

https://dspace.org/

The role of the school principal in monitoring teaching and learning : case schools in the Gauteng Province, a study of two secondary schools.

Omal, Felix

2012-03-08
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/11399

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

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to set the scene for the study by outlining the topic and the critical questions that determine a response to the main question. The chapter also states the aims of the study and provide the rationale, structure of the study as well as the research design of the study.

This study addresses the question: What are the roles of a school principal in the monitoring of teaching and learning in an inner-city and in a township secondary school? The study takes the form of a qualitative study of one inner-city secondary school in the Central Business District of Johannesburg and one township secondary school in Soweto. The study draws extensively on an earlier study conducted by Bush, et al. (2009) in the provinces of Mpumalanga and Limpopo in eight secondary schools which focussed on the significance of leadership and management in enhancing classroom practice and improving learner outcomes (Bush, et al. 2009). However, this research intends to focus on the monitoring aspect of the management and leadership roles of school principals in enhancing classroom practice and learner performance. It intends to examine whether monitoring of teaching and learning by school principals is taking place and if so, how and in what way their practice is linked to school improvement.

The Department of Education believes that effective management and leadership articulates with well-conceived, structured and needs-driven management and leadership development, and that this is the key to transformation in South African education (Educational Management and Leadership Development Draft Policy Framework, October, 2004). Further, the South African Standard for School Leadership Draft Policy (2005) states that the core purpose of principalship is to provide leadership and management in all areas of the school to enable the creation and support of conditions under which high quality teaching and learning can take place and promote the highest possible standards of learner achievement (The South African Standard for Principalship Draft Policy, 2005). These two documents provide the framework that guide school principals as they perform their roles in the leadership and management of teaching and learning in schools.

In addition the English National College for School Leadership NCSL (2007) states that management of teaching and learning is the key role for school principals with responsibilities of setting up frameworks for effective teaching and learning, developing policies to address this issue and to ensure that curriculum delivery is being implemented. However, this study shall emphasize particularly the monitoring roles of school principals in the leading and managing of teaching and learning in schools.

In a study conducted by Bush and Glover (2009) they contend that the role of principals is to take a school-wide view and that they have a direct responsibility for the quality of learning and teaching and for pupil achievement; this implies the setting of high standards and the monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of learning outcomes. Bush and Glover (2009) continue to argue that school principals who are focussed strongly on the management of teaching and learning would undertake the following activities: oversee the curriculum across the school, ensure that that lessons take place, evaluate learner performance through scrutiny of examination results and internal assessments, monitor the work of Heads of Departments through scrutiny of their work plans and portfolios, ensure that Heads of Departments, monitor the work of educators within their learning areas, arrange a programme of class visits followed by feedback to educators, and ensure the availability of appropriate learning and teaching support materials (LTSM). However, they do not say how school principals are to perform all these tasks in the schools.

Monitoring is critical if schools are going to have success with all their learners because monitoring is the feedback loop that determines the effectiveness of instruction (Hoy and Hoy, 2003; Wiles and Bondi, 2002). A key correlate of 'effective schools' research is frequent monitoring and assessment (Lissitz and Schafer, 2002; Popham, 2003b). As part of the monitoring and assessment process, feedback on learner achievement needs to be frequently obtained. To obtain this, multiple assessment methods must be used often, including teacher-made tests, portfolios, mastery skills checklists, criterion-referenced tests, and norm-referenced tests (Lunenburg and Irby, 2006, p.106).

This monitoring then informs the teachers not only what the learners are learning but also who is learning what and therefore how instruction must be adjusted to reach those students who are not learning (Leithwood, Aitken and Jantzi, 2001; Tomlinson, 2003; Willams, 2003). Where gaps in understanding are indentified, the teacher needs to go back and re-teach (Williams, 2003). It is vital to realise that in the monitoring of teaching and learning all learners do not learn in the same way (Tomlinson, 2003). Frequent monitoring and feedback need to be used to improve individual student performance as well as the schools instructional program (Danielson, 2002). When principals compare expected results with actual results, and take the necessary corrective action, they are performing a monitoring function. Monitoring completes the cycle of leadership functions. Monitoring is the responsibility of every school principal. The success with which principals carry out these functions determines how effectively the school improves.

1.2 Background to the study

In South Africa the process of decentralisation through devolving powers and responsibilities from the national and provincial government to schools and governing bodies has affected all South African public schools. Schools are now moving from a tradition of dependency to a culture of enterprise. They are now responsible for their own finances and budgets, they are required to implement and monitor school policies based on national and provincial directives, manage and maintain existing resources and provide for the teaching and learning required by the South African National Curriculum Statement (NCS). Principals are expected to build and be part of the leadership teams to ensure that all this happens. Therefore they must develop appropriate leadership styles, lead the learning process, ensure the safety and security of the school population and work with their governing bodies and their local communities to deliver a quality education service. In inner-city and township secondary schools little is known about how school principals are monitoring teaching and learning.

A large number of school principals in schools are seemingly dysfunctional (Christie and Lingard, 2001), lack legitimacy and authority, and cannot influence daily operations. These principals are often absent from school for administrative purposes, mainly preoccupied with financial school matters, human resource management and policy issues (Bush and Heystek, 2006, Chisholm et al, 2005) and have little experience in instructional leadership

(Hoadley, 2007). Yet impact on learner outcomes is likely to be greater where there is direct leader involvement in the oversight of, and participation in curriculum planning, and coordination, teacher learning and professional development (Robinson, 2007). Hence this research is seeks to establish what the monitoring practices and tasks of two school principals in management of teaching and learning are: one in an inner-city secondary school and one in a township secondary school.

1.3 Aim of the study

The aim of the study is to understand what the roles of school principals in the monitoring tasks and activities of teaching and learning in an inner-city secondary school and township secondary school are.

1.4 Research objectives

The study is guided by the following objectives:

1. To explore the significance that school principals attach to monitoring with reference to the school curriculum in an inner-city secondary school and a township secondary school.
2. To determine the dominant tools and tasks used by school principals in the monitoring of teaching and learning in these schools.
3. To determine how school principals monitor teaching and learning in these schools.

1.5 Rationale of the study

The significance of this study lies in the possible contribution these findings could make to the research and literature on the managing and leading of teaching and learning in South Africa. As Hoadley (2007, p.1) states: in the South African context, there is a consensus around the importance of leadership to improved student outcomes. The study examines the notion that school leadership is based on individual effort in the principal's office in achieving the purpose of schooling, namely teaching and learning processes.

Further, the study hopes to contribute to the literature on the role of school leadership to school improvement especially in the South African context.

1.6 Theoretical framework of the study

The theoretical framework of the study is informed by the theory of instructional leadership. In this study the theory of instructional leadership shall be used as a lens to explain the role of school principals in monitoring of teaching and learning in the Inner-city and township secondary schools.

1.6.1 Prescriptive Models of Instructional Leadership

Murphy (1988) defines instructional leadership as being narrowly focused on leadership functions directly related to teaching and learning. Studies by Donmoyer & Wagstaff, (1990); Murphy, (1988) in a broader view define instructional leadership as all other functions that contribute to student learning, including the management of all other parts of school life. Murphy (1990) noted that principals in productive schools – that is schools where the quality of teaching and learning were strong – demonstrated instructional leadership both directly and indirectly. Although these principals practised a conventional rather a shared form of instructional leadership, they emphasized three sets of activities with implications for instruction: (a) developing the school mission and goals; b) coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating curriculum, instruction, and assessment; c) creating a supportive work environment (Murphy, 1990). Focused on learning, they infused management decisions and regular school routines with educational meaning (Dwyer, 1984). Smith & Andrews, (1989) defines instructional leadership as a blend of several tasks such as supervision of classroom instruction, staff development, and curriculum development. Taken together, Glickman (1985) defined the five primary tasks of instructional leadership as direct assistance to teachers; which involves the provision of personal, ongoing contact with the individual teacher to observe and assist in classroom instruction; group development which entails the gathering together of teachers to make decisions on mutual concerns regarding instruction; staff development, which includes the learning opportunities for staff provided or supported by the school and school system; curriculum development which is the revision and modification of the content, plans, and materials of classroom instruction, and action research which involves the systematic study by the a faculty of what is happening in the classrooms and school with the aim of improving learning. Pajak's (1989) research on what the functions of instructional leadership should be generated a similar list of tasks, but also included planning, organising, facilitating change, and

motivating staff. Leithwood et al., (1999) defined instructional as an approach to leadership that emphasizes the behaviours of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students. Leithwood et al., (2006) suggests that successful instructional school leaders engage in three sets of core practice: (1) setting directions (shared vision, and group goals, high performance); (2) Developing people (individual support, intellectual/emotional stimulation, modelling); (3) Redesigning the organization (collaborative cultures and structures, building productive relations with parents and the community). However, Hallinger & Murphy, (1985) propose a model instructional leadership that consists of twenty specific functions within the three broad categories: the school mission; managing the instructional programme; and promoting school climate.

Gordon, (1997) claims that in recent years democratic, collaborative, human resource-based, developmental, and transformational approaches to instructional leadership among others, have been widely advanced based on the principles of equality (hierarchy) and reflection and growth (not compliance). For instance, from a review of models of supervision, Pajak (1993) concluded that in contrast to the common practice of instructional leadership as reinforcing specific prescribed teacher behaviours and skills (p.318), "the emerging dialogue stresses classroom teaching, curriculum, and staff development aspects of instructional leadership and helping teachers discover and construct professional knowledge and skills" (p.318). He reported that in much contemporary thinking, learning is viewed as contextual and complex, teaching is based on reflective judgement, and schools are seen as democratic teaching and learning communities. Likewise, Schion's (1988) concept of instructional leadership emphasizes classroom observations and specifically focuses on support, guidance, and encouragement of reflective teaching. Glickman (1992) described ideal instructional leadership as a collaborative endeavour enacted in a supportive environment that leads to an all-school action plan. Reitzug and Cross (1993) have discussed an inquiry-oriented practice of instructional leadership (i.e. critical collaboration) that encourages teacher voice and acknowledges diverse contexts as well as the complexity of teaching; the principals role is one of facilitating a teachers thinking about practice. By comparison, Smyth's (1997) approach is more discursive, collaborative, and critical study of classroom interaction to achieve a just and democratic world.

Shared instructional leadership involves the active collaboration of the principal and teachers on curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Within this model the principal seeks out ideas, insights, and expertise of teachers in these areas and works with teachers for school improvement. The principal and teachers share responsibility for staff development, curricular development, and supervision of instructional tasks. Thus, the principal is not the sole instructional leader but the "leader of instructional leaders" (Glickman, 1989, p.6). The principal provides teachers with resources and instructional support (Rosenblum, Louis, & Rossmiller, 1994) and maintains congruency and consistency of the educational program (Conley & Goldman, 1994). Teacher's participation in shared leadership occurs in informally as well as being manifest in formal roles (Prestine & Browen, 1993).

Teachers assume responsibility when they interact with other adults in the school community around school reform efforts, encourage others to improve their professional practice, or learn together with their school colleagues (Moller & Katzenmeyer, 1996). Collaborative inquiry supplants principal-centred supervisory practices (Reitzug, 1997). Principals and teachers discuss alternatives rather than directives or criticisms and work together as communities of learners in service to learners (Blase & Blase, 1999). Principals provide opportunities for teacher growth, but teachers are also responsible for seizing these opportunities (Blase & Kirby, 2000). Blase & Blase, (1993), Holland (1989) and Short (1995) claim empirical studies have generated only scant descriptions of the behaviours of effective instructional leaders and their impact on teachers and classroom instruction. Sheppard (1996) suggests that a synthesis of existing studies showed a positive and clear relationship between effective instructional leadership behaviours exhibited by principals and teacher commitment, professional involvement, and innovativeness. Principal behaviours associated with these effects on teachers included framing and communicating school goals, supervising, and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, supporting professional sessions, and providing incentives for learning.

The assessment of forty studies of the instructional role of school principals vis-à-vis school effectiveness done by Hallinger & Heck, (1996a) shows that three quarters of these studies conceptualised the school principal role in school effectiveness as instructional leadership (based on theoretical models discussed by Bossert, Dwyer & Lee,1982). Hallinger & Heck, (1996a, 1996b) suggest that research in instructional leadership is moving from simple, direct models to more comprehensive models wherein antecedent variables (e.g. contextual, interactive features, of the school and its environment, such as community socioeconomic status) are included in mediated-effects models employing sophisticated analytic techniques (e.g. Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, (1990); Heck & Marcoulides, (1993)). In addition, Hallinger & Heck, (1996a, 1996b) indicate that in recent studies the principal's role is more broadly defined using constructs such as transformational leadership, participative leadership, and the decentralisation of decision making.

Studies by Bredeson (1989); Halpin & Croft (1963); Kirby & Colbert (1992) have linked principal behaviours on effects on school climates, which in turn have been shown to indirectly affect student achievement. However Hallinger & Heck (1996a, 1996b) urge that the study of instructional leadership is complex and not easily subject to empirical verification and extant studies are methodologically limited. Despite the fact that many approaches to instructional leadership discussed over the past 150 years have been conceptualised as collaborative in nature, the practice of instructional leadership has often been limited primarily to one of inspection, oversight, and judgement of classroom instruction (Cogan, Anderson, & Krajewski, 1993; Gordon, 1997).

Using notions of instructional leadership theory developed in studies by Murphy (1990); Sebring & Bryk, (2000); Dwyer, (1984); Smith & Andrews (1989); Dwyer, (1984); Smith & Andrews, (1989); Pajak (1993); Moller & Katzenmeyer (1989); Hallinger & Murphy (1985); Gordon (1997) Prestine & Brown (1993); Schion (1988); Blasé & Blasé (1999); Reitzug, (1997); Blase & Kirby,(2000); Conley &Goldman, (1994); Glickman (1985); Leithwood et al., (2006), this report shall use these notions as guiding principles to explain the role of school principals in monitoring of teaching and learning with particular reference to:

a) The significance of the monitoring roles of school principals in the management and leadership of teaching and learning to the school curriculum,

b) The dominant tools and tasks used by school principals in the monitoring of teaching and learning and

c) How school principals monitor teaching and learning in an inner-city secondary school and a township secondary school.

1.7 Outline of Chapters:

The structure of the subsequent chapters of this research proposal is as follows: This study begins with a detailed literature review (Chapter two) to locate school leadership practices and their effects to school improvement in current research literature. The review of literature shall be categorised into the notions of the different forms of teaching and learning; developing professional communities of professional learning and practice; developing of families of educational cultures and the integration of learners' social capital. Furthermore, there will be an examination of the literature that examine the different methods school principals use to supervise the school curriculum in terms of checking learner performance and teacher performance in the school in such learning contexts. The final part of the literature review will look at different school leadership practices and structures that are established, practised in inner-city secondary schools and township secondary schools to facilitate the monitoring of teaching and learning. The review of literature shall be categorised into the notions of leadership, teacher leadership, principal leadership and distributed leadership. Chapter three describes the research design that shall be used in data collection and data analysis. Chapter four describes the presentation of results. Chapter five describes the discussion of the results of the study. Chapter six describes the conclusion of the study, recommendations and areas of further study.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the literature concerning the roles of school principals play to implement the school curriculum, as well as the dominant tools used and tasks done by school principals in the monitoring of teaching and learning.

2.2 The role of school principals in monitoring teaching and learning

The concepts of "curriculum leadership" and "instructional leadership", "leading of teaching and learning" and "management" are often used interchangeably (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Leithwood et al., 1999, Bush and Glover, 2009; Bush et al., 2009). This study will use these terms with an emphasis on the monitoring functions, roles, obligations and responsibilities of school principals in leading and managing schools.

Research on effective schools done in the 1980s established that school principals are the key to improved instruction (Cooper and Good, 1983). The critical challenge to school leadership today in South Africa is to educate student populations that are from low-SES, ethnically and linguistically diverse, and those groups whose education needs have not been met, who are typically located in inner cities, township schools and rural areas .The future of such students depends upon the leadership provided by school principals in determining what it means to be who they are in their schools.

2.2.1 Teaching and learning

Schools serve student populations with diverse backgrounds and characteristics. This includes students who live in poverty or whose race /ethnicity, mental or physical characteristics, cultural background, or native language abilities fall outside the cultural mainstream. Leadership appears to be especially important in schools serving a diverse students population and needs to be practised differently as well. For example, leadership effects on student achievement have been found to be stronger in low-SES schools than in high-SES schools (Hallinger & Heck, 1996a). However, aspiring leaders may be reluctant to

serve in such contexts, exacerbating leadership challenges in these schools (Winter & Morgenthal, 2002).

Studies by Louis & Smith, (1992); Rosenholtz, (1985) suggest that in schools that show impressive achievement gains, school principals maintain a clear and consistent focus on improving the core task of teaching and learning, and they accept no excuses for failure. They assist teachers to understand how they can work more effectively with their students, and this improves teachers' certainty that they can make a difference. Leithwood & Riehl (2006) posit that building powerful forms of teaching and learning requires attention to both classroom- and other school-related issues. For example, leaders emphasize the necessity of all staff having ambitious learning goals for all students. They express high expectations in part by making careful decisions about student promotion policies (McCoy & Reynolds, 1999; Westbury, 1994) and about the size and composition of classes (Finn, 2002; Nye, Hedges & Konstantoulos, 1999). Leithwood & Riehl (2006) argue that successful school leaders have high standards for the curriculum to which students are exposed; however, the curriculum in schools serving diverse and disadvantaged students often is narrowly focussed on basic skills and knowledge and lacks meaning for students. Children in diverse contexts may benefit from culturally responsive teaching in which instruction is adapted to build on the norms, values, knowledge, skills and discourse patterns associated with students cultural backgrounds (Foster, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994).

Studies by Newman et al., (2001) suggest that student learning in schools serving diverse populations also appears to increase when there is instructional program coherence; this requires strong leadership to select and adopt a common framework and make it a priority for the school, to encourage teachers to work collaboratively, and to provide sustained training for staff in the use of the framework. Studies by Darling-Hammond & Young, (2002) contend that student achievement is lower in schools serving diverse and disadvantaged populations because these schools receive the least qualified teachers and are unable to retain qualified teachers. In these schools, teaching and learning are enhanced when school principals adopt any means possible to attract and retain good teachers.

The OECD-sponsored (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) International school improvement project defines school improvement as a systemic, sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal conditions in or more schools with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively (Van Velzen, 1985). The main point here is that the change is not any change: it is systemic and sustained and directly related to student learning. In a South African context in the inner city and township schools challenging learning contexts often affect learner performance, and school principals are expected to lead change in schools in order to bring about successful school improvement.

