilities was still in a process of formulation, they did have some basis on which to build with regard to their work. The different units at district level- the auxiliary services unit, the developmental unit and the teaching and learning unit for instance- have clear duties and responsibilities, although these sometimes overlap.

The heads of teaching and learning unit had the following responsibilities: curriculum development, staff development and school support (teachers and learners). The auxiliary services

unit had the following responsibilities: guidance, psychological services, sports administration, remedial education and youth and culture. The development unit had the following responsibilities: governance, repair of physical resources and early childhood development (particularly in pre-schools and crèches).

These duties were carried out through the strategies and programmes the district officials put in place (discussed in detail below). The heads of the units revealed that, because of understaffing, they carry out other duties which are not necessarily part of their job descriptions, such as, appraisal, admissions, invigilation of examinations and head counting. These tasks should be undertaken by the District Education Co-ordinators (DECs).

All district officials but one revealed that they did not have sufficient powers to decide on issues which they felt were within their jurisdiction. Such issues included the disciplining of badly behaved teachers, and the management of educators' salaries. It would appear that numerous bureaucratic restrictions exist. One district official said:

> there is a lot of bureaucracy going on, which of course hinders one to work as an independent professional. I mean it starts here with the director, to the regional office, to the head office (appendix 1(e)).

For policy implementers to feel that they 'own' policies, they need the power to act in response to some of the immediate

demands emanating from policy implementation. Kogan (1975) argues that if people closer to implementation process are not given enough powers, the process of implementation is likely to fail.

4.2 Strategies put in place by the Districts to Improve Quality of Education

The strategies employed by all districts interviewed in improving the quality of education were more or less the same. This would appear to be because the districts functioned in virtually similar contexts (as discussed in chapter four).

In an attempt to give support to schools and to monitor the culture of teaching and learning, district officials visited schools, particularly schools which were performing poorly. Chapman (1990) says monitoring is important to identify logistical weaknesses that threaten the success of the program. The frequency of the visits differed from one district to the other (discussed in details in the following paragraphs). Two district officials revealed that they visited schools on a regular basis. Other districts revealed that because of time constraints, understaffing and insufficient transport, they could not go to schools as often as they would have wished. Some schools were visited once per quarter, some were visited when

they called for help, some were visited more than others because of poor performance at matric level. Primary schools which were used for a curriculum 2005 pilot study were visited more than others.

The interviews revealed that district officials visited schools for the following reasons: to give support to learners and teachers, to improve on their areas of weaknesses, to monitor if teachers and learners were committed to their work, to offer training with regard to management and governance problems in schools. (This latter issue included the problem of violence and or conflict between teachers and learners and between the parent component of the SGB and educator staff). Visits into the classrooms were still problematic as the district officials and the teachers revealed that because of the previous defiance campaign, some of the teachers were still not ready to welcome district officials into their classrooms (see appendix 1 (a)-(e)).

However, in cases where the relationship between a particular district official and a teacher was good, district officials were offered a chance to teach in the classroom. This was particularly so in high schools where matric results had been poor. Teachers would make a special request to the officials to offer teaching assistance in areas where the officials had particular expertise.

Nevertheless, in most schools educators expressed the feeling that the purpose of the district officials' visit to their schools was usually never clear to them. In most cases, the district officials would finally find their way to principal's office.

All districts organised schools into clusters, to encourage collaboration and the sharing of resources among schools. However, because in some cases poor schools were grouped with other poor schools, the 'clustering' was not always effective. One district official said:

> We organised our schools into clusters, however, there are instances were some schools cannot benefit from one another due to being in the same situation of being disadvantaged (Appendix 1(a).

Schools with adequate resources were not always ready to share their resources with under-resourced schools. According to one district official:

> Nevertheless, there are some difficulties accessing the resources in advantaged schools, some principals are very possessive of their resources, they feel they worked hard to attain the resources, and so disadvantaged schools should do the same. In some instances, the clustering strategy is not very helpful as some very poor schools are clustered with schools of the same situation. The previous Groups Areas Act of the apartheid era engendered a situation where the poor co-existed with the poor, and the wealthy with the wealthy and that scenario is catching up with us now (Appendix 1(b)).

The districts conducted a number of workshops in schools. These included workshops on conflict management, financial management and classroom management. However, most teachers expressed the

feeling that the workshops were usually theoretical and sometimes did not apply to their day to day experiences in the school. The teachers also expressed the feeling that the district officials themselves were sometimes not adequately prepared:

> Some of the people occupying district positions are incompetent, uninformed and inexperienced in teaching. They should stop speaking big words and get into the classroom and see what is happening. They should get in touch with reality (Appendix 2(L).)

Another teacher said:

> They should send informed people to schools, people who will be able to answer questions posed to them (Appendix 2 (N)).

Through the development units, the districts made an effort to improve the physical conditions prevailing in schools. This was however, hampered by the fact that resources were minimal. Thus, some of the schools could only benefit in a limited way, while others could not benefit greatly at all. Some schools still did not have windows, some did not have security fences, some complained that they were not provided with enough cleaning materials.

The districts formed the school support teams through the Culture of Teaching and Learning Services (COLTS) campaign. One of the aims of the teams was to, monitor punctuality and absenteeism in schools. District officials would personally go to schools to see if punctuality was observed and if teachers and learners were present at schools. There was also an effort made to assess

whether teachers and learners were in the classrooms teaching and learning. The COLTS campaign also aimed to give support to teachers by teaching aspects of a subject which were difficult. Teachers were taught the content and the new approaches to teaching. Through the subject committees issues of how to set an examination paper for common examinations were discussed between the district officials and educators. The COLTS campaign was also directed towards improving the matric results.

Districts embarked on several programs to help schools improve matric results. They encouraged morning and afternoon classes, but few schools arranged these. They organised winter schools during the June holidays, matriculants and educators went on holidays for a week only, instead of three to four weeks. Common Preliminary Exams were arranged, but not all schools sat for them since not all were cooperative. One district official said:

> ... Only five schools administered the examinations. And there is nothing you can do about such schools, in that we were just rendering assistance. Some schools seem to perceive this assistance as a way of checking what they have done and what they have not done (Appendix 1 (c))

Through the auxiliary services unit, the districts offered some psychological services to learners and remedial education to teachers. The head of the auxiliary services in one unit revealed that the benefit of these services are not felt by the schools, as the auxiliary services unit because of lack of resources, cannot really give adequate support.

> There is lack of capacity on our part due to understaffing. We are usually not in a position to follow up on programs we start at schools. The schools are many and it is only a few of us. As a result, when we go back to schools, say after six months, you find that we have to start afresh, workshopping and training teachers (Appendix 1 (d)).

It became clear from the interviews with schools that indeed the impact of auxilliary services was not felt. In almost all schools, there was a call for the Department of Education to do something about the learner from milieu deprivation, sexual abuse, and to learners with special educational needs. One teacher said:

> The district officials should stop spending time in their offices. They should come down to the ground and see what is going on in schools before they come up with rules which are uninformed. It is we teachers who are close to the brand. We are with poverty-stricken learners on a daily basis. …. They should provide us with psychological help and auxiliary services for problematic learners. Teachers should be guided on how to deal with such learners (Appendix 2(c).

In conclusion, it can be seen that curriculum development, curriculum development, staff development, school support, remedial education, psychological services, repair of physical resources -the responsibilities of district officials are crucial for South African schools. This is particularly so given the history of the country's education system. Problems which have arisen as a result of past inequalities and apartheid policies include poor teacher development, lack of commitment on the part of learners and teachers. The problems also include the trauma some of the learners and teachers still experience as a result of their direct or indirect involvement in the struggle against

apartheid (detentions, tortures) and the difficulty schools have adapting to and implementing new policies. If constraints such as understaffing and insufficient resources could be addressed, an impact of the districts could bring about an improvement in the quality of education.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE ROLE PLAYED BY THE DISTRICTS IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

This chapter examines the role that the districts played in improving the quality of the education offered in schools in the district concerned. It discusses the context within which districts functioned. An acknowledgement is made that the districts were functioning in a complex situation including constraints of insufficient human and physical resources, functioning in a transitional period, having to address issues of redress and equity and dealing with a collapsed culture of teaching and learning in some schools. The chapter also looks at the programmes the district officials put in place to impact positively on education. It is argued that the programmes that the district officials put in place are ultimately rendered inefficient, because of the lack of an enabling environment to implement them. In conclusion, the chapter argues that there was lack of vertical and horizontal coherence at various levels of governance. In addition, having functioned in a complex situation, the districts could not play any meaningful role in improving the quality of education.

It was discovered during the interviews that the post-apartheid districts (these districts functioned after all apartheid established departments of education had been disbanded and

absorbed into one national department and nine provincial departments) only started to operate in 1996. This means that a review of the role played by Gauteng districts in improving the quality of education can only cover the period 1996 to 1998.

Almost the district officials at the head of different units interviewed were new in their posts, and had been promoted from principal positions to district posts. The implication of this is that most of them were still learners in the field.

The districts functioned under serious resource constraints. They were understaffed, thereby failing to monitor policy implementation regularly. They also could not follow up on the programmes they initiated in schools because of lack of sufficient transport and lack of sufficient personnel.

The districts operated or functioned in a transitional period during which restructuring of districts was taking place. Many programmes and policies were introduced simultaneously, all demanding the officials' attention. As some of these policies and programmes were completely new to the officials, they struggled not only with implementation but with familiarising themselves with the policies and programmes themselves. Such new policies included, curriculum 2005, continuous assessment, the appraisal system and rationalisation of teachers.

Having taken over from a system developed under apartheid, the districts had much to deal with including, teachers' attitude, learners' attitudes and the problematic attitude of the former Model C schools. For instance, the officials could not monitor teaching and learning in the classrooms because of the previous defiance campaign of teachers who had not wanted to let the then inspectors into their classrooms. Some of the well-resourced schools (such as former Model C schools) were not co-operative as far as sharing resources with disadvantaged schools was concerned.

The districts were faced with a mammoth task of addressing issues of equity and redress in an attempt to eliminate the disparities in resources in schools. This should not have been difficult for districts given that there were no enabling policies in place at that time. For instance, a district could not take any serious action against a school which, did not want to share its resources with other schools. This was so despite the fact that some of the resources in such schools had been built up over the years with the help of funds which, were being unfairly distributed at the time. For instance,

> in 1986 per capita subsidies for whites were R2 365 compared with R572 for Africans in Department of Education and Training schools.... In 1993 average spending on pupils was R4 700 for whites, compared with R1 440 for Africans (Chisholm, et al, 1998:8).

All the districts can do with regard to equity and redress is

distribute the resources they have to disadvantaged schools, and given that they only have minimal resources, they find themselves trying to eliminate the disparities. The result of this is that black learners leave their local schools and go to city schools in the hope of getting better education.

The districts inherited a collapsed culture of teaching and learning (particularly in township schools). The districts have had to deal with this, and with new policies such as appraisal system and continuous assessment, it is hoped that the situation will improve.

In fact, in most schools interviewed educators and principals felt that a culture of teaching and learning was prevailed. It is clear, however, that in South Africa, teaching and learning in African public schools seems to be measured in relation to the recent past. Those in charge of schools still relate to an era during which educators and learners absented themselves at will and arrived late as well. Now, when some schools and principals and even district officials manage to get learners and educators to school on time and regularly, an assumption is made that the culture of teaching and learning is prevalent. What is overlooked is the fact that arriving at school on time every day has very little to do with real classroom practice.

The Gauteng districts did organise schools into clusters.

Clustering was ineffective as in some cases poor schools (township schools) were clustered together and good schools were clustered with other good schools. This kind of clustering was in a way inevitable, since struggling schools are situated in the same area, as is the case with well-off schools. Another mechanism of clustering could be employed. If township schools are clustered with some city schools, this will have financial implications as it might mean transporting one school (a township school to a city school, and vice versa) to another. Alternatively schools can be encouraged to pay for their own travelling expenses.

At school level, it appears that there is a problem with the dissemination of information which, is originally sent by the districts. It appears as if the information usually ends up in the principal 's office. This leads to teachers being uninformed about the role district officials play in schools. In some schools, educators could not understand the purpose of the district officials' visits. Some did not even know if district officials ever visited their schools or not.

The districts' focus seem to be more on the foundation phase (for Curriculum 2005 implementation), and then on the matriculants than on the intermediate years. More efforts appear to be dedicated to those grades probably because of pressures brought to bear upon schools and districts by higher levels of governance

and the community. District performance was still measured by the percentage of matric pass rates they produced. The district had to concentrate on the new curriculum as this was a policy emanating from higher authority and which they had to implement. Too much focus on these two phases meant poor support for intermediary phases of schools.

This gives a picture of what and how quality seems to be assessed in the South African context. Certainly, this picture needs to be problematised. Education does not start and end in matric.