Reynolds, Hopkins and Stoll (1993) argue that in 1989 over half of all American school districts ran improvement programmes based upon information linked to the 'effective schools' knowledge base. Dalin et al, (1992) in the "How schools improve" study state the characteristics of excellent schools as: (1) a headmaster that is motivated, plays a more active coordination and supportive role, is an instructional leader, works closely with teachers, encourages teachers and shares responsibilities; (2) a team spirit in the school, where teachers cooperate, student attitudes toward reform is positive, and teachers help each other with instructional problems; supervision is regular, shared between the supervisor and the headmaster and appears as a combination of pressure and support; (3) a school that works actively on the adaption of the curriculum and the production of local teaching-learning materials; (4) the in-service training process is well implemented, regular and practical; the school experiences more success, more positive students, changes in learners, teacher cooperation, professional exchanges and extra resources e.g. from the community; (5) a school that gets support from the community, parents who are more interested in the schooling of their children, a community that gives material support (p.208). In this context the school principal is central in bringing about excellence in schools through ensuring that all the other aspects that bring about excellence in schools fall into place.

In the South African school contexts, little is known about how school principals are monitoring teaching and learning. Secondary schools in the inner-cities and township areas of South Africa have large enrolment figures of learners from diverse backgrounds and socio-economic status which often affects their academic performance. How school principal responds in such situations is vital to school improvement.

Elmore (2004) agrees that the role of administrative leaders is primarily about enhancing the skills and knowledge of people in the organization, creating a common culture of expectations around the use of those skills and knowledge, holding the various pieces of the organisation together in a productive relationship with each other, and holding individuals accountable for the their contributions to the collective result (p.15). Newman et al (2000) argues that to achieve school capacity which in turn affects instructional quality and student assessment in the school as a whole, the school principal must be instrumental in developing (1) the knowledge, skills and dispositions of leaders (2) a professional community (3) program coherence (4) technical resources. In the South African school context, school leaders face many leadership challenges and how they perform these duties is of interest.

Hoadly (2007) states that in the management of teaching and learning, school principals are able to improve student outcomes through performing four management activities: regulation of school time, monitoring curriculum planning and delivery, the procurement and management of books and stationery, quality assurance of tests and the monitoring of tests. However studies by Bush et, al. (2009) argue that many school principals in South Africa have a limited role in the management of teaching and learning, have a weak grasp of teaching and learning, often lack awareness of the requirements of the New National Curriculum Statement, and do not have a clear system for evaluating and monitoring teaching and learning. Their instructional leadership is often confined to checking that work has been completed rather than making informed judgements about the quality of teaching and learning. Bush et. al. (2009) go on to state that school leaders at all levels continue to blame issues identified in studies by Fleisch (2008) namely poverty, parental illiteracy, language competence, and teacher capability and motivation, rather than taking initiatives to address these issues that were within their control, such as securing and maintaining sufficient learning and teaching support materials (LTSMs), and monitoring classroom practice. They are also weak at generalising best practice in some classrooms to the rest of the school (Bush et. al. 2009). School principals have to struggle with difficult issues arising from unpromising school contexts, weak inherited infrastructure and under-qualified teachers, but fail to use the scope they do have to improve learner performance (Bush et. al.2009).

Reyes & Wagastaff (1999) suggest that school leaders of schools that successfully educate children from diverse and oppressed backgrounds pay careful attention to the affective dimension of schooling. Fostering authentic, caring school climates that affirm culturally relevant, caring pedagogy can result in student success. Reyes, Scribner, & Scriber (1999) found that schools that were successful in educating Mexican-American students to high levels of achievement used (a) collaborative governance and leadership, including a clear vision shared by the school community; (b) collaborative dedicated administrators; and (c) humanistic leadership philosophies. Studies by Garcia (1995), Knapp & Woolverton, (1995), Ogbu (1995), Reyes, Velez, & Pena (1993) state that without attending to distinctive contributions of culture, educational efforts with these students are likely to be unsuccessful.

Valenzuela (1999) suggested that whenever the leadership is weak or ineffective a culture of authentic caring is hard to create and additional school environments that devalue or deny students' cultural identities and language, alienate students and make them closed to learning, even in the face of obvious academic talent. Scheurich (1998) identified several core beliefs and organisational characteristics that school leaders consciously would interweave to shape the climate of schools that were successful with low-SES children of colour. These variables included strong shared vision; loving, caring environments for both children and adults; being innovative, experimental, and open to new ideas; being hard-working but not burning out; and an organizational culture that models appropriate conduct.

Firestone & Riehl (2005) suggest that research on school leadership has led to few robust conclusions and it has not yet reached broadly or deeply enough to account sufficiently for the extensive variations that school leaders face in the contexts they serve, the people and organisations they lead, the actions they take, and the outcomes they pursue. Ogawa, Goldring & Conley, (2000) argue that notions of educational leadership have often moved from one idea to another without persisting in studying any specific problems or testing any particular formulation long enough to yield strong results. Studies by Purkey & Smith, (1983) suggest educational leadership has rarely investigated the impact of leadership on learning for example in the 1970s research on effective schools suggested that strong leadership contributed to student achievement, but it provided little guidance about what leaders did to make a difference and it was heavily criticized on methodological grounds. Subsequently, the design of research on how educational leaders contribute to student

learning has improved enough to suggest that better designed and executed research could yield important benefits (Hallinger & Heck, 1996b).

Studies by Coleman (1966); Jencks et al, (1972); Van de Grift & Houtveen (1999) suggest that school-related factors, student backgrounds factors, and other contextual factors have malleable influences on student learning. These factors are not independent of each other and methodological approaches to measurement and analysis can influence the weighting of effects. Nonetheless in many studies like Coleman (1966); Jencks et al., (1972); Van de Grift & Houtveen (1999) student characteristics persistently emerge as having the strongest effects on student achievement and school related factors explain a much smaller but still important portion of the variance in achievement. And these are of course, the factors most amenable to change and improvement by educators. Studies by Knapp& Associates (1995) show that schools can significantly reduce the effects of students' demographics on learning. In addition studies by Brophy & Good (1986); Monk (1994) Wang, Haertel, & Walberg (1992) state that among school-related influences, classroom practices matter a great deal and students tend to learn more when their teachers have formal qualifications and when they use appropriate, high-quality pedagogical techniques and work to a well-crafted curriculum. Hallinger & Heck (1966a) claim that school leaders also have an effect on student learning. However, the effects of leadership on student learning are indirect.

Leithwood & Riehl (2006) state that claims about the effects of leadership on learning are justified by two sources of research evidence: qualitative case studies and quasi-experimental quantitative studies. Qualitative case studies often examine "outlier" school settings in which student learning is significantly above or below normal expectations. These studies have reported very large effects of leadership on student learning (e.g., Gezi, 1990; Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Metimore, 1993; Scheurich, 1989). Studies by Cotton (1995), Sammons et al, (1995, Scheerens & Bosker (1997) suggest that effective leadership appears to encompass functions and characteristics such as a maverick orientation, the vigorous selection and replacement of teachers, buffering the school from non-learning focussed distractions, frequent monitoring of the school activities, sense- making high expenditure of time and energy for school improvement, support for teachers, and superior instructional leadership. In addition, principals have some effect on other factors that matter; these include parent involvement, monitoring of student progress, successful student

grouping patterns and other organizational arrangements, curriculum coordination, and rigorous and equitable student promotion policies and practices.

Studies by Coburn, (2001); Hamilton & Richardson, (1997) claim that case studies that do not begin by looking for leadership effects but end up concluding that leadership does matter for the improvement of teaching, also provide convincing evidence. Leithwood & Riehl (2006) then look at the second body of evidence, which are quasi-experimental quantitative studies. The chief problem with this research is that many quantitative studies examine the relationship between school organisational conditions and student achievement without including the measures of leadership. These include studies of school mission and goals (Hallinger, Bickman & Davis, 1996); culture (Nais, Southworth & Campbell, 1989); structural alternatives such as school size, the academic nature of the school curriculum, or the assignment of the qualified teachers to classes (Ingersoll, 1999); participation in decision making (Smylie, Lazarus, & Brownlee-Conyers, 1996); and relationships with parents and the wider community (Epstein, 1996). Leithwood & Riehl (2006) further argue that since these are conditions on which school leaders can have considerable impact, it might be inferred that leadership could exert indirect influence on learning through them.

Hallinger & Heck (1996a) state that schools do matter when it comes to improving student learning and certain organization structures, leadership roles and conditions contribute to instructional innovation. Studies by Bryk & Driscoll (1988), Little (1982) and Newman & Wehlage (1995) claim that schools with shared visions and norms about instruction, norms of collaboration and a sense collective responsibility for student's academic success create incentives and opportunities for teachers to improve their practice and that principal leadership is important in promoting these conditions (Lieberman, Darling-Hammond & Zickerman, 1991; Rosenhltz,1989). Sheppard (1996) confirms that there is a positive relationship between effective principal leadership behaviours including developing and communicating school goals, monitoring instruction, mobilizing incentives for teachers, supporting professional development, teacher commitment to openness and innovation, and professional involvement.

In two early studies, Barr and Dreeben (1983) and Kasarda (1980) demonstrated the value of tracing an extended chain of influence across district school, and classroom contexts to establish impact on student learning, but this approach has not been used much to examine the direct and indirect impact of leadership on student learning. Even when such a method is employed it is difficult to quantify leadership effects. An example of this problem is the research reported by Burns and Mason (2002). These researchers compared the achievement of students in a single-grade versus multi-grade classes in elementary schools and found that the composition of classes helped to explain the higher achievement in multi-grade classes. The researchers obtained firm evidence that principals deliberately assigned particular students to multi-grade classes (Burns & Mason, 1998, 2002), thus establishing a clear link between principal action, class composition, and student achievement. But the principal behaviours themselves were not included in the quantitative model so an effect size could not be estimated. There are, however some promising examples of research that comprises a reasonably complete model that incorporate contextual and leadership variables and use some form of student achievement as an outcome. Hollinger and Heck (1996a, 1996b) identified forty-odd such studies from a 15 year period.

Quantitative studies that included leadership in their models were also reviewed by Schreens and Bosker (1997). Hallinger and Heck (1996a, 1996b) concluded that in studies using the most sophisticated modelling the effects of leadership on pupil outcomes were inconsistently present and although generally small, still educationally significant. The most common mediating variable through which leadership effects were evident was school goals, although the construct of goals (or vision) was not always consistently defined across studies. Studies by Scheerens and Bosker (1997) reached similar conclusions and their comprehensive review of quantitative evidence suggested that classroom and instructional factors have clear warrants for their impact on student achievement. Organizational conditions such as high expectations and parent involvement – factors over which school leaders clearly have some influence – have moderate empirical support. Other factors related to leadership, such as pedagogic leadership, school climate and organisational structure, have what Scheerens (1992) called ‘doubtful empirical confirmation’. In general, factors and conditions closer to student learning – like instructional variables – have stronger effects than more distant factors such as school organization, policy-related conditions, or school leadership. Scheerens and Bosker (1997) found a small, though statistically significant, effect for school leadership. They also concluded that when contextual factors were taken

into account, leadership effects emerged more clearly. For example, contextual studies indicate that controlling educational leadership is associated with effective schooling in low-SES schools more than in high SES schools, and that strong leadership appears to be more important in urban rather than suburban elementary schools (Scheerens and Bosker 1997, p.288).

Other reviews of research, mainly from the international tradition of quantitative school effectiveness studies, have concluded that leadership explains 3 to 5 per cent of the variation in student learning across schools, this is actually about one quarter of the total variation (10 to 20 per cent) explained by school-level variables after controlling for student intake factors (Creemers & Reetzigt, 1996; Townsend, 2001). Leithwood & Riehl (2006) further claim that the different results regarding leadership effects reported by these sources of evidence can be explained, at least in part by sampling decisions. Most qualitative case studies examine the effects of exceptional leadership in schools most in need of it. In contrast, large scale quantitative studies report average leadership effects across schools that range from being very needy to already highly productive perhaps understanding leadership effects in schools where leadership is likely to be of the greatest value. Despite these conceptual and methodological problems, the impact of educational leadership on student achievement is demonstrable (Leithwood & Riehl, 2006). Leadership effects are mostly indirect, and they appear primarily to work through the organisational variable of school mission or variable related to classroom (Hallinger & Heck, (1966a).

2.2.2 Developing communities of professional learning and practice

Leithwood & Riehl (2006) claim that effective school principals in schools serving diverse groups of students, promote a sense of community among all of the schools members, including students, teachers, parents, and others. Pupils benefit when teachers in schools form a professional learning sub-community (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Newmann & Associates, 1996). Professional community stimulates growth in teachers' instructional skills, supports instructional program coherence, and enhances teachers' sense of responsibility for and control over student learning (Leithwood & Riehl 2006). School leaders help develop a professional community through attention to individual teacher development and creating and sustaining the structural conditions and human and social resources that support community (Leithwood & Riehl, 2006). Structural conditions include

school size and staffing arrangements that facilitate collaboration, additional time for teacher planning, and opportunities for teacher decision making (Leithwood & Riehl 2006).

Human and social resources include supportive leadership, policies and practices that create an atmosphere of openness to innovation, feedback on instructional performance, and professional development opportunities (Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996). While the instructional and learning benefits of communities of practice are widely extolled, the basic construct and pragmatic workings of such arrangements are elusive. How a school principal goes about creating, nurturing and sustaining learning communities focussed on instructional improvement is not clear-cut. Further, few studies have examined the dynamics by which a community of practice supports and promotes teacher learning and improvements in practice (Little, 2001; McLaughlin & Mitra, 2001). The number of studies examining the role of leadership in such arrangements is few. If communities of practice do indeed present promising avenues for improved student learning, there is a pressing need to explore the conditions necessary to support and sustain them.

The school principal's role in school improvement has often been seen as in terms of curriculum leadership and management or instructional leadership and management (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986). A school is created to perform a set of tasks and attain a number of stated goals that is important to student learning. However it is the school principal's job to attain these goals by working with all school stakeholders in an atmosphere of a professional learning community. This involves planning, organising, leading and monitoring. School leaders accomplish the core purpose of schooling through performing their four core basic management functions of planning, organising, leading, and monitoring (Lunenburg and Irby, 2006 p.184). Schools are social systems in which two or more persons work together in a coordinated manner to attain common goals (Lunenburg and Irby, 2006 p.181). According to the 'open systems' view, schools are seen as constantly interacting with their environments in contrast to the 'closed system' theory which views schools as sufficiently independent to solve most of their problems through their internal forces, without taking into account forces in the external environment (Miner, 2002). From these studies, the sole purpose of the creation of schools is to achieve the goals of teaching and learning which school instructional leaders often do not realise. The curriculum of a school or a course or a classroom can be conceived of as a series of planned events that are intended to have educational consequences for one or more students (Eisner, 1985, p.45).

Curriculum has the following four components; objectives, content, experiences, and evaluation mean (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1985).

Curriculum is the central focus of the school as it entails accountability for all that each student is, all each student brings to the learning situation and all knowledge, skills and dispositions that are planned, imparted or facilitated via the instructional process. However this is not the case in most cases. School leaders don't concentrate on instructional learning; instead they are often preoccupied with administrative work which is not necessarily concerned with learning. The school principal's primary goal in leading curriculum implementation is to empower the teachers regarding curriculum development or reform (Lunenburg and Irby, 2006). As much as curriculum leadership is the core purpose of school leadership, many school leaders do not fully understand and conceptualise the school curriculum such that they find difficulty in enforcing and monitoring its implementation.

Studies by Bryk and Schneider (2004) argue that school principals are able to bring about improvement in schools as result of working together with a supportive base of parents, teachers and the community members with efforts broadly focussed along two major dimensions; first, reaching out to parents and community to strengthen the ties between local school professionals and the clientele they are to serve; and second, working to expand the professional community, and finally, to direct resources toward enhancing the quality of instruction. These school principals were to achieve school improvement because they had an inclusive facilitative orientation, a school focus on student learning, efficient management, and an ability to combine pressure and support. They had a strategic orientation using school improvement and instructional focus to attack coherence. Bryk & Schneider (2002) argues that school principals are crucial for shaping trust in schools which has influence on the effectiveness of the school. In order to achieve successful school improvement, school principals must take the lead in developing and sustaining relational trust, which establishes the conditions for success. They conclude that only when participants demonstrate their commitment to engage in such work (focussed on improvement) and see others doing the same can a genuine professional community grounded in relational trust emerge (p.139). Studies by the Cross Campaign for Urban School Reform (2005) suggest that school principals were recognized as key players integral to the spread of instructional reform; they are generally called on to be leaders of instruction, spend more time in classrooms, engaging teachers in conversations about

instruction, and to spend less time on administrative, logistical and financial matters. The result was that school principals were being placed in an impossible position. School principals do not have the capacity to carry out the new roles and are burdened by too many role responsibilities that inhibit developing and practising new competences. In sum the school principal is key to school improvement but how the numerous roles are being fulfilled in such complex scenarios need careful investigation.

2.2.3 Developing of educational cultures in families

Studies by Dillard (1995) Englert (1993); Gezi (1990); suggest that social conditions associated with poverty, such as residential mobility, family breakups, and poor heath, are likely to affect students' ability to focus and do well. Lee, Bryk & Smith, (1993), however, argue there are other family conditions and interactions that explain family background effects on student learning that constitute what is known as a family educational culture. The family educational cultures are the assumptions, norms and beliefs held by the family about intellectual work in general and school work in particular. Other basic dimensions include work habits, academic guidance and support, parents' or guardians' academic and occupational aspirations and expectations for their children, adequate health and nutritional conditions and physical settings in the home conducive to academic work (Henderson & Berla, 1994; Walberg, 1984). Studies by Henderson & Berla (1994) suggest that when schools support families to develop strong educational cultures at home, children from low-income families and diverse cultural backgrounds approach the grades and test scores expected for middle-class children. They are also likely to take advantage of a full range of educational opportunities after graduating from high school (Henderson & Berla, 1994). Studies by Epstein, (1996, 2000) suggest that school principals help families develop strong educational cultures by championing parent education and coordinated services.