The introduction of continuous assessment and the phasing out of repetitions of grades in schooling might provide solutions to the problem. With continuous assessment, learners will not only be assessed in terms of tests and examinations that they write but in terms of every classwork, assignments and attitude. The motivation for the phasing away of repetition is based on the belief that there is no guarantee of whether learners will improve by repeating (Motala, 1998)

District officials receive training from the province to build capacity. Training is necessary for every leader to be effective and to realise his/ her vision and achieve his/her objectives. However, in the case of the districts interviewed, the training could not directly impact positively on the quality of education at school level. This was because financial constraints prevented

them from taking the training down to the level of teachers. In cases where this did happen, the cascade model operated. In terms of this model a few people within an institution are trained and pass on the training to their colleagues, who may have to pass it further down. The cascade model has on several occasions been proven ineffective. Usually, it is people who are on higher up in the power structure who are first targeted and who are responsible for disseminating the information to lower levels through their immediate subservients. The model has up to this far proven to be ineffective.

Lack of sufficient power hindered the officials from disciplining badly behaving teachers, such as those arriving late, those who absent themselves from work, those who are not co-operative, etc. One district official expressed it this way:

> I am not satisfied with powers and functions assigned to us, they are not adequate. We are on the ground, we know exactly what is going on but we do not have powers over certain issues. For, instance, ill-disciplined teachers are usually handled at head office level. If matters such as corrective measures could be left to districts, we could act immediately, before things get worse on the ground. (Appendix 1(a))

District officials do go to schools to monitor absenteeism, latecoming, etc. This is pointless since the officials cannot do anything about any late-coming of teachers and their absenteeism except perhaps scare teachers into arriving on time.

In the words of one official:

> Management is still disadvantaged. There is no mechanism in place where managers can discipline teachers who are not

> committed to their work. The Labour Relations Act is a protection of the employee which in this case are teachers. The act does not look into the rights of learners (appendix 1(c)).

Because insufficient powers district officials do not cater for school's needs in time. For instance, when schools apply for things such as textbooks, and salaries for teachers, they (district officials) have to apply in turn to the regional office. One official said:

> Bureaucracy is a delaying factor. Sometimes when schools request certain things from us, we cannot do them with applying to the regional office. The regional office take a lot of time before addressing problems. (Appendix 1©)

The district officials seemed content with their role and with the level at which they participate in the policy cycle (i.e. as implementers of policy). One official felt that:

> We can influence policy but policy is done at national level, we are not makers of policy but implementers of policy.(Appendix 1(b))

When the same official was asked if he is content with the role he plays, he said:

> Yes, I feel I am playing a part that I am supposed to be playing to implement policy. Policy-making is for policy makers, but of course, we are given drafts to comment on before policy is finalised (Ibid).

Another official revealed that:

> The Gauteng Department of Education work more with policy development and we work more with policy implementation. They give us chance to comment on policies that are already developed. (Appendix 1(d))

It appears as if as far as policy making is concerned, district officials get practically involved at the implementation phase, they do not play a role in policy implementation. Officials revealed that they are given draft policy documents on which to comment. Given that the officials are understaffed and have so much on hand to deal with, it is unlikely that they will have sufficient time to look at policy documents in depth.

Again, in reality, district officials only serve to endorse what has been decided upon at higher level under disguise of 'consultation'. For instance, the very drafts that they say they are given to comment on, do not reach them in time.

> Head office becomes unreasonable sometimes, they give us a document and expect us to be through with it within a short period of time. (Appendix 1(d))

The above reinforces the thesis of this research report: districts are faced with what seems to be lack of coherence and or alignment at various levels of education governance, (the national, provincial and district levels). Lack of coherence at various levels implies situation in which, for instance, an education policy is formulated and adopted at national level without direct involvement on the part of other levels of education lower governance down the hierarchy. When implementing that policy, individuals lower down in the hierarchy are expected to actively participate without being provided with necessary resources in terms of funds and guidance of how to implement the policy (Spillane &Thompson, 1970).

The Gauteng districts functioned in a complex context. It is this complexity that made it difficult for them to play a meaningful role in improving the quality of education.

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusion

This study reviewed the role of the districts in improving the quality of education in post-apartheid South Africa. It looked particularly at the period 1996-1998. Issues discussed include, the contexts within which the districts functioned, the strategies put in place by the districts to impact positively on education, and the roles the districts played in contributing to education.

The central argument of this study is that being closer to the schools, districts are better positioned to impact directly on improving the quality of education than are higher levels of education governance (the national and provincial levels). The literature review of necessity drawing on studies conducted in non African countries, argues that districts have a major role to play in impacting positively on education. Data collected from the interviews reveals that the districts were faced with a number of problems, including understaffing, insufficient resources and the apartheid legacy.

The districts operated in a complex context. For instance, all district officials interviewed only occupied their positions and started functioning after 1995 or 1996. When they got into office their job descriptions were not finalised yet, thus they found themselves carrying out some of the duties which, were out of their scope. Most of the officials were recruited directly from schools, they had been principals before and had no experience about district responsibilities, they were still trying to set their feet right.

The conclusion made by this study is that the districts were functioning in a complex context, faced with constraints of insufficient human and physical resources, functioning in a transitional period, having to address issues of redress and equity, dealing with a collapsed culture of teaching and learning in some schools. As a result, they could not make a positive impact in improving the quality of education. The districts put some programmes in place but as already indicated, the constraints they were faced with, rendered their efforts inefficient. For instance, the matric results still declined, textbooks were still delivered late in schools, violence in various forms was still experienced in schools.

6.2 Recommendations

The Department of Education has already made progress in as far

as providing for alternatives and or solutions to some of the problems and constraints faced is concerned. Policies and programmes are already in place to address some of the issues raised in the analysis and conclusion of this study. For instance, the new appraisal system has been introduced to look at the question of developing educators in their teaching and learning processes. Continuous assessment has been introduced partly to ensure that teaching and learning is not exam- driven and partly to ensure that education is not reduced to reading and writing only, but assesses learners as total beings.

There are also other programmes and policies which have been initiated at the national level such as school funding policy, and the absorption of the regions into districts (the absorption will hopefully minimise bureaucracy), etc. The programmes will hopefully make the functioning of the districts less difficult. The big issue now will be to monitor the implementation of these policies and programmes closely and to sustain the process.

The Department of education needs to look closely at whom it appoints to positions of district official positions. The credibility and competence levels of such people will play a crucial part in the successful implementation of education policy. In the case of district officials already appointed, consistent capacity building will be important to ensure the competence of district officials.

Sufficient powers should be given to people closer to implementation. Issues such as teacher salaries, teacher discipline, applications of posts, etc. should be dealt with at district level.

With the closure of most of the colleges of education, professionals who specialised in certain learning areas are now available and could be absorbed into the system given that districts lack such people.

The level of disparities among South African schools is still high. The department could try to balance this by clustering advantaged schools with disadvantaged ones.

Alternatives to the paper budget system currently used by the Gauteng Department of Education should be looked into. The district officials revealed that the paper budget system was counter-productive to quicker delivery of services as it prevented them from responding immediately to schools' demands.

The question of transport is crucial if district officials are to constantly and regularly monitor the culture of teaching and learning in schools. Means should be devised to address this need.

There should be in-service training at school level. The success of the districts relies to some extent on the competence and commitment at school level.

The role of the districts in policy making should be broadened. This will help the districts to have a sense of policy ownership and then the implementation stage should not be a problem if accompanied by resources, capacity building and commitment. An assumption here is that districts would be consulting broadly with their constituencies at school level.

Districts should guard against a situation in which they generalise about problems in schools. Most schools have individual problems, ranging from lack of resources, to lack of effective management, the collapse of the culture of teaching and learning, to the demoralisation of teachers. Regular visits schools could help the officials to diagnose what the problems of individual schools are; otherwise, resources will be wasted as officials might misdirect them because of lack of knowledge about where needs really exist.

It is commendable that the districts give more attention to under-performing schools. However, it should not be assumed that all under-performing schools do so because of lack of resources. As said above, a thorough investigation of problems should be conducted in individual schools to avoid resources being wasted.

In some of the schools the main problem might be lack of proper management, lack of motivation or negative attitude, and giving resources to such schools might not help at all.

Individual districts should have indicators of policy implementation success. The setting of indicators should help them see if they are progressing well, if they should accelerate their pace of delivery or should slow it down, if they should go back to the drawing boards or go on with what they have already started.

There is a need for rehabilitation in most township schools. The schools date from an era where resistance, defiance, and rebellion were encouraged as a way of defying apartheid practices. This period is over now, but educators and learners can still tend to be in that state emotionally. The auxiliary services unit should work closely with centres that deal with trauma, violence and abuse, so as to provide counseling to all affected schools and individuals. Alternatively, there could be an educational psychologist for each school cluster who will train teachers with regard to issues of counselling. Such a psychologist should be accessible available to offer help when the educator him/herself lacks sufficient counseling skills to do so.

APPENDICES

These appendices are transcriptions of interviews conducted for this study.

Appendix 1

Nota Bene: Questions in appendix 1 are marked by a bullet point. They are also bolded. Responses are in unmarked and ordinary font.

Appendix 1(A)

District 1

Teaching and Learning Unit

- **How long have you been working as head/co-ordinator of this unit?**

  1996 (Has been in the teaching profession for 18 years - has been principal for 1 year)

- **What are your key performance areas (in order of importance) as head/co-ordinator of the unit?**

  I am not only focussing on teaching and learning services. There are many programs within the district that affect my unit, like teacher appraisal or developmental appraisal system. The appraisal system has to be implemented by next

year. I am part of the system. I am also part of the district management team.

We do not have a final document outlining our job descriptions yet. We are still working on it. I am doing a lot of things, some of which are not related to my unit. But my areas are related to curriculum development, staff development, teacher development programs, school support, teacher support and learner support.

- **Which one would you say has been effective thus far?**

  They are balanced - we tried to work on all of them.

- **What factors hinder/impede your effectiveness in these performance areas?**

  Transport - we are 20 and we have only 4 cars that we have to share and our activities and programs differ. So we cannot perform our duties effectively. Basic resources like computers and printers - right now there is only one computer functioning in the whole district and it is not even in a good condition. For instance, I have just requested someone to go and print for me at one school.

- **What changes, if any, in the powers and functions of districts have occurred since 1994?**

- As a principal my experience was that there was no consultation with people on the ground from the district's level. We did not know what was happening at district level. We knew there were some changes going on in terms of restructuring, but we did not know exactly what was going on. We did not even know members of the districts or the units. We then decided to call upon the district officials to come and explain what was going on.

- In 1996 I was appointed as a head of a teaching and learning unit. In 1996 the situation was chaotic as we were looking at curriculum 2005, trying to merge some subjects into one learning area. We were also looking at the holistic picture of education rather than fragmented type of subjects. It was difficult trying to bring people from the ex-DET and TED together.

-In 1997 everything unfolded. There was direction. We started looking at training of facilitators at Grade 1. But it was more district-based than school-based because it was difficult to go down to schools before getting our stories right.

-Curriculum 2005 was our main focus. One hardly knew what was going on in other phases. We concentrated a lot on the foundation phase. There was a little bit of introducing district members to schools. Interviewing new personnel, and orientating them. It took some of our time since we are only a staff of twenty.

Yes, there was change at least in that schools came to know members of the district staff district officials and the role and responsibilities of this unit.

- Most of the district officials who were already in the department had their specialisation in the secondary schools, making it difficult for the efficiency of the training and workshopping of the foundation phase. It was only about three people who knew exactly what was going on in the primary schools and we had about 300 schools to attend to. What we did was that we trained everybody.

- In 1998 there was implementation of curriculum 2005.
- There was closer contact with our schools (teachers and principals).
- There was knowledge from our side of how our schools look like.
- We came to know exactly where the (schools) are situated.
- We know what it is going on in schools.
- Checked and supported what is going on in schools.

Problems are:

- Difficulties in getting reports of learners' progress from teachers.

- Difficulties around continuous assessment. The problem is not necessarily with teachers having not been trained, but with the policy being loose around the continuous assessment.

Solutions:

- We are trying to design levels of performance from grade 1 - 12.
- We are going through pilot program maps and the document will be completed at the end of the year. Then implementation will follow next year.

- **In your opinion, are the powers and functions assigned to districts adequate?**

  I am not satisfied with the powers and functions assigned to us. They are not adequate. We are on the ground, we know exactly what is going on, but we do not have powers over certain issues, for instance ill-disciplined teacher cases are usually handled at head office level. If matters such as corrective measures could be left to districts, we could act immediately before things get worse on the ground.

- **What changes, if any, in these powers and functions would you advocate in order to enhance the effectiveness of the district?**

  More powers should be given to the district. Powers like:

  (1) Examinations. Right now there is a process whereby the district will handle certain things. They submit that to

the examination section like appointment of examiners. We know our teachers, why can't we be given powers to appoint them? We can screen them and recommend who should be examiners.