Parent education helps families acquire resources and competences to support their children's education; it can be provided through group meetings and classes, newsletters, home visits, neighbourhood meetings, phone consultations, and the provision of audio, video, and print resources. Studies by Dryfoos, (1994) suggest that school principals can also support family educational cultures by helping to coordinate social services designed to meet a full range of children's and families' needs. Integrated social services can enhance families' access to and control over the services they receive and help ensure that social

assistance is congruent with the cultures and needs of families and communities. Smreker & Mawhinney (1999) suggest that school principals can help such efforts by developing with all stakeholders a common vision and a set of goals; distributing leadership flexibly across roles and stakeholder groups; ensuring adequate communication and resolving conflicts proactively; awarding power to pupils, parents, and community members to make decisions about their needs and services; and incorporating parents' home language into the provision of services. Studies by Edmonds, (1979); Reyes & Scribner (1999); Scheurich,1998; Skrla, Scheurich, & Johnson (2000) in the United States of America state that some educators have demonstrated commitment to the educational success of these students in such learning contexts, and these students have achieved at high levels. In addition, these educators' leadership, whether it be administrative leadership (principals) or pedagogical leadership (classroom teachers), takes various forms, which foster organization cultures that could result in better educational outcomes for students in such low-SES populations (Edmonds,1979; Reyes, Scribner, 1999; Scheurich, 1998; Skrla, Scheurich, & Johnson, 2000). The way principals lead in high-stakes accountability environments is critical to the success of student learning, particularly in urban areas. In her study of school principals in Chicago led in high-stakes accountability environments, DeMoss (2002) found that principals whose leadership goal was leadership for privilege or leadership for professionalism and empowerment had student test outcomes that steadily increased.

Reyes & Wagstaff (1999) state that great variation exists among schools in the United States in terms of the quality and type of education they provide their students. They argue that this variation can best be understood in relationship to the multiple settings in which schools exist and function. In addition, these settings are broad geographical regions of the country or specific as school districts within states or neighbourhoods within school districts. In these settings, powerful contextual variables such as race, ethnicity, social class, teacher quality, and leadership skills strongly influence the kind and quality of education available to students (Reyes & Wagstaff 1999).

Lomotey (1989) states school principals in Afro-American school populations possessed several qualities found in the research on principal leadership, academic achievement, and other areas. Specifically, these principals developed goals, harnessed energies, facilitated communication, managed instruction, demonstrated commitment to the education of Afro-American children, showed compassion for and understanding of Afro-American children

and their communities, and were confident in the educability of Afro-American children. Lomotey (1994) further developed his concept of leadership, calling leaders who combine these attributes bureaucratic/administrators and ethno-humanists who promote both schooling an education about students' culture, life, and where they fit in the society and the world. Foster (1993) conducted interviews of 18 experienced, exemplary Afro-American teachers who were educating for competence in community and culture as well as academic achievement. Mitchell (1998) found these that these teachers were unwilling to assume expanded roles of mediator, activist and advocate to encourage students living in urban environment where many of their primary needs were unmet. These teachers themselves were influenced by their own upbringings in urban environments where many of their primary needs were unmet. Their participation in efforts to improve the social condition of Afro-Americans, such as the civil rights movements and their recognition of the relationship between race and the socioeconomic realties faced by their students played a role in the way they mediated their teaching.. In South African school contexts in inner city and township schools, teachers are highly unionized as a means to champion improvement in conditions of service and school principals in such school contexts often experience difficulty in navigating school governance and carrying out their leadership roles of monitoring teaching and learning. To be able to achieve this, school leaders have to develop leadership in others, have modesty about them, grasp the big picture and foster partnerships with governing bodies, the local bodies, the local authority and networks beyond the school. However in the South African school contexts in the inner cities and township schools, principals struggle to meet the demands of stakeholders due to multiplicity of reasons.

2.2.4 Integration of learner's social capital in teaching and learning

Studies by Heath (1983); Moll et al., (1992) suggest that some students have family educational cultures and social capital resources that are strong and well-developed but different from what schools typically expect. Other students may have limited access to social capital assets. Successful school principals assist students in several ways to employ the social capital they have and acquire more, thereby enhancing their potential for success in school (Leithwood & Riehl, 2006). Social capital consists of the assets accrued by learners through their families and their relationships with others and assets include knowledge, information, norms, and opportunities sustained in extensive social networks (Coleman, 1988; Drisoll & Kerchner, 1999). Epstein (2001) argues that school principals

can increase the proportion of students' social capital that is valued by the school but warned against ignorance and prejudice which can cause teachers to deny the value of the knowledge and other forms of social capital that are brought to school by students. In addition, Epstein (2001) further suggests that school principals can help create meaningful partnerships with parents and communities and these partnerships can strengthen the social networks that provide capital for the students. Partnerships are much more likely to occur when educators work explicitly to help create them. Studies by Dei (1996) and Solomon (2002) suggest that school principals can increase learners' social capital by helping to enact non-discriminatory and socially just practises in schools through antiracism education. Likewise, Leithwood & Riehl (2006) state that at the individual level, such education attempts to eliminate behaviours that impact negatively on persons who experience discrimination and at the organization level, antiracist education critically examines and alters the structures and policies that entrench and reproduce inequity and injustice. In the South African inner-city and township schools little is known of how school principals are doing this. According to these studies, the school principal is the only person who is well positioned to lead and manage the school (Hallinger, 2003). However, there is evidence that members of school management teams strongly participate in leading and managing the school (Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson, and Hann 2002; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond 2004; Bush et al., 2009; Lambert 2002; Marks and Printy 2003; Hoerr, 1996; Morrison, 1995).

The central proposition here is that school leadership makes an important contribution to the improvement of schools serving diverse populations. Reyes & Wagstaff (1999) state that leadership is always provided within a context; therefore, leadership needs to be context-specific. Context-specific leadership can be provided only by those who are deeply knowledgeable about the school, the community in which the school is located, the professional and nonprofessional staff of the school, the student population, and the relationship between the school and central administration. From these studies, the core aim of school leadership is to ensure that learners receive instruction and the monitoring purpose of school principals is to ensure that this objective is actualised in the schools. Thus school principals can monitor effectively teaching and learning if they understand what constitutes teaching, learning and leadership in such challenging schooling contexts.

2.3 The dominant tools and tasks of monitoring of teaching and learning

2.3.1 Use of learner data for assessment

Studies have suggested that using student data to inform instruction and learning goals has the potential to increase student performance (Lafeee, 2002; McIntire, 2002). Campbell and Levin's (2006) study of school districts in Ontario show that for improved student outcomes, use of data and development of assessment literacy at both the school and district levels were important activities. Alongside supporting classroom and school practices, the districts developed consistent approaches through the use of district wide–assessment and evaluation guides, adopted common assessment and diagnostic tools for all schools, and organised district-wide collection, storage, analysis, and reporting of student data to inform system and school improvement and planning and practices. The Ontario districts also supported schools in using and understanding data. Professional development on data analysis and assessment literacy was provided for principals and teachers and there were clear expectations about use of student assessment information. The districts used data at the system level to inform improvement planning, set targets and goals, and build in monitoring, review, feedback and accountability for progress (Campbell and Levin, 2006 p.50-52.). However, school principals in South African schools often do not have access to learner data compiled over a period of time by the Department of Education (DoE) leading to inability use data for leadership and management of teaching and learning especially using student data in monitoring and evaluating learner performance, achievement and teacher performance in the classrooms.

Datnow et al., (2007) state that alongside supporting the use of data to inform school-level practices, reflections and actions, it is important as well to develop mutual accountability in system-school relationships, involving shared responsibility between schools and system leaders, developing a trusting relationship and a two-way communication flow between schools and central offices. In addition Lunenburg and Irby (2006) argue that school principals need to be able to disaggregate student achievement data, track the achievement of all students over time, and show demonstrable progress in raising the percentage of students who are proficient in maths and reading. The NCLB dramatically increases the responsibility school principals have to use student data (No Child Left behind Act,

[NCLB], U.S. Department of Education, 2002). School principals are expected to know how to learn from student data, examine assessment results to identify problems and plan appropriate instructional interventions (Houlihan, 2002; Mason, 2002). However, the inability to use and access learner data is one of the major reasons why school principals do not make sense of student data collected by the schools.

Assessment data can be used for a range of accountability purposes. Earl and Katz (2006) suggest that by developing appropriate use of data in a wide range of forms, including from large scale testing and formative classroom assessments, professional accountability will be enhanced. Professional accountability is based on data, not as a final judgement but as part of the toolkit for understanding current performance and formulating plans for reasonable action. Earl and Katz (2006) further argue that educational leaders and the staff members of schools who are committed to professional accountability and making informed professional judgements think of accountability not as static numerical accounting but as a conversation, using data to stimulate discussion, challenge ideas, rethink directions and exploring new programs for learners and educators. It is also used to monitor progress, providing an ongoing image of a school as it changes, progresses, stalls, regroups, and moves forward again.

Goldstein (1999) argues that effective use of data and assessment to support positive outcomes for educators and students requires careful attention to building capacity to access, understand, and apply data. Without this, the result could be a mixture of confusion, technical naivety and misleading advice. Research indicates that assessment for learning and evidence-based practices are both areas where educators require support to develop their assessment literacy ‘through their capacity and confidence in the use of data’ (Stiggins, 2001).

The English NCSL (2005, p38) states that improving the quality of learning and teaching is the most important thing schools do. Because educators, not school principals, work directly with learners in the classroom, leaders' influence is indirect and may be exerted in three ways. These are:

(a) Modelling: using the power of example – sometimes the school principal and sometimes other leaders or educators (b) Monitoring: analysing and acting on pupil learning data, knowing what is happening in classrooms, using observations to find out about and to spread effective teaching strategies and skills (c) Dialogue: professional conversations, formal and informal meetings, feedback, mentoring and coaching of colleagues (NCSL2005:38).

Classroom practice may be judged at two levels, namely monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring seeks to assess the ways in which the teaching plans are put into effect and the outcomes from these in terms of pupil attainment. Evaluation seeks to assess the impact of teaching and learning at a more strategic level (Bush and Glover, 2009, p.14).

Southworth (2004) says that monitoring includes analysing and acting on students' progress and outcome data, for example assessment and test scores. Leadership is stronger when it is informed by data on students learning, progress and achievements as well as direct knowledge of teaching practices and classroom dynamics'(p.79). He adds that monitoring involves visiting classrooms, observing teachers at work and providing them with feedback (Southworth, 2004). The English Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted, 2003) found that there is a very strong link between very good monitoring and good teaching. Southworth (2004, p.80) argues that `monitoring classrooms is now an accepted part of leadership'. He concluded that monitoring is a widely distributed function, including head teachers, deputies and heads of department (Southworth, 2004). Bush and others (2008) claim that scrutiny of documents is the monitoring device used by school leadership in performance of their duties in supervision in South Africa. From their study, heads of departments (HoDs) examine educator's portfolios and workbooks and check learners' work to see if educator claims are matched by learner outcomes. Where there are discrepancies, heads of departments (HoDs) provide feedback to educators and seek improvement. Principals in turn, review heads of departments' (HoDs) work and may also check learners'

work directly. In cases of poor performance disciplinary is taken. Classroom observation is mandated for South Africa's integrated quality management system (IQMS) but also occurs in some schools as a monitoring device (Bush et al, 2008, p.22).

Hargreaves (2005) states that there are six possible objectives of assessment of learning as an aspect of monitoring in the classroom namely, (1) measuring pupil attainment against stated targets or objectives; (2) using assessment to inform the steps in teaching and learning planning; (3) as a basis of feedback for improvement; (4) as a way for teachers to learn about pupils learning,; (5) as a basis for children to take some control over their own learning; and (6) as an opportunity to turn assessment into a learning event. In the USA, the North West Regional Education Laboratory (2001) provides a summary of monitoring practices and argues that practitioners at district and school level should (a) collect and summarise information about student performance on a regular basis, identify areas of strength and weakness and relate to these goals and objectives; (b) co-ordinate assessment to ensure quality, avoid duplication of effort and minimise disruption to classroom instruction; (c) use assessment results to evaluate programs and target areas for improvement; and (d) provide direct support for classroom-level assessment efforts.

2.3.2 Lesson observation

Bush et al (2008) state that monitoring is an ongoing process, undertaken to establish whether teaching and learning are taking place in a satisfactory way. On the other hand Reynolds (2007) states that effective monitoring and evaluation require classroom observation. O'Sullian (2007) stresses that educational quality can only be improved if there is systematic observation of what is happening in the classroom. This involves recording, analysing and reflecting on inter-relationships, interactions and outcomes and is critical to assessing and improving quality (p.253). Lesson observation can answer `the what', `how' and why' questions. However the why questions have to be supported with other data, most notably teacher interview data, in order to fully understand the teaching and learning processes currently being used and the extent to which particular processes are likely to be implemented (O'Sullivan, 2006, p.254).

Observation may be used for teacher development or as a tool for teacher assessment or performance (Bush and Glover, 2009). A teacher development focus targets the improvement of teaching and learning while a performance management approach is more instrumental, seeking to weed out inadequate teachers (Bush and Glover, 2009). Hariparsad et al (2006) make a similar point in their analysis of teacher evaluation in South Africa and state that observation has two possible purposes: a formative function for the development of professional teaching skills, and a summative function for selection and as a basis for grading and promotion. O'Sullivan, (2006, p.258) argues that much of the school observation is assessment and performance driven which makes it difficult to gain the co-operation of educators, yet it is intended to raise the standards of classroom practice.

In a study by O'Sullivan (2004) on the use of observation to assess teacher development needs in Namibia, she found that lesson observation data were particularly useful for needs assessment. They provided an insight into teachers' realities, their problems and training needs, which was not accessible using other methods. For example, interviewing teachers about their needs, the common method used to access needs, was not found to be effective. Teachers interviewed told the author that they were familiar with and using learner-centred approaches. Lesson observations, however, refuted this. They indicated that rote teaching was the only approach used by teachers. In 94 per cent of the lessons observed the teacher talked most of the lesson and only 2 per cent of lessons did individual children answer questions. This led the trainer to designing training activities to develop teachers' understanding of and capacities to use learner -centred methods and approaches' (pp12-13). In Bush et al., (2008), they argue observation is a valuable monitoring tool though they found limited evidence of its use in their eight case study schools in South Africa. It was found to be a systematic process in some schools but it appeared to be sporadic and unsystematic activity in others, restricted by the lack of time available to heads of departments (HoDs) and the lingering belief that it is discouraged by the educator unions.

Southworth (2004, p.78) argues that 'modelling is all the power of example'. Successful leaders are aware that they must set an example and use their actions to show how colleagues behave (Bush and Glover, 2009). The concept of role model underpins this approach (Bush and Glover, 2009). Learner-centred leaders are role models to others because they are interested in learning, teaching and classrooms and teachers expect leaders to be able to walk the talk (Southworth, 2004, p.78-79). Bush and Glover, (2009) argue that

where educator's pedagogic skills are weak, monitoring alone is unlikely to be effective in raising standards. In addition Bush and Glover (2009) argue that while workshops may help improve classroom teaching, modelling of good practice by the school principal, the heads of departments (HoDs) or another educator is more likely to produce favourable outcomes.

Reynolds (2007) in a recent Ofsted inspection of a large, inner-city primary school in England in dealing with challenging behaviour argues that success was achieved which brought about a positive approach to discipline because of the use of overlapping strategies. The strategies involved the use of overlapping modelling, monitoring and dialogue methods taking place simultaneously amongst other solutions (adapted from Reynolds, 2007, p.3). While monitoring and evaluation provide a means for judging the quality of classroom practice, it does not offer a means for generating improvement (Bush and Glover, 2009, p.22). Modelling does provide the potential for demonstrating good practice and generalising it throughout the school. It arises from setting up what good practice is and then developing it through mentoring, coaching, and other self-development approaches (Bush and Glover, 2009, p.22). Lataille–Demore (2007) contends that good practice has to be acknowledged and then emulated by others willing and to learn. In one combined school studied by Bush et al (2008a), the school principal states that he led by example but he was referring to his own teaching role rather than modelling or demonstrating good classroom practice to his colleagues. These authors found no examples of modelling in any of their eight schools, suggesting that it is rarely used in South Africa and lamented that there is limited published work on the use of modelling in South Africa (p.22). From these studies, there are various learning instructional monitoring methods school principals are in position to use to monitor the teaching and learning in schools. However how efficiently these methods are able to positively influence learner outcomes depends on how well a school principal is able to use these methods in the management of teaching and learning in the schools.

2.4 The distribution of monitoring of teaching and learning

2.4.1 Leadership concepts

Leadership as concept is an elusive concept (Leithwood et al, 1999). However Bush & Glover, 2003, Ofsted, 2003) define leadership as a process of influence leading to the achievement of desired purposes. It involves inspiring and supporting others towards the achievement of a vision for the school that is based on clear personal and professional values. Management is the implementation of school policies and the efficient and effective maintenance of the school's current activities (Ofsted, 2003). Studies by the Ofsted (2003) reveal that there is a strong link between the quality of leadership and management of the head teacher (together with the key staff in a school), and the quality of teaching. Leadership and good management are very important in bringing about improvement in schools, particularly in schools which are implementing special programmes to address low achievement and social inclusion, including those facing challenging circumstances (Ofsted, 2003). The monitoring, evaluation and development of teaching and the school's strategy for appraisal and performance are aspects of management which are still in need of improvement in many schools (Ofsted, 2003). The way in which the characteristics of strong leadership and good management are applied in different circumstances is of fundamental importance (Ofsted in UK, 2003). Evidence from the Ofsted inspections in the UK indicate that head teachers are less effective in carrying out some of their managerial responsibilities, such as establishing effective governing bodies, monitoring teaching, and developing appraisal and performance management systems (Ofsted, 2003).

2.4.2 Teacher leadership

Leithwood & Duke (1999) described twenty distinct forms of principal leadership, reclassified into 6 generic leadership approaches by reviews: instructional, transformational, moral, participative, managerial, and contingent forms of leadership. Teacher leadership may be even more varied in form and function. Teachers assuming formal leadership roles (including lead teacher, department head, special program coordinator, or mentor); are expected to carry out functions such as representing the school in district-level decision making (Fullan, 1991); leading submissions of schools (Cooper, 1993); stimulating the

professional growth of colleagues (Wasley, 1991); being advocates for teachers' work (Bascia, 1997); and improving the school's decision-making process (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990). Teacher leadership can also exist in a more informal sense, for example in teachers' supportive roles with each other in professional learning communities or in school transformation efforts (Grossman, Wineburg, & Woolworth, 2001). Empirical evidence concerning the effects of either formal or informal teacher leadership is limited and reports give mixed results. For example, Hannay and Danby's (1994) study of department heads found that they were not very effective as facilitators of change because of their lack of knowledge and skills in effective change strategies. Studies by Brown, Rutherford, & Boyle, (2000), Scribner, Hager, & Warner, (2002), Smylie & Marks, (2002) found that conflicts among informal teacher leaders undermine shared vision and teachers ability to function as leaders can be hampered by the principals' reluctance to share authority. On the other hand, Duke, Showers, and Imber (1980) found that increased participation of teachers in school decision making resulted in a more democratic school. Marks and Louis (1997) concluded that teacher participation in site-based governance impacted on both teaching quality and student performance. In their study of special education initiatives, Mayrowetz and Weinstein (1999) found that teachers and other persons not in formal leadership roles had important leadership functions with regard to promoting inclusive education for students with special needs, and that the leadership functions of many different persons tended to overlap.