(2) Administrative issues like salaries. You find that there is a teacher who has been there for more than three months without getting his/her salary. When the teacher reports to the district we do not handle the forms. We have to submit them to the region. The process is long and it affects the performance of the entire district. Our recommendation is that we do not see the value of the regional office. It only perpetuates the tightening up of the bureaucracy

- **How does the function of the district differ from that of the province? Are these differences, in your opinion, real or merely cosmetic? If so, why?**

  When you talk about the province you talk about people who are here in the district.

- **How are these services made available to schools? (imposed, on request, etc.)**

  Schools call us for intervention when they have problems. Sometimes we go uninvited. This year we had a program on enhancing teaching and learning culture in secondary schools. As a result we visited the schools regularly, to look at the basics. We were checking whether teachers were in classes

teaching, and learners in classes learning. We organised our schools into clusters, however, there are instances were some schools cannot benefit from one another due to being in the same situation of being disadvantaged.

- **What support do you obtain from the province in relation to these programs?**

  We usually have to find our way when we run out of resources. We do not go back to the province for assistance. We struggle for whatever resource.

- **As head of the unit do you have direct contact with principals and schools? How frequently and on what basis?**

  We have direct contact with both principals and teachers. When we get to a school we first find out from the principal as to what support mechanisms are in place to help teachers. What is it that they have been doing, do they have structures like co-ordination phase teams in the school? Do they have resource files in the office, what support workshops have they conducted? From there we get to the teachers.

- **What about parents?**

  We are invited to parents meetings to give them an idea about Outcomes Based Education (OBE). But it is the responsibility of the schools to make sure that parents are informed about what goes on in their schools.

- To what extent is the district consulted in the development of programs originating at national or provincial level? Is such consultation, in your opinion, really necessary?

  We are highly involved in the formulation of education policy particularly around issues such as assessment. Some of our district officials are involved at national level. However, to a certain extent we are left out sometimes, but we have input.

- Have incidents of violence, rape, shooting (of teachers/learners) been reported at schools in your district? What is the nature of such incidents and how frequently do they occur?

  In cases of ill behavior by teachers we have powers to intervene, but we usually leave this with the schools to handle and come to us if they cannot handle it - these are the processes we follow.

Appendix 1 (B)

District 2

Auxiliary Services Unit

- How long have you been working as head/co-ordinator of the unit?

  Since 1996 (worked within the district as a subordinate for several years)

- What are your key performance areas (in order of importance) as head/co-ordinator of the unit?

- Guidance
- Psychological services (deals with learners with special educational needs)
- Sports administration
- Remedial education
- Youth and culture

- What factors facilitate personal effectiveness in these performance areas?

  I have a well-balanced staff that was selected on the basis of equity and redress. So, it is balanced in terms of gender and race. I established various teams to look at specific areas and programs. For instance, we have a team looking at psychological services, a team looking at youth and culture, etc. They are teams of four each, making things much easier

for us. We are now able to address problems we face more effectively.

- **What factors hinder/impede your effectiveness in these performance areas?**

  The auxiliary service had been the domain of the ex-TED. It was manned by white people. It was difficult for me to head them due to their attitude of not wanting to be managed by a black person. We had problems of management, sort of having two wings within one unit. We suffered a lot of resignations from whites, which gave rise to understaffing. So, for the past years the unit was not effective, things began to take shape this year.

- **In your opinion, are the powers and functions assigned to districts adequate?**

  In my unit I enjoy a lot of autonomy. I have adequate power and functions within the context of my position.

- **How is the restructuring of the college of education sector impacting on service delivery in your district, if at all?**

  We do not have any person coming from college.

- **What support do you obtain from the province in relation to these programs?**

We do receive a lot of support from the head office. In terms of resources, they try their best to provide, but given the background of our country, it is difficult for them to provide us with adequate resources.

The department is also providing training (educational management development) to build capacity of district officials. A lot of money has been spent on this.

- **How and to what extent are the programs in your unit co-ordinated with the programs in the other units in the district?**

  There is a tendency within various units to work alone, hindering information from filtering from one unit to the other. We still have to work hard on this aspect. But I made an initiative that the Teaching and Learning Services (TLS) and the Auxiliary Services (EAS) should work together. As a result we have monthly meetings.

- **What needs to be done (at district level, provincial level, and national level) to make these programs effective?**

  To the whole system of education what needs to happen is to have mechanisms in place to see to it that teachers are retrained. The past institutions were training teachers to further the goals of the apartheid regime. The teachers need to be provided with new knowledge.

Again, the methods of recruiting teachers need to change. Some people join the profession for wrong reasons. Such teachers should be made to exit the profess- n as soon as possible, before they do more damage. If after retraining they do not improve, they should go.

- **As the head of the unit do you have direct contact with principals and schools? How frequently and on what basis?**

  This district has more special schools than other districts, making this district unique. The schools were not well serviced, perhaps due to lack of expertise in that field or lack of knowledge in dealing with such schools (on the part of the district). At the beginning of the year I provided management support in these schools.

  I am a regular visitor of not only such schools, but of normal schools as well. As one of the co-ordinators of the COLTS team we have clusters of schools that we have to concentrate on. This makes me to go to schools frequently. I have direct contact with principals and teachers.

  We visit schools to give support to learners and teachers and to monitor the situation to see to it that the culture of teaching and learning does exists, particularly among the Grade 12's.

- **Do you sometimes go to schools uninvited?**

These are the GDE schools. I do not need to be invited to our schools.

- **How do teachers and principals respond to your visits?**

  It depends on the person's attitude or the team's attitude. If you go to schools with an old approach of the DET, where an inspector was "god" to everything, then you are going to encounter problems. I do not go to schools with an aim of solving their problems or finding faults. They know their schools better than we do as the district, so we go there to help them solve their problems not to solve the problems for them, helping them to correct their situations to enhance the culture of teaching and learning. We are welcome in schools.

  As our schools are organised into clusters, we sometimes meet them as a group. The clustering mechanism is helpful in that resources of advantaged schools can be utilised to help other schools. Nevertheless, there are some difficulties accessing the resources in advantaged schools, some principals are very possessive of their resources, they feel they worked hard to attain the resources and disadvantaged schools should do the same. In some instances, the clustering strategy is not very helpful as some very poor schools are clustered with schools of the same situation. The previous Groups Areas Act of the apartheid era engendered a situation where the poor co-existed

with the poor, and the wealthy with the wealthy and that scenario is catching up with us now.

- **Do schools normally call you for intervention when they have problems?**

  When we visit schools, we do discover certain problems, but sometimes they do not call upon us to come and help them.

- **Do you sometimes find yourself in a position of not being able to help?**

  We are a new department and as a result we do not have everything to offer to schools. We try our best to cater for schools, but sometimes we find ourselves not being able to help. Sometimes this arises from the fact that the problem is not necessarily with us, but with higher levels of the GDE. For instance, if the head office does not provide us with textbooks in time or if they are insufficient, there is nothing we can do no matter how many schools pressurise us.

- **To what extent do districts play a role in policy-making?**

  We can influence policy, but policy is done at national level, we are not makers of policy, but implementers of policy. In the forums we attend we can influence policy.

- **Do you sometimes find yourselves in a position of not being able to implement policy?**

I haven't experienced that situation of being unable to implement policy. But what I can say is that I am playing a part that I am supposed to be playing, to implement policy, for instance, the issue of teacher retrenchment (temporary teachers), redeployment, etc.

- **Are you satisfied with the role that you play in policy-making?**

  Yes, I feel that I am playing a part that I am supposed to be playing, to implement policy. Policy-making is for policy-makers, but of course we are given drafts to comment on before policy is finalised.

- **Do political agendas, labour relations issues, and the teacher unions in this district support or disrupt teaching and learning? In what ways?**

  We have problems in dealing with teachers who are not committed to their work. The unions come flying to our offices once we attempt to deal with an irresponsible teacher. We have a right to take any irresponsible teacher to task, but the unions will always interfere and defend their members.

  We are supposed to have working relations with teacher unions, but I am not sure if we have. The Culture of Teaching and Learning Services (COLTS) that I talked about earlier is something the unions were against, but not necessarily all teacher unions, it is one particular teachers union. In our

district we had to enforce the culture of teaching and learning irrespective of what unions said. The enhancement of the culture of teaching and learning should be a joint project. Teacher unions together with the department should work towards it. But unions seem not to be committed to it; they allow their members to go to meetings during school hours.

In this district we went to an extent of calling in teachers who were not playing their part as far as service delivery, as advocated by the COLTS campaign, is concerned.

- **But what mechanisms do you apply to see to it that such teachers are disciplined?**

  Well in most cases we end up having lost our case against the teachers. This is due to the fact that other teachers are never willing to testify against their colleagues. You will find that it is only learners who complain about a particular teacher, which gives us a problem to pursue the case further. Managers who do not keep records of irresponsible teachers exacerbate the situation. They (managers) do support learners in most cases about their grievances against particular teachers, but without written evidence where specific dates are stated on which the teachers were showing irresponsible behavior, we couldn't do anything. Some managers seem to be intimidated by what might happen to them afterwards if they take steps against irresponsible teachers. But over and above

everything is the fact that we do not have powers to deal with them directly. It is a matter to be handled by the labour relations' office, which in most cases does not protect the employers.

- **Have any teacher strikes, class boycotts occurred in your district during the past three or four years? What was the contributing factors? How were these issues resolved?**

  A lot of them have occurred. Mostly teachers' complaints are low payments. The department had tried in most cases to address the teachers' needs.

- **Have incidents of violence, rape, shooting (of teachers/learners) been reported at schools in your district? What is the nature of such incidents and how frequently do they occur?**

  I have a big file on that, where even principals suggested that the perpetrators should be expelled. I have cases of violence, rape, drug peddling and abuse, etc. We try to address such problems by giving psychological help, counseling to the culprits and support to victims. There are cases that are left for legal intervention. We do not expel learners from schools. We only suspend them.

- **What in your opinion, are the key factors contributing to low success rates in grade 12 examinations in your district?**

Matric results are a disaster. They will never improve until the teachers' attitudes change. Teachers have negative attitudes. They are not committed to their work. Their kids are at the best schools where teaching and learning take place. Even if we can put the best resources in place, computers, science equipments, etc. as long as their attitudes are still the way they are, teaching and learning will never improve.

- **Wouldn't you say that their attitudes are informed by what they explain as poor working conditions and low salaries?**
  No ways! The government is doing all it can to please the teachers. The teachers' problem is that they always want to play a win-lose game. They never go for win-win. They go to negotiations with the mentality of rendering the department's programs null and void and put theirs in place.

- **What mechanisms have you put in place to ensure that you change their attitudes, without which the culture of teaching and learning will not take place and without which matric results won't improve?**
  To change people's attitudes is a process. Attitudes are difficult to change. What we do is we run workshops that deal with conflict management. This is because we are aware that teachers spent a lot of time in conflicts within the school, conflicts with the principal, conflict with colleagues.

Appendix 1. (C)

District 4

Teaching and Learning Unit

- **How long have you been working as head/co-ordinator of this unit?**

  Since 1997 (has been in the teaching profession for 30years, he was a principal for most of the his time in the profession).

- **What are your key performance areas (in order of importance) as head/co-ordinator of the unit?**

- To concentrate on the implementation of Curriculum 2005 (a dynamic outcomes-based policy); and to see matric results improve.

- **What factors hinder/impede your effectiveness in these performance areas?**

  We have budgetary constraints, for instance, when a school asks for a copy of a particular item, what happens is we receive one copy from the province and we have to print it on an 18 sheet, which is not budgeted for. The province simply gives you a copy and says you should distribute it and this we have to distribute to 125 schools. We only become fortunate if

a school has resources, then we simply give them one copy to photocopy for themselves and give to their learners. But in township schools you have to make a copy for each learner within the 125 schools (where resources are not available).

We only have one vehicle to transport district members to various schools.

Bureaucracy is a delaying factor. Sometimes when schools request certain things from us we can't give them without applying to the regional office. The regional office takes a lot of time before addressing problems.

Lack of specialised officials at district level in areas such as mathematics and commercial subjects. When such issues are raised with the head office, the response is, there is no money.

We are understaffed with 8 people instead of 24; even head office is understaffed. One person has to deal with a lot of issues.

We have good policies in place, but the problem is with implementation and delivery due to resource constraints.

- **What changes, if any, in the powers and functions of districts have occurred since 1994?**

A paradigm shift has been there in policy issues and matters. But we still have a problem in identifying our true responsibility. We still have situations in the townships where a defiance campaign is still continuing. The mentality

of not allowing district officials to come into schools still exists. The changes are more on paper than in practice.

- **How is restructuring of the college of education sectors impacting on service delivery in your district, if at all?**

  We could absorb people from colleges into our system for specialised areas, but people who are available are not people we need. They are people who specialised in areas that we are covered on. People we need want to take packages. We have now appointed three people for life orientation. But for critical areas like mathematics and commercial subjects we have appointed one person per area. The person that the head office has sent to us from the college is not relevant for our needs (mathematics and commercial subjects). The person is relevant for language area of which we are covered already.