Both principal leadership and teacher leadership entail the exercise of influence on the beliefs, values, and actions of others (Hart, 1995). What may be different is how that influence is exercised and to what end. Teachers and school principals often attempt to exercise leadership in relation to quite different aspects of the schools functioning, although teachers often report a strong interest in expanding their spheres of influence (Reavis & Griffith, 1993; Taylor & Bogtch, 1994). Their resources for exerting leadership differ as well. In traditional schools, for example, persons in formal administrative roles have greater access to positional power in their attempts to influence classroom practice, whereas teachers may have greater access to the power that flows from technical expertise about teaching and learning. In a study of eight elementary schools, Spillane, Hallett & Diamond (2003) found that teachers tended to consider other teachers to be real leaders if they employed human, cultural, and social capital in their work with others, while school principals were constructed as real leaders primarily on the basis of cultural capital and

especially supportive interactional styles. When teachers considered school principals to be leaders on the basis of human capital, it was generally because they displayed instructional expertise grounded in experience with a particular subject matter domain.

Studies by Hallinger and Heck (1998; 1999; 2003) argue that the effect of leaders, including head teachers, is largely indirect; what heads do and say, and how they demonstrate leadership does affect pupil learning outcomes but it is largely through the actions of others, most obviously teachers, that the effects of school leadership are mediated. Achieving results through others is the essence of leadership and it is the 'avenues of leader influence that matter most' (Hallinger and Heck, 2003). Fullan (1985) when he stressed the importance of process factors in creating effective schools enumerated four main crucial factors to school improvement: (1) leadership as a process rather than status (2) an explicit value system which is consensual (3) sophisticated social interaction and communication (4) collaborative planning.

Studies by Banner & Gagne (1995), Chrispeels, Brown, & Castillo, (2000), Day & Harris, (2002) and Murphy & Beck, (1995) state that organizational restructuring initiatives stimulated inquiry about distributed conceptions of leadership as flatter, team-based, more organic structure began to replace hierarchical structures. Recent interest in distributed leadership has been supported by substitutes for leadership theory (Jermier & Kerr, 1997), situated and distribution cognition theories (Brown, Duguid, 1991; Wenger, 1998), and institutional theory (Ogawa & Bossert, 1995). Studies by Gronn (2000), Knapp et al., (2002) and Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, (2001) suggest that an interrelated set of roles and functions across the school or system is required for effective distributed leadership, especially in the context of policy initiatives. Empirical evidence concerning the nature and effects of distributed leadership is at early stage of development but research activity in this area is on the increase (Leithwood & Riehl 2006).

Wilson and Corcoran (1988) suggest that in the schools they observed, the source of leadership shifted as problems and issues shifted. Spillane and Louis, (2002) found that the configuration of distribution in high-poverty elementary schools differed depending on the curriculum area. With education, for example, school principals exerted minimal leadership, ceding that role to highly involved teachers or to outside consultants or curriculum facilitators. With language and arts instruction, however, principals and teachers with formal

leadership designations were more likely to exert leadership influence. The distributed leadership perspective is consistent with previous studies by Smylie, Conley & Marks, (2002), but it points further towards the development of a social theory that could encompass conceptions of both leading and learning in school. This view highlights school principals and teachers as arrayed in complex collegial networks that form and re-form around specific tasks or issues – for example, principals and teachers in a school working on how to improve maths scores on standardised tests; principals in a district figuring out how to ensure that students with the right to change schools have the opportunity to do so; principals and district subject matter coordinators evaluating new curricula for adoption and so on. It then asks how leadership is shared by several people and what and how ideas about learning and teaching influence their work. While distributed leadership is an appealing construct, clear conceptions remain elusive (Prestine & Nelson, 1998).

Studies by Camburn, Rowan and Taylor, (2003) state that in more than 100 US elementary schools found that responsibilities for leadership functions was typically distributed across three to seven formally designated leadership positions per elementary school. Such positions included school principals, assistant principals, program coordinators or facilitators, mentors, master teachers, or teacher consultants, as well as other auxiliary professional staff such as family outreach workers. However, in secondary schools in South Africa the distribution of monitoring authority and its implementation is a contested terrain (de Clercq, 2007). Not everyone in the staff can participate in the monitoring activities of teaching and learning. Heller & Firestone (1995) showed in a study of eight elementary schools that multiple leaders, including school district personnel and external consultants, were taking responsibility for leadership while those with formally designated leadership positions performed some functions. At the same time, individuals who had no formal leadership positions also took responsibility for leadership functions. Teachers contributed to an array of leadership functions including sustaining the program vision and informally monitoring implementation (Heller and Firestone 1995; Firestone, 1989).

In studies by Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson, and Hann (2002) on Australian schools and studies by Hargreaves and Fink (2004) on U.S. and Canadian schools reveal that school teachers, on their own or collectively, take responsibility for leadership functions and routines at times in an effort to make up for leadership gaps that result from formally designated leaders' lack of expertise or oversight. In studies conducted by Portin et al.,

(2003) in twenty-one schools in four US cities discovered that responsibility for leadership is distributed not only among appointed leaders but also among de facto leaders – that is, individuals who, regardless of their position, exercise influence on others with respect to the direction the school is taking or should take. This study of elementary, middle, high and k-12 schools revealed that this pattern of distributed responsibility for leadership is not confined to elementary schools. The distributed leadership study by Spillane, Halverson & Diamond (2004) showed that leadership is distributed among those in formal leadership positions and teachers not in leadership positions. While leadership is distributed both among formally designated leaders and among those who are not formally designated as leaders, this does not mean that everyone in the school has a hand in every leadership function or routine. The distribution of leadership differs, depending on the leadership function or routine, the subject matter, the type of school, the school's size, and a school or school leadership team's developmental stage (Spillane, 2006 p33).

Studies by Mascall & Leithwood, (in press) claim that school leadership has greater influence on schools and pupils when it is widely distributed. In this study they argue that there are significant relationships between staff performance and external factors. The strongest relationship relates to working conditions. The relationship between total leadership and teachers' capacity is much stronger than the relationship between the head teachers leadership alone and teacher capacity. The most significant results of this study were the indirect effects of total leadership on student learning and achievement, through its direct effects on the three dimensions of staff performance. Total leadership accounted for a significant 27 per cent of the variation in student achievement across schools. This is a much higher proportion of explained variation (two to three times higher) than is typically reported in studies of individual head teacher effects. In addition to this direct evidence concerning the effects of distributed leadership, less direct evidence in support of this claim can be found in research on formal leadership succession, school improvement initiatives, processes used to successfully turn around low-performing schools and the movement towards flatter organisational structures and team problem-solving. Despite the popularity of this claim, the evidence in its support is less extensive and in some cases less direct than in support of the previous claims.

Studies by Leithwood et al., (2006) state there are relationships between the use of different patterns of leadership distribution and the levels of value added student achievement. Schools with the highest levels of student achievement attributed this to relatively high levels of influence from all sources of leadership. Schools with the lowest levels of student achievement attributed this to low levels of influence from all sources of leadership. Schools with the highest levels as compared with those in the lowest levels, of student achievement differed most in their ratings of the influence of school teams, parents and students. Head teachers were rated as having the greatest (positive and negative) influence in the schools. This evidence is consistent with claims about the ineffectiveness of laissez-faire forms of leadership. There is no loss of power and influence on the part of head teachers when for example the power and influence of many others in the school increase. While the evidence strengthens the case that some leadership distribution patterns are more helpful than others, it sheds little light on the range of patterns that actually exist in the schools and most importantly, the relative effects of these patterns on the quality of teaching, learning and pupil achievement. Evidence on these key questions is extremely limited, and efforts to fill this gap represent the advancing edge of the current leadership research. This agrees with studies Spiro, Feltovtch, Coulson & Anderson, 1989) that there may be a real danger in appropriating concepts or theories developed as explanatory frameworks for specific phenomena in one field and applying them to seemingly analogous but perhaps only distally related phenomena in another .

2.4.3 Principal leadership and distributed leadership

Bush et al., (2009) state that the responsibility for managing teaching and learning is shared amongst schools principals, school management teams (SMTs), heads of departments, and classroom educators. While educators manage curriculum implementation in their classrooms, HODs have the responsibility for ensuring effective teaching and learning across their learning areas or phases. School principals and school management teams, on the other hand, have a whole-school role. (Bush et al., 2009). However in most cases school principals leave the monitoring of teaching and learning to subject heads of departments since they argue that they are preoccupied with other important administrative duties.

Heads of department have an important role to play in the management of teaching and learning, within the school-wide strategy established by the principal and the SMT (Bush et al., 2009). The middle managers role is focussed on sub-units, based on learning areas or school phases, while school principal and SMT should take a school-wide view (Bush and Glover, 2009). Rhodes and Brundrett (in press) stress that middle managers are important in any strategy to develop learning-centred leadership in schools. The English National College for School Leadership (NCSL, 2007, p 4)) argues that second-tier leaders should lead teaching and learning through modelling (leading by example), monitoring (knowing what is going in the classroom), dialogue (by talking and listening to colleagues) and setting up structures and systems. However, the delegation of leadership to heads of department in schools to spearhead monitoring of teaching and learning in classrooms has resulted in school principals not knowing exactly what is going on in the classrooms – a major reason why schools are failing. Studies by Spillane and Louis (2002) state that without an understanding of the knowledge necessary for teachers to teach well – content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, content-specific pedagogical knowledge, curricular knowledge, and knowledge of learners – school principals will be unable to perform essential school improvement functions such as monitoring instruction and supporting teacher development. As much as middle managers are expected to participate in the leadership of monitoring activities in teaching and learning, they themselves need to be monitored to avoid cases of neglect, assumption, and contestations over supervision techniques (de Clercq, 2007).

Dimmock and Lee (1999) revealed that principals in secondary schools act indirectly as curriculum leaders and managers whereas deputies, heads of departments and their senior teachers are directly involved in curriculum leadership and management and are therefore the ones who directly influence the quality of learning in schooling. This observation is echoed in the research done by Bush and Wise (1999), Bush and Harris (1999), and Harris (1991). Southworth (2002) reveal that secondary principals have no direct effect on school effectiveness unlike in elementary schools. Southworth (2003) suggest that instructional leaders achieve their effects on student academic outcomes through other people. Ogawa and Hart (1985) argue that the effect of the principal on instructional performance is minimal but has an important influence on school outcomes. According to Sweeney (1982) school effectiveness is enhanced by a principal who focuses on achievement, sets

instructional strategies, provides an orderly school atmosphere, evaluates pupil's progress, coordinates instruction and supports teachers. Morrison (1995) reveals that deputy principals in primary schools are the ones who are well placed to exercise curriculum leadership and management due to their positions to communicate and maintain liaison between the school principal and other staff members. The distribution of monitoring roles enables fast delivery of learning instruction to teachers – a factor that is vital in improving learner performance and achievement in the absence of the school principal the chief curriculum leader in the school.

Macbeth and Oduro (2003) reveal that there are contextual issues in developing nations that can impede effective instructional leadership. Developing nations can adopt and adapt western conceptions of leadership roles but there will always be contextual issues that will impede the application of these western constructs especially in underdeveloped African countries like Ghana. In the Ghana setting, tradition, culture, geography and politics redefine the conceptions of school leadership (Macbeath & Oduro, 2003). While most research on instructional leadership advocate the vital role played by the school principal, other researchers do not to agree with this; they argue that leadership should be distributed throughout the school rather than be vested in one person (Lashway, 2000a, Lambert, 2000). Cuban (1988) asserts that the instructional leadership role of the school principal can never be the role of the principal alone, unless it is in a small primary school. However, in a larger school whether at primary or at secondary level, this type of direct involvement in teaching and learning is unrealistic (Hallinger, 2003). Moreover in secondary schools, instructional leadership does not really yield the desired outcomes because it gets complicated by the fact that in many cases, principals have less experience and expertise than the teachers they supervise (Hallinger, 2003). Hoerr (1996) argues that due to the complex demands on today's principal, it is almost impossible for him/her to do the job alone.. Although the principal bears ultimate responsibility for the quality of his or her school, it is both necessary and appropriate that teachers take on some of the responsibility for instructional leadership (Hoerr, 1996:330) – a view shared by Morrison (1995; 65) and Lambert (2002; 37).Marks and Printy (2003) and Leithwood (2006) argue that it is not just about the complexities of the role of the instructional leader that makes it difficult for the school principal to do his job alone but it is about democratic leadership. The hierarchical orientation of leadership (Fidler, 1997) has become outdated and many modern schools subscribe to the participative organisation of the schools that emerged in the 1980's with the

restructuring of schools and the movements to empower teachers as professionals (Marks and Printy, 2003). In such cases the school principal becomes less of an inspector of teacher competence and more a facilitator of teacher growth (Marks and Printy2003; 374). Here the school principal remains the educational leader of the school but exercises leadership collaboratively with the teachers. This kind of leadership becomes shared instructional leadership which entails the school principal working together with the teachers on curriculum, instruction, and assessment. School reforms demand that school principals become change agents; hence the instructional role of principals lost its centrality (Marks and Printy, 2003).

The studies above indicate that school principals cannot run a school alone (Spillane, 2006, Lambert, 2002; Hallinger, 2003). Principals are overburdened and incapable of performing all the classroom monitoring duties alone due to a complexity of many factors inherent in the school culture and school structure (Fidler, 1997). The central preposition here is that leadership in schools is exercised primarily by school principals and teachers and may be distributed to others as well.

In summary, the literature explored the different and complex school leadership landscape school principals navigate as they perform the role of monitoring teaching and learning. It draws on international and local literature on school leadership as a part of a general theoretical basis to examine how school principals monitor teaching and learning, the methods they use to monitor the process of teaching and learning and the roles they play in the monitoring of teaching and learning. The central emerging proposition in the literature is that school principals are cardinal to student learning (Bush et al., 2009). However, what is required is not the individual effort of principals but those of a competent senior management team led and inspired by a principal (Fidler, 1997).

CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The chapter contains the methodology that was used to carry out the study. It includes the research design, sample size of the study, unit of analysis and data collection procedures.

3.2 Research approach

This study explored the roles two school principals play in monitoring teaching and learning in their schools: an inner-city secondary school and a township secondary school. Considering nature of the research question, a qualitative research design was used. The research question in this study is concerned with answering the 'how' and 'who' questions which can best be answered through a qualitative study (Neuman, 1997). Exploring the role of school principals in monitoring of teaching and learning in such learning contexts required an in-depth description of how this monitoring of teaching and learning is carried out, who is involved, and how. The purpose of qualitative research is to have an in-depth understanding of a social practice and this is done by `analysing the many contexts of the participants and by narrating participants' meaning of these situations and events' (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006).

Case studies were used in this study because the purpose of the study is to gain insight into and understanding of a social phenomenon. Qualitative research is based on the assumption that multiple realities are socially constructed through individual and collective definitions of a situation (McMillan and Schumacher, 1993). Among the advantages of qualitative research is its ability to illuminate the particulars of human experience in the context of a common phenomenon (McMillan and Schumacher, 1993). It enables the collection of multiple accounts of a common experience across participants as well as individual accounts in specific contexts.

In addition, a case study approach was used because in a case study, a single case is studied in detail which could be a person, a group, an institution, a programme or a concept (McMillan and Schumacher, 1993; Denscombe, 2003). One inner-city and one township secondary schools have been selected as cases for this research. A case study, according to MacMillan & Schumacher (2006) is concerned with the selection of case(s) with the purpose of understanding the phenomenon at hand in depth.

Case studies are faulted for the questionable credibility of generalisations. There is a perception that there is a general difficulty in defining boundaries of the cases, problems of negotiating access to study settings and the effect of the observer on the natural setting (Denscombe, 2003). Inasmuch as case studies usually provide little basis for scientific generalizations, the results of case studies can be generalised into theoretical propositions and not to populations and universes (Yin, 1994).

The criterion for the choice of the two cases was to target a high performing independent inner-city secondary school and a public township secondary school that caters for black learners. This according Patton (2002) is selecting cases rich in information for study. The idea behind this is that in such secondary schools, there in a better position to reveal the role school principals are performing in the monitoring of teaching and learning in such circumstances.

3.2.1 Sampling

Purposeful sampling was used to select one inner-city secondary school in the Central Business District in Johannesburg, one township secondary school in Soweto District as cases for the study. This purposive sampling strategy MacMillan & Schumacher (2006) was used because of its convenience in data collection. The participants selected for the study were directly linked to the study in terms of involvement, participation and management. The purposive sample selected was representative.

3.2.2 Case size

The case size was a purposive selection of twenty-two participants; one school principal, two deputy school principals, four heads of department and four teachers from each of the inner city secondary school and township secondary school.

3.2.3 Secondary school case

The following criteria were used to identify the inner city secondary school and the township secondary school for study: The inner-city secondary school is a functional secondary school located in the inner city of the Central Business District of Johannesburg. This inner-city secondary school have been performing high above other inner-city secondary schools in the area as per the Gauteng Department of education records. This inner-city secondary school is an independent public school. The township secondary school is a functional school located in township area of the Soweto district in the Gauteng province. This government township secondary school is located in an area for historically for disadvantaged learners. This township secondary school has been performing high above other township secondary schools in the area as per the Gauteng Department of education records.

3.2.4 The school principal participant

In the purposefully selected inner-city secondary and township secondary schools, the school principal and the assistant principal were chosen for the study because they are expected to be operational, functional and involved in the teaching and learning. The reason for the participation of the school principal is because the study is heavily dependent on their practice especially the roles they perform in the monitoring of teaching and learning in such contexts. The exercise of establishing their views and perceptions about the roles they play is essential. Through the participation of the deputy school principals the research intends to establish how they work with their school principals especially on distribution, sharing, and delegation issues in the performance of monitoring of teaching and learning.

3.2.5 Heads of Departments participants

The following criteria were used to identify the heads of departments for the study: they were expected to be operational and functional; involved in the teaching and learning; heads of at least four core subjects, namely mathematics, English, sciences, business studies; instrumental in monitoring of the teachers in the classrooms as part of their core responsibility in the classrooms. It was important for the research to determine the roles the heads of department are playing in the monitoring of teaching and learning as well as how they are supported if they are to execute their duties well.

3.2.6 Teacher participants

Specific teachers were selected to determine how they participated in the monitoring process of teaching and learning in collaboration with the school leadership. In these inner-city and township secondary schools, the following criteria were used to identify the teachers for the study; the teachers are actively involved in teaching and learning in the schools.