- **What support do you obtain from the provinces in relation to your programs?**

  There are training sessions organised by the province for district officials, but we are still caught up in this cascade model. When we go down to report to teachers we do not receive their support at all in the sense of them not being co-operative with principals. For instance, even if principals are prepared to impart the skills they received from workshops, teachers are not prepared to stay for the afternoons or to go to school on weekends to be workshopped.

Teachers take the profession as an 8h00 to 15h00 job, five days a week. They are not prepared to sacrifice.

Management is still disadvantaged. There is no mechanism in place whereby managers can discipline teachers who are not committed to their work.

The new Labour Relations Act is a protection of the employees who are in this case teachers. The act does not look into the rights of the learners to receive the kind of education that will brighten their future.

As for Curriculum 2005 there are no credible institutions dealing with it including colleges and universities. We do not even have credible individuals driving the process of Curriculum 2005 (training and implementation). The only people we have are provincial and district officials. And we are dealing with the curriculum from our own experiences. There is no expert in the curriculum since it is new to all of us. So what we learn, we try to impart in schools, but then when it (the information/skills) reaches the school it is third-hand or fourth-hand information. This really kills Curriculum 2005. Up to today we do not have an Assessment Policy document for Curriculum 2005. Teachers do not know what the promotion requirements are. Even at the provincial level it is difficult to get a circular that will sort of become policy.

- **Does the unit have adequate capacity (human and material resources) to mediate these programs effectively?**

People I work with in my unit are competent for particular areas, but they are overworked and they do more than what their areas of specialisation are. For instance, the gentleman who has been appointed for mathematics has to oversee science and biology. All his life he has been a secondary school teacher now he has to deal with the foundation phase as well. Besides Curriculum 2005 he has to deal with numeracy. The difficulty here is that he has to guide teachers from grades 1-3. How do you guide and advise a teacher who has more expertise than you do? Within the district people haven't actually been appointed according to their expertise. So people end up concentrating on what they are comfortable with. You find all eight officials wanting to work with secondary schools, but out of compulsion they do workshops in primary schools, but they are not confident.

- **How and to what extent are the programs in your unit co-ordinated with the programs in the other units in the district?**

  We work very effectively with Auxiliary Services Unit. We share one office with them in London (pseudonym - for confidentiality purposes). When a teacher reports that a child is not learning they (EAS) handle the problem.

- **What would need to be done (at district level, provincial level, national level) to make these programs effective?**

  People at head office should come down to schools to see what is happening. They should come and pilot and/or work in schools to see what is happening, before they come up with programs from national/provincial level for implementation. It is very good to make a policy like the South African Schools Act (SASA) which is so marvelous, but it assumes that the playing field has been leveled (everybody is on the same level and you will function in the same way). The whole idea of compulsory education until the age of 15 in certain instances works, but you have learners who are over fifteen sitting in classes, how do you handle that? There is no policy dealing with that. It is only now that they are dealing with admission policy.

- **As head of the unit do you visit schools? If so, how frequently and for what purpose(s)?**

  Because of the defiance campaign that carried on from the apartheid era up to now, people (teachers and principals) will only invite you to schools when they have problems. As a district official, you can't go and say you are there to monitor what they are doing. Due to the COLTS program certain schools call us when they need help and we send some officials to teach in the classrooms, but there is too much democracy

and some people will tell you that you should make an appointment for your visit.

They still have the fear that you are not there to help or facilitate, but to search for mistakes/find faults. What aggravates the situation is the fact that, the kind of problems that are raised, I cannot deal with them as a district official. This is because we do not have autonomy; we have to go through the bureaucratic system. If a school reports that it does not have textbooks I still have to apply to the regional office that takes its time to respond.

Sometimes you will send documents to head office for approval, documents that are needed by a school, for instance, for promotion requirements. Now the principal will keep on phoning wanting to know how far you are with the documents. When you phone the head office you find that the document has not been signed or a decision has not been finalised. What happens is that the schools look at you and feel that you are ineffective, when you are actually delayed from the top.

- **Are there programs that were developed and implemented purely at district level?**

  Programs that are related to improving matric results were purely our initiative. The programs haven't been effective since teachers are not co-operative.

- **To what extent is the district consulted in the development of programs originating at national and provincial levels?** The national and provincial levels involve us in the development of programs, they consult with us and we have inputs to make. We do initiate programs at district level like the ones on improving the matric results.

- **Do political agendas, labour relations issues, and the teacher unions in the district support or disrupt effective teaching and learning?**

  We work well with the unions up to this far particularly on the program of COLTS. We meet on a monthly basis. We are trying to bring COSAS on board. In terms of teachers who are not committed to their work, unions have made it clear to us that they do not support an irresponsible teacher. But unions do defend their members hiding behind the notion that there are no resources, forgetting that at school level the main basic resources are in fact there, the building, the teacher (main resource) who receive about 90% of the total budget of education.

  The Labour Relations Act protects the employees (teachers) and does nothing about the employees' responsibility and commitment to the culture of teaching and learning.

- Does staff in the secondary schools have adequate qualifications, experience and expertise to facilitate increased success rates in the grade 12 examinations?

  Most of the teachers are qualified, but they are still working within the comfort zone. Change is very difficult. They fear change.

- Have any teachers' strikes, class boycotts occurred in your district during the past three or four years? What was the contributing factors? How were these issues resolved?

  Basically we had strikes and class boycotts that affected the whole nation or the whole province. It never happened that the strike and boycott occurred only within the district. In such cases we do intervene through our representative at provincial level.

- Have incidents of violence, rape, shootings (of teachers/learners) been reported at schools in your district? What is the nature of such incidents and how frequently do they occur?

  We did have such incidents reported to us. The Auxiliary Service Unit (EAS) handled such problems We act on a team basis. The crisis team together with the EAS handles the issues). We had an incident where a shooting happened outside a school, but ended up affecting the school, leaving learners and teachers in trauma. We had a school where learners shot

one another and there was vandalism going on in the school. We had a situation where COSAS and teachers controlled a school and the principal could not deal with the situation.

- **Since you have been the head at this unit have the matric results declined or improved?**

  I only came in last year (1997), but of course the results have been terrible.

  The programs in place to improve the results are:

- Common preliminary examinations which we arranged for teachers, but there was no support from the teachers. Only five schools administered the examinations. And there is nothing you can do about such schools in that we were just rendering assistance. Some schools seem to perceive this assistance as a way of checking what they have done and what they have not done.
- The COLTS program was also directed towards improving the matric results. We had winter school.
- There are schools that performed relatively well in the townships. The contributing factors were that both principal and teachers were committed. They took advantage of the assistance offered to them. They also attended winter school.

Appendix 1 (d)

District 3

Auxiliary Services Unit

- How long have you been working as head/co-ordinator of this unit?

  Since 1996.

  NOTE: Some of the questions and responses, which ai supposed to follow, could not be recorded.

  What kind of support do you receive from the province?

  We get trained at head office level and there appears to be sufficient resources for that. But when we come back to district level we get stuck when we are supposed to take the same quality of training to schools because of lack of resources. As a result we end up having to give training to several teachers when in fact issues such as child abuse are everybody's responsibility. All teachers, not a few within a school, need to be trained around how to deal with such issues.

- To what extent do you involve parents in such programs? e.g. (child abuse)

  That is where our shortcoming is. The only time we work with them is when they get referred to us. We have not worked with the parent community except with those that are in school governing bodies.

- What factors hinder/impede your effectiveness in these performance areas?

  We are supposed to be a staff of 28, but we are only 12 due to financial constraints. Lack of capacity on our part due to understaffing. We are usually not in a position to follow up on programs that we start at schools. The schools are many and it is only a few of us. Again, we concentrate on other projects as well than what we do in schools. As a result, when we go back to schools say after six months, you find that we have to start afresh, workshopping and training teachers.

- What changes, if any, in the powers and functions of districts have occurred since 1994?

  They have definitely changed. I worked in the district even then. Then the programs were more individual-based than mass-based. The situation is now vice versa. In the past few individuals had access to our services, but now we are concentrating on groups and we now avail our services to more children.

- **In your opinion, are the powers and functions assigned to districts adequate?**

  Our powers are not sufficient in that in a number of issues/matters we first have to go through the regional office. My problem with this is that the regional office does not always attend to our problems immediately or at least within a reasonable period. It takes them weeks to deal with matters that in my opinion could take them at least two days (If we take their own programs and plans into consideration as well, but otherwise it could take them less than an hour). In the meantime we receive a lot of pressure from principals who think that we are reluctant to help them.

- **How does the function of the district differ from that of the province? Are these differences, in your opinion, real or merely cosmetic?**

  The GDE work more with policy development and co-ordination, and we work more with implementation. They give us a chance to comment on policies that are developed already. Although we do not develop policy we have representatives from teacher unions and from various stakeholders in the department.

- **How is the restructuring of the colleges of education sector impacting on service delivery in your district, if at all?**

  People from colleges are mostly people we do not need; they are people we are already covered on.

- **What support do you obtain from the province in relation to these programs?**

  They provide training that is relevant to the programs that we have to undertake. We then go down to schools and train about two teachers per school. The GDE gives us programs and a plan for us to implement in schools.

- **Does the unit have adequate capacity (human and material resources) to mediate these programs effectively?**

  For a couple of areas we do not have specialists. We end up putting people who are not specialists in the areas to facilitate.

- **How and to what extent are the programs in your unit co-ordinated with the programs in the other units in the district?**

  Our programs overlap into the Teaching and Learning Unit. We work a lot together particularly on the foundation phase and grade 12. As for the development unit we work with them in district matters.

- **As head of the unit do you have direct contact with principals and schools? How frequently and on what basis?**

  To get more financial support so that we can give a better quality of training teachers. The head office needs to do their plan well in advance, so that when we plan at district level we should include their plans. Sometimes they come with

their plans after we and schools have already planned, as a result they disturb our flow of functioning.

- Head office become very unreasonable sometimes, they give us a document and expect us to be through with it within a short period of time.

- **As head of the unit do you visit schools? If so, how frequently and for what purpose(s)?**

  We do go particularly to schools which need a lot of support particularly those whose matric results were poor. We can go to schools anytime, of course, with prior arrangement. Since the beginning of the year through our provincial campaign of COLTS we had several programs of going into schools. This was particularly by the schools support teams, they go to schools every morning to monitor the late coming of teachers and learners, monitor what is going on in schools. We do not go into classrooms due to the previous defiance campaign. But teachers do not call us to come and help them with certain subjects. That is how we enter classrooms and teach although we do not have enough capacity on some subjects.

- **What do you do a in case where late-coming and absenteeism prevail in a school?**

  We take notice of that and we talk to the principals (school management) about it. We follow up and we end up not pursuing it due to some of the programs that we have to attend to. But

if the situation is too serious, I am sure further steps can be taken, it is only that it hasn't really happened in a way that is disturbing.

- **Are there programs that were developed at district level?**
  Yes. There are programs that we initiated and implemented, for instance, the support committees that I talked of earlier are our initiative.

- **To what extent is the district consulted in the development of programs originating at national or provincial level? Is such consultation, in your opinion, really necessary?**
  Most of the programs start at national level, then the province get drawn in, then the district until the schools are reached. Consultation is made widely with all these levels. Up to this far we haven't received any program that we did not know about - we are consulted first (But of course there are some systematic shortcomings). A typical example of how widely we are consulted is on the issue of developmental appraisal for teachers. Consultation has been going on for about 10 years now, it started in 1989 and it will only be implemented in 1999.

- **Do political agendas, labour relations issues, and the teacher unions in the district support or disrupt effective teaching and learning?**

  Through COLTS campaign, the unions and even COSAS are being consulted about the programs we undertake, they are also represented in the campaign. They receive feedback from us and they have a chance to make inputs. We give them invitations to all our functions, to meetings we have with teachers and principals.

- **Since you were the head at this unit has the matric results decline or improved?**

  The matric results have been poor. And we have put the following mechanisms in place to improve them:

  - Schools support teams (talked about earlier). We gave schools the syllabi because some schools did not have the right syllabi: they now have all the syllabi that they have to teach at matric level.
  - We established subject committees. Teachers and district officials (from TLS) come together and discussed questions of how to set an examination paper for common examination.
  - Common examinations. However some schools driven by COSAS did not write the examinations. Our officials (from TLS) help with teaching when invited.

- We had winter school during the June holidays (for all matric for two weeks). We gave them previous question papers for those who are doing mathematics.
- We bussed all our matriculants to the botanical gardens to go and look at potential careers in botany and zoology.
- We have taken them to Iscor to get some bursaries in science and technology. We did study skills with them.

- **Why is it that a lot of focus seems to be on the foundation phase then straight up to matric? What about the middle grades?**

  That is definitely a problem. We are on specific programs for the intermediate phase. We do cover them through the school support teams, but we do not have specific programs for them (policies around that will come).

Appendix 1(e)

District 5

Development Service Unit

- How long have you been working as head/co-ordinator of this unit?