As this was a limited and focused study over a short period, it was important to reduce the possibility of disruptions when the study is conducted. Therefore, the school needed to be fully functional. Taylor et al (1999, p. 136) point out that teaching and learning cannot occur in an environment which is lackadaisical, unpredictable and not directed towards optimising quality classroom time.

3.3 Research Methods

In this study the following methods were used to collect data: field observations and semi-structured field interviews.

3.3.1 Field observations

According to McMillan & Schumacher (2006) field observations provide a rich description of the research site, people as well their actions. According to Moyles et al., (2002) observation is a very useful research tool for leaders /managers because it can give access and insights into complex social interactions and physical settings, give permanent and

systematic records of interactions and settings, be context-sensitive and ecologically valid (Denscombe, 2003) all of which is relevant to this study.

During the course of the study in school A, the following procedure was used to observe the participants in the study: In the first week of the study, the researcher observed activities of four selected individual classroom educators, in their designated school classrooms, staffroom, school administration offices and in the school compound during the normal school working hours. In the second week of the study, the researcher observed activities of the four HoD participants, in the designated classroom, staffroom, in the school compound and in the school administration offices. Also, the researcher observed activities of the two selected deputy school principal, one in each consecutive week, in the designated classrooms, staffroom, in the school compound and in the school administration offices. Lastly, in second week of the study, the researcher observed activities of the school principal participants in the designated classrooms, staffroom, in the school administration offices and in the school compound. Specifically in school A, the researcher observed class lessons in grades 9, 10 and 11 in the secondary school. Observations in the school took place from 7:00a.m.in the morning to 3:30 p.m. in the afternoons. Each of these selected individual participants in the study was observed for one working day by the researcher as they went about their activities in the school classrooms, staffroom, and school administration offices and in the school compound.

The same procedure used in school; A was observed for school B in weeks 3 and 4.

3.3.2 Field Interviews

Patton (1990) urges that qualitative interviewing is to provide a framework within which the respondents can express their own understanding in their own terms. However, Moyles et al., (2002) posits that interviewing is the preferred tactic of data collection when it appears that it will get better data or more data at less cost than other tactics. According to Moyles et al., (2002) the purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in somebody else's mind but not to put things there. We interview people to explore their views in ways that cannot be achieved by other forms of research and report our findings in as near as we reasonably can their own words.

During the course of the study in school in both schools A and B the researcher followed the following procedure to interview the participants in the study: after observation of one day, participants were interviewed on the second day in an interview that lasted a maximum of forty-five minutes. This pattern was followed with all the participants with the exception of one deputy principal form school A, who was observed but not interviewed. Interviews were arranged and conducted after school teaching hours in the afternoons. The interviews were recorded with a tape recorder with consent of the interviewee. Each individual interview was supposed to last a maximum 45 minutes but in some instances took less than 30 minutes.

The study used a semi-structured interview format comprising of opened-ended and closed questions. The purpose of using semi-structured interviews was to probe for detail, Moyles et al., (2002), after observation. Opened-ended questions were semi–structured in nature because they provided clarity on issues noted during observation. The closed questions were used to achieve a minimum of restraint on the responses and to bring out the unanticipated answers. Closed questions sought factual information. Follow-up interviews allowed the interviewer to probe responses of participants while events were still fresh in their minds. Lastly the interviewer was able to clarify actions if and when misunderstood by the participants during the course of the study. In such studies, follow-up interviews try to ensure that reliability is at least achieved through establishing consistency of the data.

3.4 Validity and reliability of the study

Reliability is the extent to which a management procedure yields the same answers wherever it is carried out (Denscombe, 2003). Validity is the extent to which a measurement gives the correct answers (Denscombe, 2003). In qualitative research, issues of validity and reliability are difficult to determine in totality however they form an essential part of scientific study (Maxwell, 1996). Merriam (1998) states that reliability is problematic in the social sciences because human behaviour is never static.

To determine reliability and validity of the study triangulation was used. In this case study through interviewing the school principals, deputy school principals, heads of departments and teachers with similar semi-structured and open questions, differences in reliability and validity were reduced and narrowed, though not totally removed (Merriam, 1998). The use of triangulation in this study enabled the researcher to obtain information from different sources and enabled the researcher to compare the results to establish similarity of information if they correspond.

3.5 Limitations of the study

In the course of the study it was difficult to gain access to the school principals and the school leadership in both schools as they were often unavailable despite being present on the school campuses. In school A it was not possible to access the deputy school principal though the school principal and the deputy school administration were eventually available for the study. In school B educators were not available until the protracted intervention of the school principal. The educators at one stage did not want to take part in the study citing reasons of being busy and having a lot of class work to do at the time of the term, trying to catch up after many outside disruptions to schooling not of their own making. This agrees with Denscombe (2003) that there is a perception that there is a general difficulty in defining boundaries of the cases, problems of negotiating access to study settings and the effect of the observer on the natural setting.

Due to the small size of the sample, it is not be possible to generalise findings, which agrees with Yin (1994) that case studies usually provide little basis for scientific generalizations. However, the results of case studies can be generalised into theoretical propositions and not to populations and universes.

3.6 Ethical considerations

Blaxter et al., (2001) state that the conduct of ethically-informed research should be the goal of all social researchers. Any research has the potential to impact on the lives of others and therefore consideration must be given to recognise and protect the rights of human beings (Cohen and Manion, 1994). It is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that ethical standards are adhered to. Therefore, in this study, measures were taken, while planning and

conducting the study, to ensure the rights and welfare of each subject participants would be protected, and that nobody was harmed in any way during the research process. For the purpose of referencing and for ethical reasons to protect participants' identities, codes had been invented to identify participant. The schools were referred to by alphabetical letters: school A from a township area and B from the inner-city.

To render this study ethical, the researcher observed several safeguards, including privacy, self-determination, anonymity, confidentiality and informed consent. The researcher used several safeguards for protecting the participants of the study. Firstly, the questionnaires were sent with a full outline of the research to be undertaken, which included the opportunity to decline or to ask any question regarding the research, including ethical concerns.

Secondly, at each interview, a copy of the questions, with the background was provided for each interviewee and each interview was started with a conversation about ethical concerns, including confidentially, and results storage. The participants were assured that the tape recording would be heard by the researcher only and that it would be destroyed after the research was completed. The interviewees were also told that they could withdraw from the research process at any time. At the conclusion of each interview, the participant could ask to listen to the interview.

Thirdly, a letter requesting permission to conduct research in South African schools was obtained from the Department of Education and was accompanied by a consent letter for participants. The principal of the school where the research was conducted was approached for permission and was asked to make all the necessary arrangements.

3.7 Piloting of instruments

An initial pilot study was conducted to further determine validity and reliability of data collection instruments. The pilot study was carried out in another secondary school in the inner city code named (x) which resulted in the adjusting of the data collection instruments to suit the needs of the research question for the study.

3.8 Procedure of data analysis

The data analysis was an on-going process as the data was being collected. Data was organised into categories on the bases of themes, concepts or similar features (Neuman, 1997). Categorization of the data into themes is one way organising the collected information from the field for easier processing. In this case study, themes which were directly linked to the research questions and sub-questions were used. Selected quotes from the data allowed the participants' own words to express what the researcher's inferred. This is intended to deal with the limitation of individual bias in qualitative data collection.

This chapter looked at the qualitative methods that were used for the analysis of the role of the school principals in monitoring teaching and learning in schools A & B. Qualitative methods were used because of the strengths of qualitative research in presenting complexities of school leadership in challenging situations. Field interviews provided an opportunity to explore a rich description of leadership experiences and issues while the observations provided context-sensitive and ecologically valid school leadership experiences. The two qualitative methods allowed triangulation of information which improved reliability.

CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This Chapter contains the findings of the study. The findings are presented per individual school. The responses from the school principal, deputy school principals, heads of departments and educators are presented interchangeably per school with major emphasis reflecting their views on the role school principal in monitoring teaching and learning in the school, the methods used in monitoring teaching and learning and the school structures the school principal relies to monitor teaching and learning in the school.

4.2 The school background and contextual description

4.2.1 School Profile: A

School A is a co-educational public secondary school with 1320 learners located 6 km into Soweto Township and belongs to the Johannesburg Central District. It is a fenced school with the school playgrounds located outside the school compound. It caters for learners from grades 8-12 only. The school has had a national matric pass rates of above 80 per cent for the last five years. The school has strong buildings, well ventilated secure classrooms, furnished classrooms, a desktop computer in some classrooms, spacious school corridors, administration offices, sick bay, big staffroom, school reception area, car parking space, school canteen, school administration offices, security personnel at the school gate, school laboratory, main hall, separate toilets for boys, girls, female and male teaching staff and a school siren for time keeping. The school has a school governing body (SGB), a school principal, two deputy school principals, seven Heads of Departments (HoDS) and 43 educators. The learner population comprises of learners from local families living in the surrounding areas in the Soweto Township. The community served by school A exhibits a combination of social and economic problems, including drug abuse, unemployment, poverty, crime and low SES.

4.2.2 Responses to questions on the role of school leadership in monitoring teaching and learning specific to the school curriculum

In response to the question regarding the role of the school principal in monitoring teaching and learning, when interviewed school principal A said:
My major work involves several roles however the major role is to oversee the running of the school, learner admissions, and ensure that teachers are teaching and learners are learning. And as educator I make sure I am in class teaching as per the timetable. Thereafter I continue with my administrative duties in the school.

It is evident that the school principal acknowledges that the most important work of a school leader is to oversee the running of the school and monitor the process of teaching and learning in the school. This agrees with the South African Standard for School Leadership Draft Policy (2005) that the core purpose of principalship is to provide leadership and management in all areas of the school to enable the creation and support of conditions under which high quality teaching and learning take place and promote the highest possible standards of learner achievement. On the other hand, the school principal emphasized that the monitoring of teaching and learning is a daily activity that cannot be done by one person.

The deputy school principal in school A emphasized that the school principal is proactive and highly involved and participates in the monitoring of the work of educators, grade 8 to grade12 learners and HoDs work. Though the school principal has two deputy school principals, one for academic and the other administration, the school principal does everything ranging from involvement in learner admission, distribution of report cards for grade12 learners and attending to parental concerns about learner performance and class attendance. Furthermore the deputy school principal in charge of administration said that the deputy school principal in charge of academic matters was mainly concerned with internal monitoring of other educators in the classes and the coordination of activities of HoDs. He attended and participated in cluster assessment meetings, verified and certified the information on the learner profiles, possible retention /failure and promotion/progression, monitored the implementation of a variety of teaching and learning activities, analysed learner assessment and repetition rates, ensured the effective use of portfolios and learner profiles, prepared progress reports at least once a term on the implementation of SAT

management plans and all assessment issues, ensured preparation of overall progress reports on learners assessments, and addressed parent and /or learner appeals against assessment decisions. He ensured the implementation of the district assessment strategies and monitored the completion and moderation of GDE learner support forms at least once a term. He also ensured the use of different forms of assessment to accommodate learner diversity and drew up and implemented a school assessment plan by the end of the year for the following year. School principal of school A expressed his sense of frustration over the multiplicity of tasks: *The roles of a school principal should be separated from teaching; instead a school principal should concentrate more on administrative issues in the principal's office*.

When interviewed on the conditions that affected learner achievement in the school, the school principal lamented that there were several factors that affected learner achievement in school A namely:

a) Mature learners who abuse drugs which affects their attention, concentration and which increases anxiety and hyper-sensitivity making them prone to violent behaviour in the school compounds and classrooms, if provoked. For example the school principal when asked, said*: I used to deal with the trouble makers individually. I am a sports fanatic and I play a lot of soccer so I tried to get them into sports rather drugs and gangs. But if that did not work I got rid of them from the school.*

b) Most learners come from families living in low income areas characterised by poverty, and unemployment. As a result learners are forced to hustle with their parents leading to learner absenteeism, late coming, and not doing classroom assessments in time.

c) Mature girl learners fall pregnant as a result of unprotected sex. This has exposed these girl learners and sexual partners to incidences of HIV infection. Pregnancies amongst girl learners have led to high rates of absenteeism.

d) The standard medium of instruction is English but to all the learners in these schools English is fourth language spoken after a mother tongue language, community languages and languages spoken when learners are together in the school compound or outside the school compound. Code switching takes place in the classes during the teaching and learning process. This greatly disadvantages the learners in these schools because they have

to write continuous and summative assessments in English. Code switching is frequently used by educators to make learners understand.

e) In school A all educators are South African educators with the exception of two temporary foreign educators. The educators are unionised with an exception of a few. Union activities often affect teaching and learning during school days. When interviewed on how the school principal was able bring about changes in the school under these challenging conditions the school principal related the following:

It is not by chance that the school renaissance coincided with my appointment as a school principal. I am formerly a maths teacher at the school and have a PhD in mathematics and science education. I was well-aware of the challenges ahead and while many others would have baulked at the idea of taking over the reins of this impoverished school, where buildings were in disrespair, teachers were in short supply, and armed students conducted their turf wars on the school grounds.

The school principal school further explained:
When I was appointed principal I decided I had do something to turn the school around and I started by motivating the educators. I had been at the school as a teacher so they [teaching staff] knew what type of person I was. Admittedly I had to a lot of spade work to do to try and win these people over, as many were lagging behind, but once they saw I was committed to the task they decided to support me.

4.2.3 Responses on the question regarding the dominant tools and tasks school principal uses to monitor teaching and learning

In response to questions about the methods the school principal uses to monitor teaching and learning when interviewed, the deputy school principal in charge of administration reiterated that the school principal was highly involved in the monitoring of the work of educators, checking their educator workbooks and profiles, grade 12 learner books, attendance register for grade 12 learners, educators attendance register on a daily basis, teaches mathematics and physical science to grade 12 learners, and monitors HoDs work. The school principal sets specific days when all educators' profiles, portfolios, attendance registers are inspected

for consistence and compliance. The school principal calls for specific meetings for HoDs to receive their progress reports about how educators are performing in their subjects.

When interviewed on how the school goes about the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classes, the deputy school principal claimed that the school principal depended on the team of HoDs and the deputy school principals to supervise the work of educators on a daily basis. The school principal instructed the HoDs on how to supervise the work of educators in their departments and provided adapted school assessment guidelines and tools for educators from the GDE to guide them on how to monitor the work of educators periodically in order to improve learner performance. Whenever HoDs went to any classroom for classroom visits and observation, they were expected to go with assessment tools as evidence of monitoring. One HoD said: *The school principal expects the HoDs to orient and mentor new educators such that they can fit into the school system.*

When interviewed on how the school principal monitors teaching and learning in the classrooms, one of the class educators said: *The school principal makes unplanned classroom visits especially to 12 grade classes in response to complaints of low learner motivation to study particular subjects like Isizulu.*

When interviewed on how the school principal goes about the daily activities of monitoring teaching and learning in the school in general, the school principal explained that the school opened at 6.30 a.m in the morning and closed at 3:30 p.m in the afternoon. Classes begin at 7:00 a.m in the morning and end at 3:30 p.m in the afternoon. Break time is for 15 minutes in the school compound and lunch break is for 30 minutes in the school compound. In the school all educators have their own classrooms and learners rotate for lessons throughout the day according to the school timetable. Lessons take 40 minutes and are controlled by a school siren which rings automatically after 40 minutes and learners have five minutes to rotate classes. Educators prepare the lesson notes, use prescribed textbooks, and prepare exercises for the day, teach and monitor the work of learners. They fill in a learners' attendance register each lesson. HoDs are assigned to monitor the work of educators in their departments and are in turn monitored by the deputy school principal in charge of academic matters. The school principal monitors the work of grade 12 learners.

When interviewed on how the deputy school principal academic monitors teaching and learning in the classes, the school principal academic explained that monitoring is carried out through the following ways: planned observations classrooms visits, educator attendance registers, checking assessment schemes of work and schedules, and cluster moderation. When interviewed on how HoDs monitor teaching and learning in the classes, two HoDs (for life sciences and physical sciences) said they use the following ways to monitor educators work in their department: unplanned observations classroom visits in case of complaints about poor subject lesson delivery, departmental meetings with educators to discuss assessment moderation, checking of schemes of work, orientation of new educators so that they can fit into the way things are done in the classrooms and the school.

When interviewed on how educators monitor teaching and learning in the classes, the class educators for languages said they use the following ways to monitor learners work in their classes: giving continuous tests, language exercises and monitoring learner attendance. All this information about educators, learners' work, is given to subject heads and HoDs to cross check before sending to the school principal as evidence of monitoring activities. The school principal calls for specific meetings for HoDs to receive their progress reports about how educators are performing in their subjects.

According to one educator: *The SGB team comes to the school on a daily basis to check how the teaching and learning is going on in the classes, however we are always ready for them with our educator work schedules and profiles at the work stations. But because they know that we are a good school they stop in the school principal's office.*

The academic deputy school principal teaches life sciences and monitors the class educators. The school principal teaches mathematics and monitors the class of grade 12 learners, and is monitored by the HoD for the physical science. When interviewed about how the school principal responds to teacher absenteeism due to sickness and union activities, the deputy school principal administration replied,

All educators if sick, get sick leave permission before they leave. The school principal's office make arrangements to avoid class disruptions, and in case of union activities educators make sure learners are not affected and in case of class disruptions learners are given extra lessons to try to catch up.

4.2.4 Responses on how school principal monitors teaching and learning

In response to question regarding how the school principal carries out the monitoring of teaching and learning in the school, the school principal echoed, *the monitoring of teaching and learning is daily activity and it cannot be done by one person.*

When interviewed on the school structures that facilitate the monitoring of teaching and learning in the school, the school principal revealed that the school has two deputy principals one for administration one for academic, seven HoDs and 43 educators. In the school teachers are assigned by the deputy school principal administration and learners rotate per lessons throughout the day as the school timetable dictates. The class educators are stationed in the classes throughout the school learning hours in the day. The class educators are stationed permanently for the year in these classes and prepare the lesson notes, prescribed textbooks, and exercises for the day. These class educators teach and monitor the work of learners who come to attend the subjects begin taught throughout the day. They mark the learner's attendance register per lesson. These educators test standard tests and their rubrics and submit them to the HoDs for moderation. HoDs are assigned to monitor the work of educators under their departments' and are monitored by the deputy school principal academic. The academic deputy school principal is concerned with the internal monitoring of the class educators in their work-sites. The school principal monitors the work of grade 12 learners.

As evidence suggests the school principal in this school is involved in both direct and indirect supervision of teaching and learning.