  Since March 1996

- What are your key performance areas as head/co-odinator of the unit?

  I co-ordinate the unit which deals with:

  Governance of schools

  Physical cleaning in schools

  When there is a need for a building to be erected, or renovated in schools

  We also look at adult centres (2 in the area)

  Early childhood development particularly in the pre-school and crèches.

- What factors facilitate personal effectiveness in such performance areas?

- Support from head office provided us with training. Sponsorship from the Danish government to do development work

in schools, especially governing bodies and schools management.

- **What factors hinder/impede your effectiveness in these performance areas?**

  Lack of resources, transport and finance.

  Understaffing. We are supposed to be a staff of 7, but we are 4.

- **In your opinion, are the powers and functions assigned to districts adequate?**

  No. There is a lot of bureaucracy going on, which of course hinders one to work as an 'independent' professional. I mean it starts here with the director, to the regional office, to the head office. So everything that one has to via somebody before it is implemented.

  One thing I need to raise is that the GDE has a tendency of submitting documents late to us, and expects us to make comments and recommendations within a very short period of time, like in a week's time. How do you play a meaningful role and make sensible comments if you are not given enough time to do so? The thing is we have other things to do and when documents come we do not simply drop everything and concentrate on them, we do what is on our plan first because schools out there expect us to deliver.

- **How is the restructuring of the colleges of education sector impacting on service delivery in your district?**

  We've never heard any person from the colleges joining us. But we need people.

- **How and to what extent are the programs in your unit co-ordinated with the programs in other units?**

  We cut across every sector in the district. For instance, we train teachers; we have the science project going on at Vista University. Other units like the TLS and EAS are also contributing. By training teachers we contribute almost directly to teaching and learning because if teachers are not trained and or do not know their stuff then learning and teaching won't prevail.

  A science person from the TLS co-ordinates the science projects. I found the partner (ISCOR) and made the necessary communication with the partner (for the science project). He (science TLS) has to make sure that teachers attend the training. I also go to the training sessions to tell them, why they are there, i.e. who sponsored them and for what.

  Presently because of Matric exams we go everyday. Throughout the year we go whenever there is training going on in schools. We have school support teams which go to schools. The teams go twice a week to schools, not particularly to the same schools. We go even when we are not invited. It is part of our job. We

go to see if there is a need and we come and structure our program.

- **How have the schools /principals/teachers responded to these programs?**

  When we come they shower us with problems. We get into dialogue; we talk about their problems.

- **What kind of problems do they direct to you?**

  Shortage of text books. Shortage of wood for wood work. Shortage of plumbing materials to unblock toilets. How they can involve parents outside the SGBS to be active in school matters

- **Do you find yourselves in most cases being in position to help when such problems are directed to you?**

  Not at all times. We encourage them to be creative and to do what they can to help themselves. We explain to them that things cannot happen overnight. But we try to help them with the basics.

- **What is your role in policy making?**

  We are consulted to make inputs in the development of programs and policy though we play a lot of an implementing role. We are presented with drafts to make contributions and inputs.

- **Does the unit have adequate capacity?**

  We all learn as we work. We don't emphasize being skilled but the potential to be skilled.

- **Is there any direct role that your unit plays in improving the matric results?**

  Yes. In whatever that we are here for we are contributing to the Matric results. The science project that I talked about involves developing and training teachers. We make sure that the physical environment of schools are nice looking. It makes learners to feel at home and to enjoy being at school.

Appendix 2

School A	District 4
No. of teachers interviewed:	Three (2 teachers and the Principal)

School Environment

School Level:	High School
No. of Teachers:	50 (18 employed by the SGB and 32 by GDE)
No. of learners:	1131
Teacher pupil ratio:	1:35
Predominant Race:	Whites (multi-racial)

Physical Environment

It is a clean, big and well-resourced school. The lawn is attractive with well-trimmed trees and colourful flowers. The administrative block is big, catering for a staff-room and a number of offices for secretaries and a Deputy Principal.

Period as Principal/Teacher

Principal: 4 years as a principal, 20 years as a teacher

Teacher A: 19 years

Teacher B : 21 years

Improvements since 1994

Principal: Interaction and communication between schools and districts

Teacher A: Nothing now

Teacher B: Slight improvement

Support Received from the District to improve the Quality of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Training of school management team

Teacher A: No support

Teacher B: No direct support

The Frequency of District Officials' Visit to the School

Principal: Once in a semester

Teacher A: Once in a while

Teacher B: No known visits

What Officials do During Their Visits

Principal: Look at how the school is administered

Teacher A: End up in the principal's office

Teacher B: Not applicable

The Existence of a Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors Contributing to Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Involvement of all stakeholders.

Teacher A: Teacher commitment.

Teacher B: Teacher and parent commitment

Recommendations

Principal: More visits should be added.

Teacher A: The officials should address teachers' problems.

Teacher B: The officials should visit to see what goes on.

School B	DISTRICT 1
No of teachers interviewed:	3 (A principal and 2 teachers)

School Environment:

School Level:	High School
No. of Teachers:	Not Verified
No of Pupils:	Not Verified
Teacher Pupil Ratio:	Not Verified
Predominant Race:	African

Physical Environment

The office was clean except for the long grass.

Duration as Principal/Teacher

Principal:	A deputy principal for 5 years and a teacher for 27 years.
Teacher A:	9 years
Teacher B:	14 years

Improvements since 1994

Principal: Communication flow between the district and schools. Advises on how to teach subjects. Common exams for grades 10,11, 12

Teacher A: Renovations of the school. Communication channels improved a lot. Flexibility on the part of the districts and offering of auxiliary services (academic, social and psychological)

Teacher B: Useful workshops that allow for active participation for teachers.

Support Received from the District to Improve the Quality of Education

Principal: Workshops & seminars

Teacher A: Workshops, though there are no follow-ups thereof.

Circulars on some of the subjects.

Teacher B: Workshops and seminars.

The Frequency of the District Officials' Visits to the School

Principal: Regularly

Teacher A: Once in a quarter

Teacher B: Once in a semester

What District Officials do during their Visits to Schools

Principal: Inspect the School. Help us to solve problems. Help the principal about discipline and order in the school.

Teacher A: They end up in the principal's office

Teacher B: Teachers do not normally see them. They are only told that the officials were around.

The Existence of the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Co-operation between parents, teachers and learners.

Teacher A: Good management, co-operative parents and learners

Teacher B: Commitment of teachers

The District's Role in Promoting the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Advice given to teachers on how to teach subjects

Teacher A: Through common exams, they keep teachers on their toes to teach the syllabus thoroughly and to cover it on time.

Teacher B: The workshops they provide for teachers give teachers direction on how to teach subjects.

Recommendations to the District

Principal: Provision of equipment such as desks, learning materials and sufficient textbooks. Processing of applications should be speeded up, to avoid a situation where items applied for take over four months before they are delivered to schools.

Teacher A: Improvement of teachers' working conditions and benefits such as salaries, subsidy of teachers further education.

Teacher B: The delivery and fulfilment of their (officials) promises. The speeding up of application processing, provision of equipments such as photocopying machines and sufficient learning materials. Teacher salaries should increase.

School C District 2

Number of teachers interviewed: 3 (the principal and 2 teachers)

The School Environment

Level of the school:	High school
No of teachers:	29
No of learners:	879
Teacher pupil ratio:	1:43
Predominant race:	Africans

Physical Environment

The school was clean and tidy. The principal's office was clean and tidy.

Duration as Teacher/Principal

Principal:	7 years as a principal, 6 years as a teacher
Teacher A:	28 years
Teacher B:	15 years

Improvements since 1994

Principal:	Workshops for teachers and principals
Teacher A:	No improvements, I used to enjoy my work but I am no more. -Lack of resources -Lack of parent participation -Learners being demotivated -Teachers being demotivated due to poor working conditions -A lot being expected from teachers while not given tools to deliver, and low salaries.
Teacher B:	-No improvement

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Teacher B: -Lack of communication with people on the ground i.e. District officials are too high to reach.

Teachers do not have a direct contact with them.

Support Received from the District to Improve the Quality of Education

Principal: -Provision of resources such as furniture, stationery, photocopying machines for a cluster of schools, paper and textbooks.
Teacher A: -No support
Teacher B: -No support

THE FREQUENCY OF THE OFFICIAL=S VISITS TO SCHOOL

Principal: -When there is a problem
-When they want to assess what is going on in the school
Teacher A: -Not often
Teacher B: -Once in a while

What District Officials do when they visit the School

Principal: - Help to solve problems
Teacher A: -They end up in the principal's office
Teacher B: -They end up in the principal's office

The Existence of a Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: - Teacher commitment

Teacher B: - Commitment of teachers maintaining discipline by keeping the gates locked for late-comers
- To keep learners within the yard during school hours.
Teacher B: - Parent involvement

RECOMMENDATIONS

Principal: -The district should provide with more resources like teaching aids and filling the laboratory with relevant staff.

Teacher A: - The district officials should stop being in their offices

-They should come down to the ground and see what is going on in schools before they come up with rules that are uninformed. It is us teachers who are closer to the brand. We are with the poverty-stricken learners on a daily basis. We have to teach them in the classroom, expect them to perform well, and blame them if they do not, whilst knowing exactly that they are seated in the classroom with their stomachs empty.

-Districts have to address the core needs, the deeper seated problems of these learners' socio - economic background. Let them start with these learners' socio-economic background.

-Let them stop telling us about appraisal system and come up with feeding schemes. We never have a chance to raise our dissatisfaction. They never come down to us to hear our cries. They only come up with problems. District officials should consult with us and be transparent about issues that affect us directly as teachers.

-They should provide with resources
-They should revisit redeployment policy
-They should implement SASA policy

Teacher B: Provide with sufficient resources particularly textbooks, libraries.
-Consult with teachers, make a follow up on their workshops
-Impose a moratorium on redeployment until such times they are informed about what is going on at the grassroots level. Redeployment is an uninformed policy.
-Provide with auxiliary services
-psychological help for problematic learners, teachers should be guided on how to deal with such learners.
-Teacher pupil ratio should be reduced.
-Being products of an unstable situation, the apartheid era, teachers should go through rehabilitation sessions to change their attitudes towards work.

School D District 5

Number of teachers interviewed: 3 (2 teachers and a deputy principal)

School Environment

School level:	High School
No of teachers:	34
No. of learners:	+-1140
Teacher pupil ratio:	+-1:34
Predominant race:	African

Physical Environment

Learners were moving up and down the school premises during school hours. Teachers were going in and out of the staff-room. Some were moving around with sticks on their hands suggesting that corporal punishment is still practised. The school is clean when judged within the context of township schools. There is no phone at the school.

Period as a Teacher/Principal

Principal: 3 years as a deputy, 16 as a teacher

Teacher A: 12 years

Teacher B: 15 years

Improvements since 1994

Deputy principal:
-Top down leadership no longer strong
-Teaching and learning no longer based on rote learning
-A lot of developmental workshops

Teacher A:
- A lot of support
-Provision of materials and workshops
-Help solve problems

Teacher B:
-Workshops
-Monitoring of the culture of teaching and learning

Support Received from the District to Improve the Quality of Education

Deputy Principal: -Assistance from subject advisors
-Provision of materials
-The school was given R5000 to improve matric results

Teacher A: -Provision of materials, attendance of workshops

Teacher B: Attendance of workshops

Frequency of District Officials' visits to the School

Deputy Principal: -Twice a month

Teacher A: -Often

Teacher B: -Once a quarter

Purpose of Visits

Deputy principal: -Meet with staff
- Help teachers to teach difficult areas

Teacher A: -Check on administration issues
-Visit in classrooms
-Teach learners
-Help in Saturday schools.

Teacher B: -Check learners' books, files and teach

The Existence of the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Deputy Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Deputy principal: -Unity among staff members

Teacher A: -Good working relations between district and schools
-Co-operative learners

Teacher B: -Co-operation with the District

Recommendations

Deputy Principal: - Check on the schools constantly

Teacher A:	-There is lack of resources at the school. -The school needs a fax machine, photocopying machine, telephone, overhead projector, chairs and tables. -Over and above all the school's electricity does not work
Teacher B: -	No recommendations. (when asked about lack of resources at the school, the interviewee said that the district does not have money and that even if resources could be provided, there would be burglary.

SCHOOL E DISTRICT 3

Number of teachers interviewed : 3 (2 teachers and the principal)

School Environment

Level of school : Primary

No of learners : 1274

No of teachers : 30

Teacher/pupil ratio : 1:48

Predominant race : African

Physical Environment
The school is situated in an informal settlement. The school building is still new. The school was very noisy.

Period as a Principal/Teacher

Principal: 7 years

Teacher A: 11 years

Teacher B: 10 years

Improvements since 1994

Principal: Well-Structured programs such as workshops. Clear circulars received from the district.

Teacher A: Maternity leave sometimes done without pay. There is more transparercy at the way things are done.

Teacher B: Teachers receive support through workshops aimed at equipping teachers with skills to implement Curriculum 2005. Again teachers received guides on how to teach.

Support Received from the District to Improve the Quality of Education

Principal: The school was assisted by subject advisors on how to approach and teach different subjects

Teachers A and B: the district conducted Workshops. The district also assisted with the

implementation of the Outcomes Based Education.

Frequency of District Officials' Visits

Principal: Visits from the district were irregular. District officials did come to visit the school to assess the amount of progress being made at the school. They also come when invited to help resolve problems.

Teacher A: District officials come to the school when invited. At one time they were more regular because the principal was hospitalised.

Teacher B: District officials visited the school on a quarterly basis

What do district officials do when they visit schools?

Principal: District officials assess the administrative capacity of the school

Teacher A: Teachers are not really clear about the purpose of the district officials' visits because they mainly communicate with the principal and less with the teachers.

Teacher B: The principal gets a major report about some developments within the district.

Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: It is really difficult to say that there is a culture of learning and teaching. I depend on individual teachers.

Teacher A: There is no culture of learning and teaching.
Teacher B: There are good attempts to have a good culture of learning and teaching

Factors Contributing the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Some teachers lack skills. Others need motivation

Teacher A: Poor class attendance, late coming, lack of discipline, and lack of commitment on the side of educators.

Teacher B: There is commitment from the side of the

learners, educators, and parents.

Recommendations

Principal: Educators should be made to respect the regulations that require them to be in their offices till 15H00. There should be constant visits from the district to assess the culture of teaching and learning.

Teacher A: There should be constant assessment of the teachers. This will push teachers to be committed to teaching

Teacher B: The redeployment policy should not be implemented. Instead more schools should be built.

SCHOOL F DISTRICT 5

Number of teachers interviewed : Three (Principal and 2 teachers)

School Environment

School Level: Primary School

No of Teachers : 34 (25 employed by GDE and 9 by SGB)

No of Learners: 1009

Teachers/Pupil Ratio: 1:39-40

Predominant Race: Whites (Multiracial)

Physical Environment

The school is well equipped with more than three computers in the secretary's office. It has facilities such as a swimming pool, tennis court, big playing fields, etc. The staff room, secretary's office are big. Generally the school is clean and tidy, with well kept lawn, colourful flowers and well-trimmed trees.

Duration as Principal/Teacher

Principal: 1 year as a principal and 20 years as teacher

Teacher A: 7 years

Teacher B: 26 years

Improvements since 1994

Principal: A lot of workshops. Interaction between the district and schools

Teacher A: The district is more organised

Teacher B: The district is in touch with the schools

Support Received from the District to Improve the Quality of Education

Principal: Visits from subject advisors. Training

Teacher A: Training. The involvement of subject facilitators. Workshops

Teacher B: Training

Frequency of District Officials' Visits to the School

Principal: Twice in a year

Teacher A: No visits

Teacher B: No visits

What District Officials do when they Visit the School?

Principal: They check on how administration is run in schools

Teacher A: Not applicable

Teacher B: Not applicable

The Existence of the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Strong teaching body. Involvement of parents

Teacher A: Extra mural curricular. Parent participation, particularly in fundraising

Teacher B: Committed, dedicated and hand-working teachers. Good percentage of parent involvement.

Recommendations

Principal: The district should improve on their channel of communication. Information does not reach the schools quickly enough.

Teacher A: Teachers should be workshopped on how to implement particular policies. In trying to bring together the disadvantaged and advantaged schools, the district should not overlook the impracticalities involved. For instance, they should not base workshops in schools that are not

equipped like township schools. Schools which do not have resources should be prepared to go to those that have resources, this is a practical issue not a political one.

Teacher B: The district should have enough resources to travel to schools.

SCHOOL G DISTRICT 5

Number of Teachers Interviewed: Three (Two teachers and a Deputy Principal)

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

School Level : High School

No of Teachers : 52 (19 employed by SGB and 33 by GDE)

No of Learners : 1140

Teacher Pupil Ratio : 1:36

Predominant Race : Whites (Multiracial)

Physical Environment

The school is large and well-equipped. With good sporting facilities and pleasant grounds. The administration block has many offices together with a big staff room. The school is clean inside (the offices) and outside (well-trimmed lawn and colourful flowers).

Duration as Principal/Teacher

Principal: 5 years as a deputy principal. 20 years as a teacher.

Teacher A: 22 years

Teacher B: 21 years

Improvements since 1994

Principal: There is more communication and interaction between the districts and schools.

Teacher A: There is more training and workshops

Teacher B: There is more training

Support received from the District to improve the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Workshops

Teacher A: Being there when needed

Teacher B: Seminars. Subject advisors visit the school

Frequency of District Officials' Visits to the School

Principal: Per invitation.

Teacher A: Once a quarter.

Teacher B: Regularly.

What Officials do when they visit the School

Principal: Talk to the principal about the running of the school

Teacher A: Check if the school has problems. To see how teachers cope with teaching and learning

Teacher B: Talk to teachers about appraisal system

The Existence of the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Discipline of all stakeholders, learners, teachers and parents. The school's code of conduct.

Teacher A: Commitment of educators. Positive attitude from teachers. Conducive environment to teaching and learning in the school.

Teacher B: Dedicated teachers in school where most parents are not involved.

Recommendations

Principal: The district should have sufficient funds to help schools

Teacher A: The district should intervene and help place learners with low IQ or learning problems

Teacher B: The district should provide special psychological help in schools.

SCHOOL H DISTRICT 3

Number of teachers interviewed: 3 (2 teachers and a Principal)

School environment

Level of school:	Primary school
No. of learners:	1274
No. of teachers:	30
Teacher pupil ratio:	1:47-50
Predominant race:	African

Physical Environment

The school is big, clean and tidy. The office and the staffroom are big enough. The school was very noisy, the noise was audible a kilometre away from the classes. This might be explained by absent teachers (apparently a problem at this particular school)

Duration as a Principal/Teacher

Principal: 8 years as a principal, 22 years as a teacher.

Teacher: 11 years (Head of department)

Teacher B: 10 years

Improvements since 1994

Principal: Well-structured programmes such as workshops, clear circulars of what is expected of teachers.

Teacher A: Transparency on issues affecting teachers such as maternity issues.
Teachers know exactly whom to contact when they have problems.

Teacher B: -Regular workshops, materials on how to teach

Support received from the District to Improve the Quality of Education

Principal: -Subject advisors on various subjects

Teacher A: -Workshops, assistance on the implementation of OBE

Teacher B: -Workshops on curriculum 2005, Head of

Departments and principals, provision of materials on how to teach

Frequency of the Officials' visits to the School

Principal: Per invitation. Once in a while

Teacher A: Per invitation. Used to visit on regular basis when the principal was hospitalised.

Teacher B: Quarterly

What Officials do when they visit the School

Principal: Check how the school is progressing. They get the information from the principal.

Teacher A: They end up in the principal's office

Teacher B: Get the progress report from the principal

The existence of the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Prevalent to some extent

Teacher A: Not prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Some teachers need motivation, they lag behind on what is expected of them as educators.

Teacher A: Poor class attendance by learners and educators. No discipline. Late arrivals. Lack of commitment.

Teacher B: Commitment of teachers, learners and parents

Recommendations

Principal
The district should respect their regulations such the rule that teachers should not visit the district offices during teaching hours. They should take action against such teachers. They should visit the schools constantly to monitor the culture of teaching and learning.

Teacher A
Inspection and assessment of teachers should be done. It will push teachers to be committed to their teaching.

Teacher B

More schools should be built to avoid overcrowding in schools. Redeployment policy should not be implemented.

SCHOOL I DISTRICT 6

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

School level:	Primary School
No. of teachers:	27
No. of learners:	1027
Teacher pupil ratio:	1:40
Predominant Race:	Coloured

Physical Environment

The school is clean, particularly outside. The lawn is well-trimmed

Duration as Principal/Teacher

Principal: 1 year as a principal, 14 years as a teacher

Teacher A: 12 years
Teacher B: 13 years

Improvements since 1994

Principal: -Improvement are at a very slow pace

Teacher A: Regular workshops, regular provision of circulars.

Teacher B: -Teaching guidance through workshops

Support Received from the District to Improve the Quality of Education

Principal: -Workshops, subject advisors visit school when called upon to solve problems/to render help

Teacher A: - Regular workshops
- Regular provision of circulars

Teacher B: -Workshops

Frequency of District Officials' Visits to the School

Principal: Rare
Teacher A: Not often

Teacher B: Not regular

Purpose of the Visit

Principal: Motivating and implementation of OBE

Teacher B: End up in the principal's office

Teacher B: Implementation of OBE

The Prevalence of the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: -Experienced teachers
-Disciplined teachers
-Parent involvement

Teacher A: The school used not to have resources

Teacher B: -Teachers' commitment
-Financial support from parents, businessmen and the community at large

Recommendations

Principal: -The district's help should be speeded up
-Bureaucracy be done away with
-Auxiliary services should be done effectively. The school sit up with children with learning problems for a long time. This should be taken as a matter of urgency.
-The question of understaffing should be addressed
-Support systems be provided in schools
- Paper budget system should be changed to cash system. Paper budget contributes to ineffectiveness in that things the school applies for take a long time to be processed.
-Sometimes the school does not received the things it has requisitioned

Teacher A: - District officials should come down to schools and see what is happening.
They should come and see problems experienced in schools, then talk about policy implementation.
-OBE should be context-bound. The Afrikaans community should be left to learn in their own way and style of living. They are not used to talking in groups.

SCHOOL J DISTRICT 1

Number of teachers interviewed: 2 (A principal and a teacher)

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

Level of the school: Primary school

No of teachers: 36

No of learners: 1400

Teacher pupil Ratio: 1:44

Predominant Race: Coloured

Physical Environment

The school was clean with a beautiful lawn, flowers and well-trimmed trees. The classrooms were clean. The principal's office is large as is the staffroom.

Duration as Principal/Teacher

Principal: 31 years as a teacher, 4 years as a principal

Teacher: 25 years

Improvement since 1994

Principal: Improved communication channels. Regular workshops for the School Management Teams and Principal

Teacher: There are workshops that are aimed at improving teachers' skills.

Support received from the District to Improve the Quality of Education

Principal: Regular workshops are organised. District officials pay regular visits to schools.

Teacher A: Regular workshops are organised. Study materials are also provided

Frequency of District Officials' visits to the School

Principal: Once a quarter

Teacher A: They rarely visit. They only came for survey

What District Officials do when they visit the School

Principal: They assess the administration function of the school

Teacher A: They only meet with the principal.

The Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Commitment from the side of teachers. Teamwork.

Teacher A: Good leadership and management. Teacher commitment

Recommendations

Principal
District officials should build a closer relationship between themselves and teachers.

Teacher
District officials should make follow-ups of the workshops they organise. They should visit teachers in classrooms to be able to give them guidance and advices. Outcomes Based Education should start at Grade II.

SCHOOL I DISTRICT 6

Number of teachers interviewed: 3 (2 teachers and the principal)

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

School level:	High School
No of teachers:	48
No of learners:	1860
Teacher pupil ratio:	1:48
Dominant race:	African

Duration as a Principal/Teacher

Principal: 4 years as a principal, 20 as a teacher

Teacher A: 11 years

Teacher B: 10 years

Improvement since 1994

Principal: -Regular workshops for school management teams
-Subject advisors are there for teachers

Teacher A: -Workshops
-Subject advisors helpful for teachers

Teacher B: -Workshops for school management team

Support received from District to Improve the Quality of Education

Principal: - Regular workshops for school management teams
- Subject advisors role

Teacher: A: - Workshops
- Subject advisors helpful
- Received R5000 to buy resources to improve the Grade 12 results

Teacher B: - Workshops

Frequency of District Officials' visit to the School

Principal:	-Twice a month -On request
Teacher A:	Not often
Teacher B:	Not often

What District Officials do when they Visit Schools

Principal:	- Check administrative issues
Teacher A:	-End up in the principal's office
Teacher B:	-End up in the principal's office

The Existence of the culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal:	Prevalent
Teacher A:	Prevalent
Teacher B:	Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal:	Disciplined learners (also helped by the district officials' meetings with the SRC) -Teachers' mindset changing from that of the apartheid era
Teacher A:	-Student co-operation -Co-operation between teachers and the principal
Teacher B:	-Yizo-Yizo influence on learners (a film depicting chaos in one school)

Recommendations

Principal:	-Provision of sufficient resources -There should be staff development
Teacher A:	-The district officials should fulfil their promises -They should provide textbooks
Teacher B:	- Communication lines should be more open -They should send information to schools on time.

SCHOOL L DISTRICT 4

Number of teachers interviewed: 3 (2 teachers & deputy principal)

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

School level:	Primary school
No of teachers:	36 (25 employed by GDE &11 by SGB)
No of Learners:	Unverified
Dominant race:	Whites (Multiracial)

Physical Environment

The school is big and clean. The lawn is well-trimmed with colourful flowers surrounding the school. The security is tight with an intercom at the gate. Access to the principal's office is not easy. There is a main door into the office and the secretary has to unlock the main door for visitors to allow them into her office.