4.3 The school background and contextual description

4.3.1 School profile B

School B is a co-educational independent school with 2000 learners located in the inner-city of Central Business District of Johannesburg. It caters for learners from grade R to grade 12. The school has had a matric pass rate of 80 per cent for the past five years. The school is located in a big down-town city rented building surrounded by a street market, a. church, bus and rail station, and busy, noisy streets. The school building contains administration offices, staffroom, school reception, and security at school gate. There is no school

laboratory, no play grounds, narrow school corridors, a school sick room, and congested classrooms. The school has a school governing body (SGB), three school directors, one school principal, two deputy school principals, two Heads of departments (HoDs) for primary and intermediate phase, three (HoDS) for secondary school, one senior teacher for primary school, one senior teacher for high school, 76 educators and a SAT coordination team. The learner population comprises of learners from migrant families and the local indigenous families living in the suburban inner-city, as well as many other areas outside of the Central Business District of Johannesburg. The community served by school B exhibits a combination of social and economic problems, including drug abuse, unemployment, poverty, crime, homelessness, and working class black immigrants.

4.3.2 Responses to the question of the role of school leadership with specific reference to the school curriculum

In school B the school principal agreed that the most important work of a school principal is to oversee the running of the school, monitor the process of teaching and learning in the schools. This agrees with, the South African Standard for School Leadership Draft Policy (2005) which states that the core purpose of principalship is to provide leadership and management in all areas of the school to enable the creation and support of conditions under which high quality teaching and learning take place and promote the highest possible standards of learner achievement. The school principal in school B pointed out that the monitoring of teaching and learning is a daily activity that cannot be done by one individual.

In response to the question regarding the role of the school principal in monitoring teaching and learning the deputy school principal said the school principal and the directors of the school were too preoccupied with school administrative issues such that issues of checking how educators are doing their work is mostly being coordinated by the deputy principal, subject heads and HoDs in the school. Student monitors in the classes also play a role. Two educators are on duty for and in charge of monitoring learner arrival, attendance, disciplinary issues, and other delegated administrative issues from the deputy school principal's office. The deputy school principal working with HoDs and subject heads manage the staff duty timetable and coordinate the monitoring of educators in the classes and the learners in the school. When interviewed on the role of the school principal in monitoring teaching and learning the school principal stressed: *As much as my work is to*

ensure that learning is taking place in the school, I cannot go the classes to teach because I don't have time, I am busy in the office, If I want to leave, someone will be waiting and calling to see me with issues to solve and I must attend to them. If I want to know what is going on in the classrooms I consult the deputy school principal, enquire from the subject heads and HoDs and even the class monitors to tell me what is happening in the classrooms.

When interviewed on the conditions that affect learner achievement in the school the school principal said that there are several factors that affect learner achievement in school B namely:

a) Learners who to come to school with drugs, which is taken during the break-times with other learners and which cause these groups of learners to be anxious and uneasy during the classes.

b) Large numbers of learners cramped in the small sized classrooms, with no play grounds which results in the learners turning the classrooms into playing grounds at break time. It is also the reason why educators delay reaching the classrooms after a lesson. The lack of space for extra-curricular activities in the school building means there is a lot of noise generated during playtime in the classrooms which distracts other learners in other classrooms.

c) Most learners come from families living in low income areas characterised by poverty and unemployment. As a result, learners are forced by the conditions of poor living in the families to hustle with their parents leading to learner absenteeism, late coming, and not doing classroom assessments in time. In addition some learners complain of family problems, e.g. fighting, poverty, financial issues, immigration harassment, and noisy neighbourhoods at home that make it difficult for them to do homework or preparation. Many learners prefer to do their homework in the school.

d) Learners play truant and instead participate in criminal activities like breaking into houses during school hours.

e) The standard medium of instruction is English but for all the learners in these schools English is a language spoken after their mother tongue, community languages and languages spoken when learners are together in the school compound or outside the school compound. There is limited code switching. A lack of English proficiency greatly disadvantages the learners in the school who have to write continuous and summative assessments in English.

f) Most of the educators are foreign educators and are paid very little. As a result most have more than one source of income. This affects their commitment and also means educators often leave in pursuit of better job opportunities elsewhere.

The response of the school principal on how these issues are being dealt with was as follows: *I concentrate more on making sure that things in the school are working and depend on the reports of the educators, HoDs, deputy school principal on what is happening in the classes. Whatever they cannot handle, they refer to the school principal's office.*

When interviewed on their roles in monitoring teaching and learning, two HoDs for physical science and life sciences listed the following: *observing how the science educators teach the sciences, checking their schemes of work and discussing the moderation of tests*. According to two of the physical science educators, monitoring take the following form: giving continuous tests, assignments as per the assessment plan and marking learner attendance. All this information about the educators, learners work, is given to subject heads and HoDs to verify and check learner performance in the subjects in their departments. When interviewed on their roles in monitoring teaching and learning, two educators for mathematics and languages said that as educators in school B they are responsible for what is happening in the classes on daily basis and report to the HoDs and the deputy school principal and the school principal in case of any disciplinary issues. The HoD for the physical sciences said: *The school principal depends on the reports of the HoD for what is happening in the classes. As a HoD for the physical sciences in the school I make sure all educators assigned to teach the physical sciences have the assessment guidelines and plans for the year, the lesson plans ready at all times, learner attendance registers are marked and absent learners reported to the school principals office.*

4.3.3 Responses regarding the question on the dominant tools and tasks school principals use to monitor teaching and learning

A timetable regulates the duration of the classes and who and where educators are supposed to teach. This timetable is designed by a committee comprising of the school principal the deputy school principal the HoDs and subject heads in the school. Registers for educators and learners are kept on a daily basis by HoDs on duty and class monitors; the deputy principal relies on HoDs to observe and check educator files, lesson preparations and delivery, inspect educators' subject outlines/assessment plans, and relies on class monitors to report on educator attendance and the amount of learning content covered per lesson. When interviewed on the ways the school principal uses to monitor teaching and learning, the principal emphasized: *We have our own way of doing things in these schools and every parent and their children who enrol in the schools must adhere to our rules. Discipline is our key. We are strict on latecomers. Every morning, every class has class registers which is marked per lesson to check on learner attendance, class monitors record teacher attendance, the subject taught, the time lessons started and ended , Subject heads and HoDs check what educators have covered and class tests are given as agreed between the HoDs and the educators.*

The principal emphasized that as part of their monitoring roles they use continuous and summative assessments to evaluate learner achievement. Continuous assessments (tests) are designed by the subject educators with assessment guidelines from the GDE and sent for moderation to the SAT for results analysis. The process is overseen by the HoDs as senior educators who monitor the subject educators during the design and the moderation of the continuous assessments. However the school principal complained: *On test days learners come late with all kinds of excuses like cold weather, traffic delays, sickness, family problems, oversleeping, petty thieves who harass learners in the morning.*

When interviewed on how they monitor teaching and learning, two HoDs (for physical science and life sciences) said they evaluate their learners through giving the learners exercises in the form of experiments and observe how the learners perform the exercises. The HoDs together with the subject educators design standard tests and discuss the rubrics for moderation. When interviewed on how they monitor teaching and learning, two of the

physical science educators listed continuous tests, assignments as per the school assessment plan and marking learner attendance.

SAT only informs the school principal's office of the results but is not involved in its activities. SAT is comprised of senior subject heads and senior HoDs under the guidance of the deputy school principal. The school administrators (SGB, directors and the school principal) are less involved in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the school. The school principal used to teach life sciences subjects but stopped to concentrate on the running of the school.

4.3.4 Responses to the question on how school principal monitors teaching and learning in the school

When the principal was interviewed on the effectiveness of deputy school principals, HoDs and educators' work, he said: *We work as a team as much as possible in such circumstances and try not to victimise any educator unless it is a serious case*. The school principal does not go to the classes to check on the teaching and learning processes in spite of being present in the school all the time. In school B the principal only reacts to issues brought to his office by the deputies, the HoDs and educators.

4.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter looked at the different roles and interfaces school principals take on, as they perform their roles of monitoring teaching and teaching, the tools they use to monitor the teaching and learning process and how they go about the process of monitoring teaching and learning in schools.

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

The South African Standard for School Leadership Draft Policy (2005) emphasizes that South Africa is committed to the fundamental transformation of its social institutions and the values that underpin and shape them. The policy includes a vision, directions for an effectively-led, well-managed, largely decentralised and site-based education system (p.3). At the heart of all these is the intention to build upon the quality of leadership and successful outcomes observed in the best schools within the context of their communities and to address a concern with poor leadership and inadequate outcomes of schooling in others (p.3). This transformational process implies a profound change in the culture and the practice of schools. In South Africa, the many complex economic, political, and social and health factors make change difficult. Particularly the widespread, devastating impact of HIV and AIDS makes it vitally important for schools to provide for the overall well being of their learning communities in a nurturing and supportive environment. Increasingly, the extent to which schools are able to provide such support and give effect to genuine transformation, necessary change and improvement will depend to a large degree on the nature and quality of the ways in which they are led and managed (p.3). However, there is concern about how school principals as instructional leaders interpret, negotiate and translate these national visions and goals into working knowledge of school core mission statements and values that translate into the core purpose for monitoring teaching and learning in the schools.

5.2 The roles of the school principal in monitoring teaching and learning.

5.2.1 School principals' instructional goals

Evidence from this case study indicate that the school principals seem to agree on the purpose of school leadership which is to ensure that learning takes place in the classes, which supports studies by Bush et al., (2009; 2008); Bush and Glover (2009), Leithwood et al, (2006); Blasé & Blasé (1993); Day et al., (2000); McLaughlin & Talbert (2006); Hallinger & Murphy (1986); Lunenburg & Irby (2006), The South African Standard for

School Leadership Draft Policy (2005) states that the core purpose of school leadership is to provide leadership and management in all areas of the school to enable the creation and support of conditions under which high quality teaching and learning take place and promote the highest possible standards of learner achievement, The responses from this study point out that the school principal school B does not participate in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the school. This supports studies by Christie and Lingard, (2001) that in daily practice school principals in schools are seemingly dysfunctional, often present on school compounds but totally focussed on administrative duties, mainly preoccupied with financial school matters, human resource management and policy issues (Bush and Heystek, 2006), administrative activities (Chisholm et al, 2005) and have little experience and interest in instructional leadership (Hoadley, 2007). The school principal in school B is not absent from the school premises; he is ever present but too preoccupied in the office. This further agrees with studies by Christie and Lingard (2001) and (Bush and Heystek,2006) that school principals prefer staying in their offices doing school administrative work rather than being involved in the monitoring of teaching and learning which often they delegate the other school teaching staff like the school deputies and educators.

In school A, the data collected is not in its entirety supportive of studies by Christie and Lingard (2001), that in daily practice school principals in schools are seemingly dysfunctional and have little experience and interest in instructional leadership (Hoadley, 2007), but suggests sufficient evidence to say that school leaders prefer to be mainly preoccupied with financial school matters, human resource management, policy issues, administrative activities studies and leave the monitoring of teaching and learning to other school leaders and educators in the school (Bush & Heystek, 2006; Chisholm et al, 2005). In school A the school principal is highly involved and participative as an educator and school principal in the teaching and supervision of learning which is not the case in schools B where the school principal is less involved in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms. This agrees with notions of instructional leadership by Sebring and Bryk (2000) that everything school principals do in the schools is instructional. However, in such challenging circumstances it is presumptuous to take at face value that what the school principals are doing around the schools is the actual monitoring of teaching and learning in the classes. Understanding why school principals prefer doing administrative work rather than monitoring teaching and learning will perhaps explain why school principals are seemingly dysfunctional Christie and Lingard (2001). However, there is no conclusive

education leadership research in this area to explain this leadership contradiction and this study cannot draw any conclusions on this issue beyond the suggestion that certain principals may feel overwhelmed by circumstantial factors.

The strongest support for monitoring teaching and learning occurs where there is a shared vision (Bush et al., 2009; 2008; Bush and Glover, 2009). In school A the school principal was keen to demonstrate a commitment to academic goals, more so than principal school B. This agrees with Leithwood et al., (2006) that school principals as instructional leaders in challenging schooling contexts need to devise a system of monitoring teaching and learning that is learner-centred amongst the school staff that can inspire the educators. When visions are value-laden, they can lead to increased commitment from the educators and provide compelling purposes for continual professional growth (Hallinger & Heck, 2002). Bush et al., (2009) argues that a learning-centred vision in South Africa needs to begin with an audit of the context served by the school, of maps of the socio-economic background of the community and how it relates to the role of the school and the needs of learners.

Evidence from the study seems to that suggest the school principals in each of schools have different ways of carrying out their monitoring activities. Thus it could be of future research interest to find out the causes of differences in instructional leadership practice in such learning contexts. It creates a need to fill in the gaps in leadership practice research to explore how differences in interpretation of leadership practice and pedagogical knowledge would affect practice. explanations of why still school principals play a limited role in the monitoring of teaching and learning in schools in spite of having a learning-centred vision need to be sought. Studies by Hallinger & Heck (1996a, 1996b); Glickman et al, (2001); Ogawa & Hart, (1985); Bush et al, (2009); Dimmock & Lee (1999); Marks & Printy, (2003), Morrison, (1995); Bush & Wise (1999); Spillane (2006); Harris (1999; 2001) all seek to find answers to this question.

School principals as instructional leaders are expected to provide direction through actions that demonstrate their expectations for quality and high performance from educators (Leithwood et al., 2006). In challenging schooling contexts school principals must challenge underperformance, ensuring appropriate corrective action and follow-up. As leading professionals in the school, principals are expected to lead by example and setting high expectations which can assist educators see the nature of the goals being pursued, while also

making it clear that expectations are feasible (Podsakoff et al., 1990). However, there is little empirical evidence to describe how this is enacted by school principals.

In both schools A and B there are structures that oversee the monitoring of teaching and learning in the schools. In school A the school principal depends on the two deputy school principals and the HoDs to monitor the educators in the classes and report any difficulties to the school principal's office. In school B the school principal similarly depends on the two deputy school principals and the HoDs to monitor the educators in the classes. The only difference is that in school A the HoDs are more effective in their roles in comparison to the HoDs in school B. This agrees with Hallinger & Heck, (1996a) that certain school structures, leadership roles and conditions contribute to instructional innovation. School principals as instructional leaders must assist other educators in the classrooms, and set direction by encouraging educators to develop goals that are shared (Leithwood et al., 2006). School principals working with the HoDs must encourage educators develop ways on how best the monitoring of teaching and learning can be carried out in the classrooms. In such challenging schooling contexts as the inner-city and township areas the school principals as instructional leaders working with other instructional leaders in the school through team work, collaborative initiatives and partnerships in strong learning communities, must be able to promote strategies to encourage high expectations and set challenging targets for achievement. School principals must ensure that educators have a full understanding of the national curriculum statement and posses attendant skills related to teaching, monitoring and evaluation.

Educators are motivated by goals that they find compelling and challenging but achievable (Ford, 1992). Having such goals help educators make sense of the school and craft an identity within their work context (Pittman, 1998; Thayer, 1988). This seems to accord with school A where the school principal is keen and skilful at working with the school educators to achieve the school goals of learning entrenched in the aims of monitoring teaching and learning in the classes in comparison to the school principal school B. In school B there is an indication that the school principal is struggling to mobilize educators to achieve agreed-upon school goals. The monitoring of teaching and learning is an educator's individual responsibility and contract of learning, co-visioning with school leadership vision of enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in the school. However in such scenarios school principals do not make clear who should do the actual monitoring of teaching and

learning in the classes. The main argument here is that the school principal as the leading instructional leader in the school has one goal which is to ensure that teaching and learning is properly taking place.

5.2.2 School principal roles

In both schools A and B the principals understand that their role in monitoring of teaching and learning but differ on how it should be carried out. They delegate the roles of monitoring teaching and learning to HoDs and deputy school principals. In school A the school principal follows up on the tasks assigned to the HoDs through the deputy principals; this is not the case in school B. This agrees with studies by Bush et al (2009), Hallinger & Heck (1996a, 1996b); Leithwood et al., (2006); Hallinger & Murphy, (1986); Lomotey (1989); Ingeroll (1999); Burns & Mason, (2002); Fin (2002); Nye, Hedges & Kanstantoulos (1999) that a school principal's actions do affect student achievement. In school B the school principal presumes that educators are working and only responds to issues forwarded to his office. Both school principals spend a great deal of time in the administration offices and seem not to provide direct assistance to educators; instead they send HoDs and deputy school principals to supervise the educators and report to the school principal's office. This agrees with Bush et al (2009); Hallinger & Heck, (1996a, 1996b); Glickman et al, (2001); Ogawa & Hart, (1985); Dimmock & Lee,(1999); Marks & Printy, (2003), Morrison, (1995); Bush & Wise,(1999); Spillane, (2006); Harris,(1999; 2001); Lambert, (2002); Hoadley, (2007) that school principals play a limited role in monitoring teaching and learning in the classrooms. Both the school principals in these schools operate an open-door policy in which educators are free to approach the school principal. This does not appear to be instrumental in the improvement of teaching and learning, which, according to studies, is dependent on classroom observation, feedback, and reflective dialogue (Rosenhltz & Simpson, 1990). Educators enter the school principals' offices only with issues that require clarification. However, considering the time spent in the principal's office little is known of the benefits of these interactions. Conference interaction between the school principal and educators is to help teachers reflect on and improve instruction (Cogan, 1973; Glickman et al, 2001). Yet studies of instructional conferences have raised questions about their contribution to collegiality and teacher growth (Roberts, 1991a, 1991b, 1992a, 1992b, 1994). Political power regimes can dramatically undermine conference success (Hargreaves, 1990; St.Maurice, 1987). In school A educators do not support any direct, controlling

strategies by the school principal on educator issues and are strongly unionised which is not the case in school B. This agrees with studies by Asby (1996) where principals minimise the level of resistance in the school by hiring educators whose values were consistent with theirs and those of the community. The main argument here is that the role of school principals as the leading professional instructional leaders in schools is to enhance the quality of teaching and learning and raise the level of learner achievement in any context. This agrees with studies by Louis & Smith, (1992); Rosenholtz, (1986); Leithwood & Riehl, (2006); McMoy & Reynolds, (1999); Finn, (2002); Nye, Hedges & Konostantoulos, (1999); Foster,(1995); Ladon-Biling, (1994); Newman, (2001); Dalin et al., (1992); Cooper and Good, (1983); Hoadly (2007) that school principals are the key to improved instruction, to which they cannot achieve if they continuously do not monitor the processes of teaching and learning in the schools, however how this is carried out from the study by each of the school principals in schools A and B seems to differ.

5.2.3 Curriculum Development

In schools A and B the school principals are the curriculum leaders in the school which agrees with Blasé & Blasé (1993); Hallinger & Murphy (1985); Glickman, (1985); Smith & Andrews, (1989); Lunenburg & Irby, (2006); Bryk et al,(2006); Day et al,(2000); Hubbard, Mehan & Stein, (2006) that school principals' involvement in curriculum fulfilment is vital for school improvement. However in schools A and B the school heads simply receive the national curriculum statements from the GDE and pass these on to the HoDs with educators under them to implement. In school A and B the school principals expect the HoDs to assist the other educators in case of difficulties in implementing aspects of the curriculum that may seem difficult. However in school B, school principal is not involved in the supervision of the actual implementation of the different subject curriculum in the classes and does not teach any classes. The supervision of work progress is delegated to the deputy school principal and the HoDs, who, due to other commitments elsewhere in other classes, rarely do classroom visits. In school A the school principal has a deputy school principal who supervises the implementation of the curriculum in the classes in conjunction with the HoDs. The school principal as an educator of the grades 10, 11, and 12 mathematics participates in the implementation.

What emerges from this discourse are two different leadership practices and behaviours in challenging learning contexts. In school A the school principal is actively participating in the monitoring activities in spite of delegating monitoring roles (a kind of delegative-active- collaborative-supervisory leadership practice) which is not the case of school principal B. In school B the school principal is passively involved in monitoring activities.
(a kind of delegative-passively indirectly-involved collaboration-supervisory leadership practice). The evidence in school B, this agrees with studies by Bush et al (2009); Hallinger & Heck, (1996a, 1996b); Glickman et al, (2001); Ogawa & Hart, (1985); Dimmock & Lee (1999); Marks & Printy (2003), Morrison, (1995); Bush & Wise (1999); Spillane, (2006); Harris (1999; 2001); Lambert (2002); Hoadley (2007) that school principals play a limited role in the day-to-day actual monitoring of the actual implementation of the school curriculum in the classes. However, this seems not entirely substantiated from the evidence from school A which portrays a school principal as actively participating in the monitoring activities of teaching and learning.

Curriculum development is the collective work of educators to select curriculum purpose, content, organization, and format that is appropriate to the needs of students and supportive of teacher's choice and commitment to implementation of the curriculum (Glickman et al., 2001). However, in such circumstances according to Glickman et al., (2001); Pajak, (1993); Smith & Andrew, (1989); Blase & Blase, (1993); Smith & Andrew (1989) school principals as instructional leaders are doing little to facilitate curriculum relevance. The main argument here is that as instructional leaders in such contexts, school principals need to be involved in the actual implementation of school curriculum through visible presence in the classrooms on a daily basis, experience firsthand what is going on in the classes then with other educators devise learning strategies and integrate them into the school curriculum (The South African Standard for School Leadership Draft Policy, 2005).

5.2.4 Professional development

Professional development is the continuous education of educators for the purpose of improving the quality of education in a school (Glickman et al., 2001). What emerges from this study is the different approaches towards professional development the two school principals are practising as part of their monitoring activities In school A the school principal does support the professional development of educators as long as it does not affect the daily planned lessons in the school time table. In school B the school principal claims to support the professional development of educators as long as it does not affect the daily planned lessons in the school time table. In school B the school principal does not hold educator workshops supported by the GDE on moderations, invigilation of examinations, assessments and the implementation of adjustments in the new curriculum. However, in school B the educators said that they do not receive substantial assistance geared towards professional development from the school principal and are left to make things work in the classrooms. The school principal school B believes that at the time of hiring the educators, qualified educators were selected therefore there is little need to invest in retraining the educators at the school's expense. In school A the school principal described that he holds educator workshops supported by the GDE on moderations, invigilation of examinations, assessments and the implementation of adjustments in the new curriculum. Educators are free to pursue further studies as long as it does affect the planned lessons in the school at their own cost.

The differences in approaches towards professional development of educators in challenging contexts raise the issues of how school principals grapple with school leadership and pedagogical knowledge and practice. Perhaps in such challenging learning contexts each school principal is cautious on how to navigate around this issue such that it does not jeopardize the teaching and learning process in the schools. This agrees with studies by Blasé & Blasé (1993); Leithwood et al,(2006) ; Glickman,(1985); Smith & Andrews (1989); McLaughlin & Talbert (2006); Lunenburg & Irby (2006) that school principals are vital for development of professional teacher learning. However, as seen from the study, conceptions differ on the importance of teacher professional development as part of monitoring teaching and learning. Thus it could be of interest for future research to look into how school principals in their different schooling contexts go about this. The main argument here is that

as the leading instructional leader in the school the school principal should champion teacher professional development since empowered teachers are able to function better.

5.2.5 Teacher collegiality

The aim of group development is support teachers as they work in collegial groups to improve their performance, in contrast to working alone or competitively. In both schools A and B the school principals depend on HoDs to facilitate group development amongst the educators in the school, in accordance with the suggestion of Glickman et al, (2001). As evidence from this study points out that there are differences in how each of school principals translate these expectations into practice as part of monitoring of teaching and learning.

The HoDs in school B do not set aside time to sit with the other educators and rarely observe educators teaching in the classes despite the principal's expectations that the HoDs work together with educators. The school principal never really follows up with the HoDs on how they are carrying out their actitives unless they report back. The HoDs have tended to be soft on the educators over disciplinary issues. Thus, whenever educators have issues to be resolved they go directly to the school principal. As a result educators are not able to benefit from the purpose of group development. Among other things, such group work is designed to develop the communication, decision-making, conflict-resolution and problem–solving abilities of teachers (Schmuck & Ruckel, 1994). Interestingly, educators in school B rarely spend quality time in the staffroom together. Since these educators do not participate in cluster meetings as compared to school educators in school A, educators rely on consultations with each other and HoDS, but rarely with the school principal. In School B the school leadership never enters educator classes and educators are left to teach alone. The school principal depends on the reports of HoDs and learner class monitors to understand what is going on in the classes. In school B the educators seem to talk to each other and are not unionised. However, it is difficult to describe the purposes of these interactions as collegial, collaborative and oriented towards professional community development.

In school A, staff meetings are held every week and educators chair the meetings in rotation to encourage teacher leadership and participation. Educators are affiliated to teacher unions, participate in rotated weekly staff meetings, have cluster meetings with other educators which can be termed as collegial, collaborative and oriented towards professional community. The educators' staffroom in school A is easily accessible by educators and they tend to enjoy spending time there talking to each other. In school A, educators have little say in decision-making on administrative issues, but are permitted to set continuous assessments and summative assessments which have to be moderated by the HoDs who submit these reports to the school principals. In School A there is a high administratively controlled collegial effort geared towards ensuring that teaching and learning is taking place which is not the case in school B. In school A the school principal facilitates educator collegial activities while in school B the school principal is not keen on participating in educator's activities unless it involves the learners.

In schools A and B school principals as the leading instructional leaders expect educators to plan and teach lessons as per the timetable; they encourage professional development as long as it does not interfere with the teaching and learning in the classes. Educators have limited decision-making powers with respect to instructional matters which agrees to some extent with studies by Blasé & Blasé (2000); Hargreaves, (1994); Louis & Kruse, (1996); Newman & Wehlage, (1995) that teachers can exercise powers over certain aspects of planning, teaching, professional growth, and decision-making with respect to instructional matters have come under teacher control (Blasé & Blasé, 2000; Hargreaves, 1994; Louis & Kruse, 1996 Newman & Wehlage, 1995). In this study there seems to agreement on what is expected from the educators by the two different school principals however how this is carried out differs in each of the schools. In school A the school principal seems to encourage active collaborative working relationships between the educators, HoDS and the school leadership in the monitoring of teaching and learning which is not the case in school B. In school B the centering of all school activities around the school principal makes the school principal autocratic in nature. This agrees with Reitzug, (1997) that collaborative inquiry supplants principal-centred supervisory practices. In school A the different identities the school principal takes in the staff meetings as an educator first, then as head teacher has enabled both educators and the school leadership to engage in constructive debates on how best to improve teaching and learning in the classes which according to Blasé & Blasé,

(1999) is important because there is need for school principals and teachers to discuss alternatives rather than directives or criticisms and work together as communities of learners in service to learners. However there is need more research to understand how school principals in such unique learning contexts practice teacher collegiality.

In school A the school principal is keen on accomplishing the schools vision of ensuring that teaching and learning is taking place in the classes in comparison to the school principal in school B. This supports studies by Leithwood et al., (2006) that school principals as instructional leaders must be skilled communicators, to be able to identify, and articulate visions well, to focus attention and frame issues in ways that will lead to productive discourse and decision making (Bennis, 1984; Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996). School principals as instructional leaders must make educators understand why they need to make the monitoring of teaching and learning a success in school. Educators should not be afraid of the processes of monitoring in the classes. Through developing communities of professional practice and learning where educator collaboration, participation, professional development, empowerment are enhanced, anxiety about the monitoring processes can be dealt with.

The main argument here is that the school principals as the leading instructional leader in such learning contexts must lead the development of teacher learning communities where teachers share their teaching experiences, learn better ways of teacher performance and how to improve learner achievement. To date, however, there is little empirical evidence to describe how this is enacted by school principals.

5.2.6 Caring and response

The South African Standard for School Leadership Draft Policy (2005) emphasizes that every school exists within a particular social and economic community that has a direct influence on and is influenced by the school. Just as the wider community in which the school is located represents a source of resources and support for the school, so the school itself can play a vital role in the well-being and development of its wider community. School improvement and community development are therefore, interdependent processes. The school principal, working with the school governing body and the school management team, should work to build collaborative relationships and partnership within and between the internal and external school communities for the mutual benefit of each.

In schools A and B the school principals have shown understanding and concern of the effect of students' background and how it could affect their academic performance. However, there are differences on how they have approached this issue as individual schools. The community served by the two case study schools experience a range of health problems, poverty, and unemployment. This has had negative impact on the learners characterised by a high rate of learner absence from lessons and other schooling activities. In terms of resources, School B does not have a science laboratory for the science subjects, no school library, no school text books for the learners available to learners per subject. The classes are overcrowded and noisy which disrupts the classes next door. As a result of overcrowding, it is difficult for students to pay attention to the teaching that is taking place. This gives the impression that school B there has weak school leadership. In school A there is only one science laboratory to cater for all the learners in the school which is too small. The majority of learners in the cases do not use the language of instruction (English) within the school compounds and in the classrooms educators switch languages during instruction more in school A than school B. This agrees with studies by Fleisch (2008) that English is a foreign language, a contributory factor for low standards of literacy.

Studies by Fleisch (2008) and Leithwood et al., (2006) posit that school principals must understand their schooling contexts and work effectively with all constituencies to foster shared understanding (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Daft, 1992). The findings from this study provide evidence to support this analysis and studies by Dillard, (1995) Englert, (1993); Gezi, (1990) and Fleisch (2008), that social conditions associated with poverty, such as residential mobility, family breakups, and poor health, certainly are likely to affect student's ability to focus and do well.

Powerlessness breeds inaction which agrees with studies by Fleisch (2008) that in such challenging situations school principals tend to rationalise and justify learner failure. According Smyth's (1997) model of instructional leadership of using classroom interaction to achieve a just and democratic world, school principals as instructional leaders must serve as an integrative tool in the school. No one else has the authority and credibility to act this role. This agrees with Lomotey (1989) that school principals need to go an extra mile to achieve school success. Blasé & Anderson, (1995) suggest that each school must forge its own approach to democratic and empowering leadership. To achieve this school principals

need to develop collaborative leadership approaches that approach teachers, parents, community members and other constituents to support and advance the school in ways to frequently counter past strategies that promoted isolation, limited or unequal participation, and bureaucratic and authoritarian ideas.

The South African Standard for School Leadership Draft Policy (2005) argues in such challenging schooling contexts school as principals find themselves, they have to explain to educators that the purposes of monitoring schooling goes beyond the teaching and learning. They have to show educators that their contributions are linked to and related to the school's wider community and are valuable, important and possible. This supports studies by Glickman et al., (2001) that action research is the integrating task for school-level instructional improvement whereby educators conduct studies of their activities. According to Glickman et al., (2001) model of instructional leadership, school principals need to be proactive through applying evidenced based research to deal with issues that may spill over and affect the teaching and learning in the school. School principals must facilitate the creation of conditions that promote student motivation. They need to challenge ideas about deprivation and dysfunctionality in student's homes. There is an abundance of knowledge in the households where students live which calls for challenging notions that those learners in such learning contexts are not motivated to learn (Moll, & Diaz, 1987; Moll & Greenberg, 1990; Moll et.al., 1992). Showing respect for learners requires appreciation of the circumstances affecting their learning (Cooney, 2006). This agrees with Bush et al., (2009) that while school principals cannot address all these problems, there is need for them to be aware of the ways in which these issues affect learning and teaching. Studies by Ofsted, (2003,b) that strong leadership and management are very important in bringing improvement in schools, particularly in schools which are implementing special programmes to address low achievement and social inclusion, are powerfully relevant to the situations found in both schools A and B, but particularly in school B.

The main argument here is that it is the school principals' prerogative as leading professional instructional leader in such challenging learning contexts to work out their own way of monitoring teaching and learning to make things work. This agrees with Reyes & Wagstaff (1999) that leadership is always provided within a context; therefore, leadership needs to be context-specific. Context-specific leadership can be provided only by those who are deeply knowledgeable about the school, the community in which the school is located,

the professional and nonprofessional staff of the school, the student population, and the relationship between the school and central administration.

5.3. The dominant tools and tasks school principals use to monitor teaching and learning

5.3.1 Lesson Observation

In both schools A and B the school principals claim to monitor educators. This shows that each of the school principals have they own notion of monitoring teaching and learning in the classes. There is evidence that in school B the school principal does not visit classes as part of monitoring teaching and learning and instead opts to rely on the deputy school principal and the HoDs to monitor the processes of teaching and learning in the classes. In school A the school principal does not visit the classes on a regular basis unless called upon which is rare, for fear of victimization. Instead class visits are rarely carried out by the deputy school principal and only when educators voice dissatisfaction with particular learner behaviour in the classes. In school A collegial classroom observations are rarely carried out and in most cases only the HoDs and the deputy school principals are involved while in school B it does not occur. HoDs claim to surprise classes in cases of reported learner dissatisfaction about teacher delivery. However, this is difficult to substantiate. Also, educators always try to justify incompetence.

The study findings support Bush et al., (2008) that monitoring involves visiting classrooms, observing teachers at work and providing them with feedback. This agrees with Southworth, (2004) that monitoring classrooms is part of school leadership and it is a widely distributed role, including the head teacher, deputies and heads of department. Findings from the study further confirm studies by Bush et al (2008) that cross checking educator's portfolios and learners' work increases performance, and agrees with the English Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted, 2003) that there is a strong link between very good monitoring and good teaching. In scenarios without monitoring control mechanisms, according to Sebring & Bryk, (2000); Pajak, (1993); Glickman, (2001); Schion (1988); Murphy, (1990) there is no quality control of educator outcomes.

The school principal as an instructional leader must stress that the aim of monitoring teaching and learning is not to de-professionalise and victimise educators not performing well in such challenging contexts but to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. The abuse and misconception of the monitoring process in the classrooms is the reason why educators are anxious of the process. School principals as leading instructional leaders in schools are not participating in classroom observations which could explain why schools in such contexts are seen as dysfunctional. Surprisingly these schools boast high pass rates and the question remains how these schools in such learning contexts are able to produce such results without monitoring of what the educators are doing in the classes. It may be that school leadership practice that it is informed by data on students' learning, progress and achievements as well as indirect knowledge of teaching practices and classroom dynamics, is effective.

In spite of the importance of lesson observation to teaching and learning, the study indicates that school principals often relegate the practice to heads of department which agrees with Bush et al., (2008) that lesson monitoring appears to be sporadic and unsystematic activity, restricted by the lack of time available to heads of departments (HoDs) and the lingering belief that it is discouraged by the educator unions. The issue here is that the school principals as functional leaders cannot afford to stand back and wait for others to check on how educators are doing their work, but must be proactive and dynamic in the continuous monitoring of lessons.

5.3.2 Modelling and mentoring

Leithwood & Riehl (2006) urges that school principals exert leadership for developing educators by setting examples for others to follow that are consistent with the school values and goals. Modelling provides a clear guide for growth and action; it enhances educators' beliefs about their own abilities and their sense of efficacy. In each of the two schools the school principals have different ways of modelling and mentoring as a way of monitoring teaching and learning.

In school B the school principal does not teach any classes in the school, but trusts subject educators, relies on the deputy school principal and HoDs to handle teacher concerns of instructional practice. In such situations according to Sebring & Bryk (2000); Pajak (1993); Glickman (2001) educators do not benefited from the school principal's presence in the school. In school A the school principal purposely teaches specific classes, namely grades 11 and 12 mathematics and participates in capacity building meetings for examination cluster meetings, staffroom meetings, alongside educators. By modelling certain instructional practices, school principal school A is leading by example.

Findings from the study confirm studies by Glickman et al, (2001), Bush and Glover (2009) that modelling does provide the potential for demonstrating good practice and generalising it throughout the school. In school A the HoDs of as part of their leadership practice orient new educators such that they can fit into the school system which agrees with Lataille–Demore (2007) that good practice has to be acknowledged and then emulated by others willing to learn. This agrees with Leithwood & Riehl (2006) that school principals support educators by showing respect and concern about their personal feelings and needs. This assures educators that problems faced while operating in such schools will be taken seriously and help will be offered (Louis, Toole & Hargreaves, 1999). Studies by McColl-Kennedy & Anderson (2002) suggest that a leader's personal attention to employers increases levels of enthusiasm and optimism, reduces frustration, transmits a sense of mission, and indirectly increases performance. However there is need explore how in different learning contexts school principals model teaching and learning as a way of monitoring teaching and learning in the schools.

The crucial argument here is that the school principal in such challenging schooling situations must model high professional standards, intervene in a supportive or manner corrective manner when this seems necessary, observe and reinforce positive educator behaviours in the classrooms that ensure an academically demanding climate and an orderly, well-managed classroom. Simply orienting new educators into school contexts does not mean mentoring or modelling by the school leaders. This agrees with Bush et al (2008a) that modelling is rarely used in South Africa. However, if used, it would address crucial issues in teacher education in the South African educational system.