DURATION AS A PRINCIPAL /TEACHER

Principal:	4 years as a principal, 25 as a teacher
Teacher A:	10 years
Teacher B:	12 years

Improvements since 1994

Principal:	-No improvement for Model C schools. -All things introduced (like Curriculum 2005) are not new for model C schools. -People in district offices are uninformed, they need training
Teacher A:	No improvements.
Teacher B:	No improvements, the officials are only helpful in as far as inexperienced teachers are concerned, otherwise they are learners themselves. -Workshops are simply a waste of time for teachers.

Support received from the District to Improve the Quality of Education

Principal:	-When approached for help, the district responds positively.

Teacher A: -No concrete help from the district

Teacher B: -No support

Frequency of District Officials' visits to the School

Principal: -Once a month

Teacher A: -No visit

Teacher B: -No visit

What Officials do when they visit the School

Principal -Check how the school is administered

Teacher A: -Not applicable

Teacher B: -Not pplicable

The Existence of the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal: - The school is well structured and organized
-Parent involvement
-School support system
-Fund raising

Teacher A: -Teachers' commitment to their profession

Teacher B: -Teachers' motivation, teamwork

Recommendations

Principal: -Some of the workshops are a waste of time.
-The officials should check the relevance of the workshops before they call teachers to attend.
-They should send information and invitation to schools in time.

Teacher A: Some of the people occupying district positions are incompetent and inexperienced in teaching.

They should stop speaking big long words and get into the classrooms and see what is happening. They should get in touch with reality.

Teacher B: -They should let the schools know about their plans in time

SCHOOL M DISTRICT 6

Number of teachers interviewed: 3 (2 teachers & a principal)

SCHOOL LEVEL

School level:	High school
No. of teachers:	26
No. of learners:	1039
Teacher pupil ratio:	1:47
Predominant race:	African

Physical Environment
The school is big but not very clean.

DURATION AS A PRINCIPAL\TEACHER

Principal: 4 years as a principal, 40 years as a teacher

Teacher A: 16 years
Teacher B: 14 years

Any Improvement Since 1994

Principal: No improvement, instead the quality of education has gone down

Teacher A: Parents are more involved in their children's education

Teacher B: No improvement, instead things are worse. There is no authority; teachers and learners do as they wish. Teachers no longer have respect for the departmental authorities.
Learners are not disciplined. They are overprotected by the South African Schools Act.

Support received from the district to improve the culture of teaching and learning

Principal: No support

Teacher A: - Workshops
- Circulars
-Communicate with teachers about their problems in teaching and learning.

Teacher B: - No support

The Frequency of the Officials' visits to the School

Principal: Occasionally, about twice a year

Teacher A: Once a year

Teacher B: Once a semester

What the officials do when they visit the school

Principal: -Check on the school's progress
-Help teachers in the classrooms

Teacher A: Check the Grade 12 and assignment books

Teacher B: Talk to the principal

The existence of the culture of teaching and learning

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the existence of the culture of teaching and learning

Principal: Discipline on the part of teachers and learners
School Governing Body's involvement

Teacher A: Teamwork among teachers

Teacher B: Discipline on part of learners and teachers

RECOMMENDATIONS

Principal: The district officials should be supportive
They should provide with more training
They should address problems reported to them and be committed to solve them

Teacher A The district should provide schools with resources
They should send us experts from universities to help us on some subjects
There should be more training and workshops for both educators and parents.

Teacher B:	District officials should not visit schools to find fault, they should visit to help solve problems Appraisal system is just a change of name from inspection, it is not needed. They should speed up the process of providing schools with assistance They should improve on their auxiliary services They should visit schools more often.

SCHOOL N DISTRICT 4

Number of teachers interviewed: 3 (2 teachers and a principal)

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

School level:	Primary school
No of teachers:	36
No of learners:	1413
Teacher Pupil ratio:	40
Predominant race:	African

Physical Environment

School buildings are new, big and clean. The staffroom is well-furnished with beautiful tables and chairs.

Duration as a teacher/principal

Principal:	7 years as a principal, 35 years as a teacher
Teacher A:	3 years
Teacher B:	9 years

Any Improvement since 1994

Principal:	Workshops, Consultation between the officials and teachers
Teacher A:	Not applicable
Teacher B:	Teacher-pupil ratio is lower, although there are still classes that have more than 40 learners

Support received from the district to improve the culture of teaching and learning

Principal:	The officials are there to solve the schools' problems

Teacher A:	Provision of learning materials The district motivates teachers in their profession
Teacher B:	Advise teachers on how to teach OBE Gave the school some prefab classes

The frequency of the officials ' visit to the school

Principal:	Monthly (the school was a pilot school)
Teacher A:	On invitation Monthly (because of this being a pilot school)
Teacher B:	Frequently (because it was a pilot school)

What the district officials do when they visit the school

Principal:	Guide teachers on the implementation of OBE
Teacher A:	Monitor the implementation of OBE
Teacher B:	Observe how teachers implement OBE in classes

The existence of the culture of teaching and learning

Principal:	Prevalent
Teacher A:	Prevalent
Teacher B:	Prevalent

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE CULTURE?

Principal:	The district 's consultation with teachers
Teacher A:	District transparency and consultation The good use of available resources The district's motivation for teachers
Teacher B:	Commitment of teachers

RECOMMENDATIONS

Principal:	No recommendations
Teacher A:	They should send informed people

into schools, people who will be able to answer questions posed to them

Teacher B: No recommendations. They are doing their best.

SCHOOL O DISTRICT 5

Number of Teachers Interviewed: 3(2 Teachers and the Deputy Principal)

School Environment:

School Level:	Primary School
Number of Teachers:	17
Number of Learners:	640
Teacher-Pupil Ratio:	1:40
Predominant Race:	African

Physical Environment

The school is equipped with facilities such as a computer (a donation from one company), a fax machine, a photocopying machine and an overhead projector. The school is clean outside and inside (there are workers employed to clean the classrooms and the outside ground).

Duration as a principal / a teacher

Principal: Four years as a deputy principal and thirty-one years as a teacher.

Teacher A: Twenty years.

Teacher B: Nineteen years.

Any Improvement since 1994

Principal: The method of teaching is no longer teacher centred but learner centred.

Teacher A: Improvements are minor although education governance is more democratic and decentralized. Teachers have a say in education.

Teacher B: No major improvements. Whatever change is there is just an addition to what has always been there.

Support received from the district to improve the quality of education.

Principal: Workshops on curriculum 2005.
Workshops on staff development and management.
Provision of teaching and learning materials.

Teacher A: Workshops.
Teaching and learning materials.

Teacher B: Provision of equipment such as an overhead projector.
Workshops (although what the workshops entail is not completely new).

The Frequency of Officials' visits to the School.

Principal: Occasionally.

Teacher A: Twice a month.

Teacher B: About once or twice a year.

What the district officials do when they visit the school.

Principal: Monitor the culture of teaching and learning.
Talk to the SGBs.

Teacher A: Talk to teachers to hear what their problems are.
Talk to the Principal.

Teacher B: Listen to the teachers' problems.
Observe the running of the school.

The existence of the culture of teaching and learning.

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the culture of Teaching and Learning.

Principal: Co-operative staff.

Teacher A: The project MOLTENO - teaches creativity, writing and reading.

Teacher B: Commitment of Teachers.
The former principal was involved in the project MOLTENO.
The former principal wrote the book; *Lets Write English*.

The current principal writes a book in Setswana.
Resources such as a computer.

Recommendations

Principal: Teachers need motivation.
District officials should be clear about subject matters of workshops they offer us, they need training themselves.

Teacher A: They have to reduce the number of workshops - Workshops disturb teaching and learning. They should rather give out manuals.

Teacher B: They should provide sufficient workbooks to satisfy the needs of all learners particularly the junior phase.
-They should provide us with adequate funds.

School P : District 1

Number of teachers interviewed: 3 (2 teachers and the principal

School Environment

School Level:	Primary School
No. of Teachers:	30
No. of Learners:	800
Teacher-Pupil Ratio:	1:32
Predominant Race:	White (Multiracial)

Physical Environment

The school is well-resourced. It has sporting facilities such as tennis courts, a swimming pool, and a cricket ground. The security of the school seems to be tight. Not everyone is allowed into the school yard unless when the purpose of the visit is clear. There is an intercom at the gate(always locked) and at the entrance to administration block. Time is considered of the essence (this I gathered when I arranged an appointment with the school).

Duration as a principal/teacher

Principal: Six years as a Principal.
Twenty-four years as a teacher.

Teacher A: 9 years.

Teacher B: 8 years

Any improvement since 1994

Principal: Nothing new.

Teacher A: Nothing new.

Teacher B: No improvement. School time is wasted by unnecessary seminars.

Support received from the district to improve the quality of education.

Principal: No support.
Teacher A: No support.

Teacher B: No support.

The frequency of the Officials' visit to the school.

Principal: Once a quarter.

Teacher A: Once or twice a semester.

Teacher B: Not often.

The purpose of the officials' visit.

Principal: To check how the school is administered.
To monitor the implementation of Outcomes Based Education.

Teacher A: To monitor the implementation of Outcomes Based Education.

Teacher B: They end up in the principal's office.

The existence of the culture of teaching and learning.

Principal: Prevalent

Teacher A: Prevalent

Teacher B: Prevalent

Factors contributing to the culture of Teaching and Learning.

Principal: Commitment of parents and teachers.
Effective management.

Teacher A: Teamwork.

Teacher B: Teamwork.

Recommendations

Principal

The officials should be organised, for their lack of being organised causes schools to be disorganised. They should send out their information on time. Officials should be well-informed before calling schools into seminars.

Teacher A

Outcomes Based Education is not a new thing. Not all teachers should be monitored on how they implement it.

Teacher B

More of the officials should be seen in schools.

School Q District 2

Number of teachers interviewed: 3 (2 teachers and the principal)

School Environment

School Level:	Primary School
No. of Teachers:	27
No. of Learners:	1200
Teacher Pupil Ratio:	1:57
Predominant Race:	Africans

Physical Environment

The school is clean and big. The lawn is well-trimmed with colourful flowers.

Duration as a principal/teacher

Principal

Fourteen (14) years as a principal
Thirty eight (38) years as a teacher

Teacher A

Nine (9) years

Teacher B

16 years

Improvement since 1994

Principal

Officials are concerned about teachers' discipline

Teacher A

Training on Curriculum 2005

Teacher B

There are no improvements

Support received from the district to improve the quality of education.

Principal

Support given is not adequate. Insufficient stationery and learning materials are provided to the school.
There are not enough classrooms.

Teacher A
Not enough support given. The school received a photocopying machine from the Gauteng Department of Education with the request to use it as possible. The machine ends up being of no use because not all materials needed in the school can be photocopied. No paper for the machine is provided.
-Workshops on fundraising and management.

Teacher B
-No support. A photocopying machine has been given to the school but it has a lot of restrictions attached to it. We are told that we over-use the machine.

The frequency of the officials' visits to the school

Principal
Once a quarter

Teacher A
Once a year. When called upon to come to the school they take centuries.

Teacher B
No visit

What the officials do when they visit the school

Principal
Give guidance to teachers on OBE implementation
Monitor the culture of teaching and learning

Teacher A
Check on how teachers cope with OBE

Teacher B
Not applicable

The prevalence of the culture of teaching and learning

Principal	Teacher A	Teacher B
Prevalent	Prevalent	Prevalent

Factors contributing to the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal
Committed parents, teachers and learners

Teacher A
-Co-operative School Governing Body
-Making use of available resources

Teacher B
Commitment of teachers

Recommendations

Principal
-The district should concentrate on township schools and improve them in every respect. They should make schools attractive and welcoming to learners.
-They should stop sending lazy and incompetent teachers to primary schools.
-They should do right-sizing in schools
-They should motivate parents to contribute to the teaching and learning of their kids.

Teacher A
-They (district officials) should provide schools with resources
-The introduction of OBE was poor, the planning was poor, officials who visit school on OBE were uninformed and they do not follow up on their plan.
-They should take into consideration the disparities between black and white schools and stop comparing them.

Teacher B
-They should not compare black schools with white schools given the history of education in South Africa
-They should provide schools with resources.

School R | District 4

Number of teachers interviewed: 3(2 teachers and the principal)

School Environment

School level	High School
No. of Teachers:	50
No. of Learners:	1850
Teacher pupil ratio:	1:37
Predominant race:	African

Physical Environment

The school is big. One cannot comment about cleanliness since it was a cultural day at the school, it was busy and there were no classes going on.

Duration as a teacher/principal

Principal
Five years as a principal
Twenty-six years as a teacher

Teacher A
Seven years

Teacher B
Ten years

Improvements since 1994

Principal

Training of the School Management Team (SMT), School Governing Body (SGB), and the SRC.

Teacher A

Introduction of the democratic running of the school through the SGB.
There is transparency in education. Teachers now know what their job descriptions are.

Teacher B
Not enough changes. There is a shortage of books even when they supply us with books, they reach schools very late.
Subject advisors are not available for all subjects.

Support received from the district to improve the quality of education

Principal

Provision of resources such as learning materials, cleaning and exam materials.
They help with the maintenance of the school.

Teacher A
No support

Teacher B
No support

The Frequency of the Officials' visit to the School

Principal
Once a quarter

Teacher A
Seldom

Teacher B
Seldom

What the officials do when they visit the school

Principal

They monitor progress
They help the school with a year plan
They acquaint the school with their District Plan

Teacher A

They end up in the principal's office

Teacher B
To advise some teachers on their subjects

The Existence of the culture of learning and teaching

Principal
To some extent

Teacher A
Prevalent

Teacher B
To some extent

Factors contributing to the culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal
Parents participation. Parents bought four television sets, four videos, video cassettes for the Grade 12 and cleaning machines worth seventeen thousand rands.
There are counselling sessions provided by Rand Afrikaans University (RAU) to counsel those traumatised during violence.
Training on counselling is also offered to teachers.
Parents feel that the school belongs to them.
Parents and the community discipline badly-behaved learners.

Teacher A
Commitment of teachers and parents

Teacher B
Teachers lack motivation
Learners are not committed.
There is lack of discipline,
Methods of teaching and learning introduced by the district are not practicable due to lack of resources
Parents are not involved

Recommendations

Principal

The officials should be fully involved in the problems faced by the school
They should provide us with more resources
They should be committed to education policy implementation

Teacher A
They should monitor the culture of teaching and learning. They shouldn't only go to schools when the results are bad.

Teacher B
District officials shouldn't introduce a lot of things at once, they would do better to introduce one thing at a time, to give it time to develop and then to follow up on it.
Supply of resources be done as early as possible
Subject advisers should visit schools often
Workshops should be teacher-centred, input should come from teachers to avoid top-down kind of workshops.

The officials should visit schools to see what is happening on the ground.
Something should be done to motivate teachers.
Student leaders should be trained.

School S District: 1

School Environment

School Level:	Primary School
No. of Teachers:	30
No. of Learners:	800
Teacher-Pupil Ratio:	1:32
Predominant Race:	Whites (multiracial)

Physical Environment

The school is well resourced. It has sporting facilities such as, tennis courts, a swimming pool, cricket ground, etc. the security of the school seems to be tight. Not everyone is allowed into the schoolyard unless when the purpose of the visit is clear. There is an intercom at the gate(always locked) and the other one is at the entrance of administration block. It is at the entrance of the administration block where visitors specify the purpose of their visit or they are turned back. Time is considered of essence (this I gathered when I arranged an appointment with the school).

Duration as principal/a teacher?

Principal

Six years as a Principal.
Twenty four years as a teacher.

Teacher A

9 years

Teacher B

8 years.

Improvement since 1994

Principal

Nothing new

Teacher A

Nothing new

Teacher B

-No improvement. School time is wasted by unnecessary seminars.
-Support received from the district to improve the quality of education.

Support received from the districts

Principal

No support

Teacher A

No support

Teacher B

No support

The Frequency of the Officials' visit to the school.
Principal

Once a quarter

Teacher A

Once or twice a semester

Teacher B

Not often

The Purpose of the Officials' visit

Principal

-To check how the school is administered.
-To monitor the implementation of the Outcome Based Education.

Teacher A

To monitor the implementation of the Outcome Based Education

Teacher B

They end up in the principal's office.

The prevalence of the culture of teaching and learning

Principal	Teacher A	Teacher B
Prevalent	Prevalent	Prevalent

Factors contributing to the culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal

-Commitment of parents and teachers
-Effective management

Teacher A

Teamwork

Teacher B

Teamwork

Recommendations

Principal

The officials should be more organised especially in their relations with schools. They should send out their information on time. Officials should be well informed before calling schools into seminars.

Teacher A

Outcomes Based Education is not a new thing. Not all teachers should be monitored on how they implement it.

Teacher B

More of the officials should be seen in schools.

SCHOOL T DISTRICT: 2

Numbers of teachers interviewed: 3(The principal and 2 teacher)

School Environment

School Level:	Primary School
No. of Teachers:	820
Teacher Pupil Ratio :	1:40 - 48
Predominant Race:	African

Physical Environment

The school was tidy, with reasonably well-kept lawns. The toilets were not clean. The principal's office was tidy and neat. There was noise going on in classrooms showing the implementation of Curriculum 2005, learners being at the centre of teaching and learning. The researcher went into the classrooms for observation. Corporal punishment is minimally practised.

Duration as a Principal/Teacher

Principal

A principal for four (4)years
A teacher for 22 years

Teacher A

Seven (7) years

Teacher B

9 years

Any improvement since

Principal

Yes, there is a friendly communication between the district and the schools.
The officials are no longer authoritarian. They no longer intimidate educators.

Teacher A

The officials' attitude towards schools is different. There is communication between the officials and the schools.

Teacher B

Teaching is no longer teacher-centred but learner-centred.
Officials are approachable to a particular extent but there is still a top down approach in dealing with educational issues.

Teachers are still subjects to the district officials. They (teachers) are not involved in decision making.

Support received from the district to improve the quality of education

Principal
Officials are committed to the implementation of policy particularly COLTS (Culture of Leaning and Teaching Services). They organise workshops for Principals, School Governing Bodies, School Management Teams, Heads of Department and Teachers. The workshops focus on a variety of issues such as financial matters, management and curriculum 2005.

Teacher A
Workshops and seminars. They (workshops and seminars) are relevant since some of them are related directly to subjects we teach.

The frequency of the officials' visits to the school

Principal
They come when invited or when needed.

Teacher A
From time to time

Teacher B
Not often, once in a while

What the officials do when they visit the school

Principal
Assessment of how the school is coping with the new Curriculum
Solve problems

Teacher A
Visit classrooms to give advices

Teacher B
They check the management work of the principal.

The Existence of the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal	Teacher A	Teacher B
Prevalent	Prevalent	Prevalent

Factors contributing to the culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal
Commitment from the teachers and the community

Teacher A
Commitment from teachers

Teacher B
Commitment from the teachers, parents and learners

The Districts role in encouraging/ensuring the existence of the culture of Teaching and Learning

Principal
Workshops and seminars provided by the district are very helpful.

Teacher A
The advices they give to teachers on how to teach better is valuable.

Teacher B
Not much help. The culture of teaching and learning has always prevailed in the school.

Recommendations to the District

Principal
The officials should improve on their relationship with teachers.

Teacher A
The district should provide us with more resources such as library materials and stationery. The district should renovate the library building.

Teacher B
Workshops should be longer so that issues can be thoroughly dealt with. This will assist us because those who attend will be able to explain and share with other colleaques.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Badger, B(1985),'Behavioural problems-the primary/secondary link', School Organisation, vol. 5, no.2, pp.185-193

Carrim, N & Shalem, Y (1999), School Effectiveness in South Africa, Qualitative studies in education,vol.12,no.1 pp.59-83

Chapman, D.W (1990), 'Monitoring Implementation' in Chapman, D.W and Carrier, C.A, Improving Educational Quality (New York: Greenwood Press)

Chisholm, L & Vally, S (1996), The Culture of Learning and Teaching in Gauteng, (Johannesburg: Wits EPU)

Chisholm, L, Motala, S and Vally, S (1998), Review of South African Education 1994-1997, A paper written for the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency, unpublished

Chudnovsky, D (1998), The Big Bungle Teacher Redeployment in South Africa, in Southern Africa Report, pp.26-29, unpublished

Claffey, J.M (1990), 'The Donor Role in Instructional Improvement', in Chapman, D, W and Carrier, C.A, Improving Educational Quality (New York: Greenwood Press)

Cohen L, and Manion, L (1994), Research Methods in Education, (London: Routledge)

Coombe, C (1996), 'Local/District Governance of Education in South Africa: Learning from Experience' in Local /District Governance in Education (Johannesburg: Centre for Education and Policy Development)

Crawford, P (1998), A Brief Overview of Quality Management Systems and Quality Assurance, research paper commissioned by the South African Department of Education, unpublished

Dimmock, C (1993), School Based Management, (London: Routledge)

Education Development & Management (1994), 'Issues in the Management of Schools', (Johannesburg: the Graduate School of Public & Development Management)

Elmore (1993): 'The Role of Local Schools district i ~'.ional Reform' in Furhman, S, (1993), Designing Coher. .ucational Policy, (San Francisco: Jossey Bass)

Frankfort - Nachmias, C and Nachmias, D (1992) Research Methods in the Social Scier ces (London: Edward Arnold)

Friedman, S (February, 1995) Every Navigator needs a Map (the case for independent policy research in S.A) Policy: Issues and Actors, volume 8, no. 2

Fullan, M (1991), The New Meaning of Educational Change, (New York: Teachers' College Press)

Godden, (1996): 'Issues in Devolving Responsibility for Education to District \ Local level' in Coombe, C & Godden, J (1996), Local\ District Governance in Education: Lessons for South Africa, (Johannesburg: Centre for Education and Policy Development)

Goodson, I and Ball, S, (1997), Education Policy (London: Taylor & Francis Ltd)

Gray, J (1990), 'The quality of schooling: frameworks for judgements', British Journal of Educational Studies, vol.38, no.3, pp.204-233

Hanuschek, E.A (1989), 'The impact of different expenditures on school performance', Educational Researcher, vol.18, no.4, pp.45-65

Ham, C and Hill, M (1993) The Policy Process in the Modern Capitalist State, (New York: L. Harvester & Wheatsheaf)

Hargrove, E.C, (1983), 'The Search for Implementation Theory', in R. Zeckhauser and D Leebaert (eds), What Role for Government? Lessons from Policy Research, (Carolina: Duke University Press)

Hargreaves, A(1989), Curriculum and Assessment Reform, (Milton Keynes: Open University Press)

Hedges, L.V, Laine, R.D and Greenwald, R (1994), ' Does money matter? A meta-analysis of studies of the effects of differential school inputs on student outcomes', Educational Researcher, vol.23, no.3, pp 5-14

Hogwood, B. W and Gunn, L. A (1984), Policy Analysis for the Real World (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hubberman, M. and Miles, M (1984), Innovation Up Close: How School Improvement Works, (New York: Plenum Press)

Jansen, J.D (1997), 'Effective Schools', Comparative Education volume 31, no. 2, 1995

Jansen, J. D (1998), 'Why Educational Policies Fail' in Indicator South Africa, Volume 15, Number 1, Autumn 1998

Keane, J. (1989), Democracy and Civil Society (London: Verso)

Kogan, M. (1975), Educational Policy Making: A Study of Interest Groups in Parliament, (London: G. Allen & Unwin)

Levine, D.U, *et al.* (1979), 'Concentrated poverty and reading achievement in seven big cities', The Urban Review, vol.19, no 1, pp.25-34

Levine, D.U and Lezotte, L.W (1990), Unusually Effective Schools: A Review and Analysis of Research and Practice, (Madison: National Centre for Effective Schools, Research and Development)

Motala, S (1998): 'Reviewing Education Policy and Practice: Constraints and Responses' in Quarterly Review, volume 5, no. 5

NEPI (1992), Education Planning, Systems & Structure, (Sandton: Oxford University Press)

O' Day & Smith (1993): 'Systemic Reform and Educational Opportunity' in Furhmann, S (1993): Designing Coherent Educational Policy, (San Francisco: Jossey Bass)

Pressman, J and Wildavsky, A (1973), Implementation, (Berkeley: University of California Press)

Republic of South Africa (1996), South African Schools Act ,no.84, (Pretoria: Government Printers)

Reynolds, D, Bollen, R, Creemers, B, Hopkins, D, Stoll, L & Lagerwel, N (1996), Making Good Schools: Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement, (London: Routledge)

Reynolds, D & Cuttance P (1992), School Effectiveness, research, policy and practice (London: Casell)

Ridell, S & Brown, S (1991), School Effectiveness Research, (Edinburgh: HMSO)

Rosenholtz, S.J (1989), Teachers' Workshop, (New York: Longman)

Scheerens, J (1992), Effective Schooling: Research, Theory and Practice, (London: Casell)

Scheerens, J and Creemers, B.P.M (1989), 'Conceptualising School Effectiveness', in International Journal of Educational Research, vol.13, no 7, pp.691-706

Spillane, J & Thompson, C (1997), 'Reconstructing Conceptions of local capacity: the local condition agency 's capacity for ambitious instructional', in Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, volume 19, no 2, pp.185-202

Wilby, P (1986), 'Teacher Appraisal', in Journal of Education Policy, vol.1, no. 1, pp.63-72

Author Tshoane M
Name of thesis The Role Of The Gauteng Districts In Improving The Quality Of Education 1994 - 1998 Tshoane M 2000

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.