5.3.3 Data management

Findings from the study agree with Houlihan (2002) and Mason(2002) that school principals are expected to know how to learn from student's data, examine assessment results to identify problems and plan appropriate instructional interventions, Lunenburg and Irby (2006) believe that school principals need to disaggregate student achievement data, track the achievement of all students over time, and the No Child Left behind Act, ([NCLB], U.S. Department of Education, 2002) shows that this dramatically increases the school principal's accountability toward student's data. In schools A and B school principals rely on student data compiled by the GDE. However, they ignore the continuous data from the numerous class assessments and learners activities in the school which could be a good indicator of the learner's progress. This agrees with Datnow et al., (2007) that alongside supporting a dynamic use of data to inform school-level practices, reflections and actions, it is important as well to develop mutual accountability in system-school relationships, involving shared responsibility between schools and system leaders, developing a trusting relationship a two way communication flow between schools and central offices. The lack of active involvement of principals in schools A and B has it made it difficult for them track learner performance.

On the other hand, the daily use of registers has enabled the school principals to keep track on the learner and educator attendance. In schools A and B the class educators' participation in the construction of continuous assessments and evaluations with their HoDs has enabled them to track learner progression in the grades they are teaching which agrees with Hargreaves (2005) that assessment of learning measures and pupil attainment against stated targets, informs the steps in teaching and learning planning. It acts as a basis of feedback for improvement, and as an evidence for teachers to learn about pupils' learning; it also acts as a basis for children to take some control over their own learning, and provides an opportunity to turn assessment into a learning event. In school B the school principal does not teach or participate in continuous and summative assessments of learners in comparison to the school principal A who teaches on a daily basis. The school principal of school A is more informed about what is going on in the classes than school principal B. In such scenarios, according to Glickman (1985), the school principal in school B as instructional leader may not be in position to correctly interpret student data from numerous assessments throughout the schooling calendar.

The main argument here is that the school principal as the leading instructional leader in the school is expected to know how to learn from student's data, examine assessment results to identify problems and plan appropriate instructional interventions (Lunenburg and Irby, 2006). The ability to make things work in the school depends upon school principal's preparedness and commitment to act in such contexts.

5.4 How school principal monitors teaching and learning in the school

5.4.1 Developing instructional leaders through sharing leadership

Evidence from the study indicates in schools A and B school principals in such challenging learning contexts have differing ways and means of sharing responsibilities with deputies, HoDs and educators over certain aspects of the monitoring of teaching and learning. The evidence suggests that school principals relegate the responsibility monitoring of teaching and learning to their subordinates, the deputy school principals, HoDs, educators in the school, which supports studies by Bush et al., (2009) that the responsibility for managing teaching and learning is shared amongst schools principals, school management teams (SMTs), heads of departments, and classroom educators. This study claims that educators manage curriculum implementation in their classrooms; HoDs have the responsibility for ensuring effective teaching and learning across their learning areas or phases, while school principals and school management teams have a whole-school role (ibid).

This evidence also agrees with studies by Bush et al., (2009); Bush and Glover, (2009); Rhodes & Brundrett (in press); NCSL, (2007) that HoDs have an important role to play in the management of teaching and learning, within the school-wide strategy established by the principal and the SMT. The middle managers' role is focussed on sub-units, based on learning areas or school phases, while school principal and SMT take a school-wide view., that middle managers develop learning-centred leadership in schools, middle leaders should lead teaching and learning through modelling, monitoring dialogue and setting up structures and systems.

This agrees with Blase & Kirby (2000) that school principals as instructional leaders provide opportunities for teacher growth, but teachers are also responsible to for seizing these opportunities. In school A when interviewed the deputy school principal said that the he depended on the team of HoDs and the deputy school principals to supervise the work of educators on a daily basis. The school principal school A instructs the HoDs on how to supervise the work of educators in their departments and provides adapted school assessment guidelines and tools for educators from the GDE to guide them on how to monitor the work of educators periodically in order to improve learner performance. Whenever HoDs go to any classroom for classroom visits and observation, they are expected to go with assessment tools as evidence of monitoring. This agrees with Rosenlum, Louis, & Rossmiller (1994) that as instructional leaders, school principals invest teachers with resources and instructional support; Prestine & Brown (1993) and that teacher's participation in shared instructional leadership occurs informally as well as being manifest in formal roles.

Poole (1995) states that the school principal becomes less of an inspector of teacher competence and more a facilitator of teacher growth, whereas the school principal remains the educational leader of the school, teachers who have requisite expertise or information, exercise leadership collaboratively with the school principal; Reitzug (1997) suggests that collaborative inquiry supplants principal-centred supervisory practices. As teachers inquire together, they encourage each other toward answers for instructional problems; Blase & Blase (1999) feels that leadership for instruction emerges from both the principal and the teachers when teachers interact with principals as they engage in these activities. This leads to the reporting of positive changes in teachers' pedagogical practices. Principals and teachers both play a part in forging an effective leadership relationship. Principals and teachers discuss alternatives rather than directives or criticisms and work together as communities of learners in service to learners. However, relegation of monitoring roles without supervision as seen in school B could breed complacency and under performance.

It is important to realise that the delegation of some aspects of leadership positions to teachers based on competence did not make the school principal less effective. The distribution of leadership positions did not constitute the sharing of the principal's positional role in the school as the CEO. In school B the school principal felt it sufficient when other staff members coordinated the monitoring of teaching and learning in the school as long as it did not involve dealing with budgeting school finances. In school A the school principal felt comfortable when educators were actively involved in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classes but educators were not included in the financial decision making and budgeting of the school. What emerged is that the school principals in schools A and B each devised monitoring structures that are convenient and are able to deliver in such distinctive leaning contexts. There are differences on how each of these school principals shared leadership activities during the process of monitoring teaching and learning. In school A the school principal has leadership monitoring structure however the school principal is seen actively participating alongside other educators in cluster meetings and is answerable to other subject HoDs without really jeopardizing the school principal's authority. In school B though the school principal has a similar school monitoring structure, the school principal is answerable only to school board and not accountable to other subject HoDs since the school principal is not involved in the teaching of classes.

When interviewed the deputy school principal of administration in school A said: *You cannot tell the difference between the educator staff and the school principal – we work as a team, but the school principal does everything…* In school B when interviewed the school principal said: *If I want to know what is going on in the classes, I ask the subject heads and HoDs and even the class monitors to tell me what is happening in the classrooms. Class monitors monitor educators per week, HoDs monitor learner's books. The deputy school principals and HoDs do most of the work; still we work as a team. Monitoring is also done by district officials so the school must always be ready.*

In such school leadership scenarios it is difficult to identify which kind of leadership practice is being used by the school principals. In school A the school principal leadership practices and behaviour has traces of shared leadership, distributed leadership transformational leadership and democratic leadership. While in school B the school principal leadership practices has characteristics of autocratic leadership, shared leadership and distributed leadership.

Shared leadership often is confused with distributed leadership, democratic leadership, and transformational leadership. Transformational leadership focuses on problem finding, problem solving, and collaboration with stakeholders with the goal of improving school performance and its members to achieve these results. Transformational leadership seeks to raise participants' level of commitment (Burns, 1978), to encourage them in reaching their fullest potential (Bass & Avolio, 1993), and to support them in transcending their own self-interest for a larger good (Bass & Avolio, 1993); Leithwood, Tomlinson, & Genge, 1996; Sagor & Barnett, 1994; Silins, Muford, Zarins & Bishop, 2000). Transformational leadership affirms the centrality of the school principal's reform role, particularly in introducing innovation and shaping organizational culture (Conley, & Goldman, 1994; Leithwood, 1994). While concentrating on renewing the organization and its personnel, however, transformational leadership lacks explicit focus on curriculum and instruction (Hallinger & Leithwood, 1998). Transformational leadership and shared instructional leadership are complementary. This perspective acknowledges the value of multiple leaders, and it in no way negates the critical role of the school principal. This perspective on distributive leadership is a conceptual lens or diagnostic frame for examining leadership and management in school. It provides a framework for identifying the multiple ways in which leadership and management practice can influence instructional practice. However, the idea that school leadership is distributed among educators in schools, as well as incumbent within certain roles, is not new. While distributed leadership is an appealing construct, clear conceptions remain elusive (Prestine & Nelson, 1998).

While the cases in schools A and B acknowledge the central role of the school principal, they also reveal the important role that other leaders play in monitoring teaching and learning in the school. While the shared instructional leadership perspective focuses attention on the possibility that anyone in the school could be engaged in the work of monitoring teaching and learning in the classes, it does assume that everyone is or even could be an instructional leader. This agrees with Blase & Blase, (1999) that leadership for instruction emerges from both the principal and the teachers as they discuss alternatives rather directives or criticisms and work together as communities of learners in service to learners. In school A where educators at times lead staff meetings, participate in disciplinary meetings, invigilation of examinations, and cluster moderations, it did not make them question the authority of the school principal. As in the case of school A, if teachers are to develop as instructional leaders, it does not happen by decree. Instead, they need

opportunities to develop as instructional leaders, and this often involves work on the part of the school principal as the leading instructional leader in the school. As showed in school A, the school principal assigned educators to be class educators, and educators were selected weekly to lead staff meetings in the staffroom in which the school principals and deputies all participate in their different capacities. This agrees with Blasé & Blasé (1999) that as school principals participate and contribute importantly to these communities, they promote teacher reflection and professional growth. When educators interact with school principals as they engage in these activities, the teachers experience changes in their pedagogical practices.

There is need to understand how shared instructional school leadership functions in challenging schooling contexts and how it is operationalised in specific sites. The question that then comes into focus is: how do schooling discourses legitimate certain forms of leaders while marginalising others? The main argument here is that the school principal in such challenging learning contexts is not the sole instructional leader but the leader of instructional leaders. The school principal and the educators as instructional leaders share responsibility for staff development, curriculum development, and supervision of instructional tasks. To date, however, there is little empirical evidence to describe how this is enacted by school principals in other schooling contexts.

5.4.2 Improving the school instructional culture of monitoring teaching and learning

In these schools the school principals seem to make considerable effort into relying on class monitors to report on the what and how is the teaching is going on in the classes, mobilising parents, religious leaders, motivational speakers to talk to learners, practical handling of stubborn learners and dealing with learners abusing drugs in the school premises, looking and running after learners not attending classes. Evidence from the study posits that each of the school principals in schools A and B have their own way of cultivating the cultures teaching and learning as a way monitoring the teaching and learning process.

This tends to support studies by Bush et al., (2009) which contend that producing profound changes in teaching and learning requires more than just the sensitive application of management strategies such as evaluation, monitoring, observation and modelling. It requires a cultural shift so that all stakeholders understand the reasons for such changes. These findings also support the needs raised by Southworth, (2004) that the kind of culture needed in schools today should be characterised by collaboration and shared leadership as

well as a strong focus on learning for adults as well as students. Successful learning cultures feature professional dialogue, with educators, and school leadership sharing their experiences, within and beyond their classrooms. Studies by Motala and Pampallis (2001) emphasise the need to promote teaching and learning and claimed that the most important but neglected resource in teaching and learning is the teacher. They add that the achievement of a quality education continues to be an enormous challenge in South Africa. The restoration of a culture of teaching and learning becomes increasing urgent.

These findings resonate with studies by Deventer and Kruger (2003) which state that one of the major problems facing school principals is the creation of a sound culture of teaching and learning in which effective teaching can take place; studies by Coleman (2003) show that promoting effective learning, teaching and encouraging a culture of learning have wide implications for those involved in the management of the school. These include staff development. Bush et al., (2009) urge that changing school cultures has to be a deliberate process, intended to achieve specific results such as enhanced learner outcomes. Culture is usually deeply embedded and is difficult to shift particularly if, as in most South African schools, most educators have substantial experience in the same school and are used to working in certain way. It takes an external force or threat to produce new patterns of working. Bush et al., (2009) continues to argue that another possible stimulus for cultural change is the appointment of a new principal, when stake holders may be expecting innovation. It may not be by chance that school renewal of school A coincided with the appointment of current principal. When interviewed the school principal said,

When I was appointed principal I decided I had to something to turn the school around and I started by motivating the educators. I had been at the school as a teacher so they (teaching staff) knew what type of person I was. Admittedly I had to a lot of spade work to do try and win these people over, as many were lagging behind, but once they saw I was committed to do the task they decided to support me.

This agrees with studies by Leithwood & Jantzi, (1990); Skalbeck, (1991) that school principal's influence school culture through practices aimed at developing shared norms, values beliefs, and attitudes and promoting mutual caring and trust among staff. A strong school culture draws educators together around the goals being pursued by the school and the values and beliefs underlying the goals. The schooling contexts in each of these schools are quite different which makes monitoring of teaching and learning a contested issue, De Clercq (2007). In school A the monitoring of teaching and learning is sensitive as it is tied to performance which makes it restricted to the deputy school principal and HoDS only with the consent of the school principal. However this is not the case in school B.

According to Louis, Kruse, and Associates, (1995) school principals can redesign school cultures through changes in staff and task assignments, the scheduling and design of time and space, routine, operating procedures, and the deployment of technology and other material resources, all of which can hinder or enable individual performance and the accomplishment of school goals. Successful school principals direct structural changes to establish positive conditions for teaching and learning. This agrees with studies by Garcia (1995); Knapp & Woolverton (1995); Ogbu, (1995); Reyes, Velaz & Pena, (1993) that without attending to distinctive contributions of culture, educational efforts with learners are likely to unsuccessful. This agrees with studies by Sleegers, Geijsel, & van den Borg, (2002) that school principals work to enhance school performance by providing opportunities for educators to participate in decision making about issues that affect them and for which their knowledge is crucial. Such involvement assures staff that they can shape the school context to meet their own needs relative to goal accomplishment. The only problem in some of these schools is that some school cultures do not last once the school principal leaves the school or is transferred. This creates need for more contextual studies to explore how school cultures are preserved.

Lastly, the findings support the propositions raised in the South African Standard for School Leadership Draft Policy (2005), that the school principal needs to know about the National Curriculum Statement and the values and goal which shape it, practices of teaching and learning which support the delivery of the National Curriculum Statement, accessing and utilising resources to support teaching and learning, strategies for the effective monitoring and evaluation of the performance in relation to the National Curriculum Statement, methods of accumulating data, and data analysis, relevant to monitoring and evaluating

performance in relation to the National Curriculum Statement. To be able to realise this the school principal as the leading professional instructional leader in the school must be able to ensure that teaching and learning are at the heart of the schools strategic planning and management of all resources, facilitate the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of all classroom practice, ensure that sound data at class and school level is collected and used to inform the continuous monitoring and evaluation of teaching and learning together with learner progress and achievement. However it is important to realise that in such dire situations school principals perform many roles outside their normal duties to make teaching and learning take place which are often not recognised. In school A the school principal calls it "spade work" in school B the school calls it "running up and down". This agrees with Sebring & Bryk, (2000) notions of instructional leadership that actions orientation theoretically encompasses everything a principal does during the day to support the achievement of learners and the ability of educators to teach.

The cardinal arguments here are that the school principal as an instructional leader should develop and maintain progressive school cultures that create conditions that facilitate teaching and learning in such schooling contexts. The school principal must know what do and how to do it in such learning contexts. They must know how to skilfully integrate students' backgrounds through proactive inclusive school cultures that stimulate learning. They need to challenge notions that students in deprived conditions of learning are not motivated to learn. However, there is little empirical evidence to describe how this is enacted by school principals.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY

6.1 introduction

This chapter is set out to present the conclusions, recommendations, summary and areas of further study in the study.

6.2 Summary of major findings

The study set to find out the role of school principals in monitoring teaching and learning in an inner-city and township secondary schools. The major findings of the study were: firstly the role of school principals as instructional leaders in monitoring teaching and learning is supervision which entails leadership roles in curriculum supervision, educator professional development, collegiality, care and response the school principals as instructional leaders. Secondly in each of the unique different schooling contexts the school principals use different methods of monitoring teaching and learning .The differences arise in the application of unique contextual supervisory monitoring tactics and strategies to make learning and teaching possible in such of different challenging learning contexts. Thirdly the school principals differentially minimally participate in the monitoring of teaching and learning and rely on feedback from classroom observations and learner data collected by the deputy school principals, heads of departments / subject heads and class educators to monitor learner performance. The differences in participation seem to emerge from the challenging learning contexts these school principals are faced with on daily basis.

6.3 Conclusion

The goals of monitoring teaching and learning in the classrooms in challenging schooling contexts is to improve the quality of learner achievement and from the study the school principals fully understand this. The role of the school principals in monitoring teaching and learning in such situations is to ensure that these goals are attained and evidence from the study indicates that the school principals acknowledge. However, there are differences in how each of the school principals in schools A and B operationalise these goals in these

unique challenging learning contexts. In each of these schools the school principal have devised distinctive working methods of monitoring teaching and learning in the schools. The differences in leadership monitoring practice and behaviour between the two school principals seems to be context-based. The greater role of monitoring teaching and learning is relegated to the deputy school principals, HoDs, senior educators, and even class learner monitors. In carrying out the roles of monitoring teaching and learning, these school principals tend be bureaucratic through delegation of roles to be done and completed tasks reported back to them. The monitoring of teaching and learning is a delegated shared responsibility amongst the deputy school principals, HoDs, and senior educators who are expected to provide feedback to the school principals. The school principals depend on feedback to take action and respond to issues brought to their attention as their considered monitoring roles.

The school principals in schools A and B prefer to concentrate on administrative issues that tend to affect the overall running of the school than actual monitoring of the teaching and learning processes in the classes. The school principals in the study rely on class observations by others, formative and summative assessments and, modelling practices to monitor teaching and learning in the schools. The use of monitoring tools is left in the hands of the deputy school principals, senior educators and HoDs to use and provide feedback to the school principal of what is happening in classes. The lack of active participation makes it difficult to effectively monitor teaching and learning in such learning contexts. If school principals are to bring about instructional improvement, they cannot afford not to participate in the monitoring of teaching and learning. This agrees with studies by (Ofsted, 2003); Reyes, Scribner & Scriber (1999) that school leaders are key to instructional improvement in schools in challenging situations. School principals need to focus more on teaching and learning, if schools and learner achievement are to experience instructional improvement in learning contexts.

6.4 Recommendations

The starting point is developing a vision for the school that places learning and teaching at the centre. School principal and their SMTs need to set out clear expectations of their learners and educators, and demonstrate good practice in their own teaching and leadership activities. The major tools for monitoring teaching and learning are observation, assessments and modelling. School principals should provide good models in terms of lesson preparation, subject knowledge assessment, and pedagogic approaches. School principals should monitor educators work in systematic way and provide constructive feedback.

School climate has to promote a positive approach to learning among all stakeholders, learners, educators, parents and the local community. School principals should learn how to negotiate and navigate such challenging schooling contexts without excuses to justify school dysfunctionality.

School leadership needs to be context-specific, which requires a deep knowledge about the school, the community in which the school is located, the professional and non-professional staff of the school, the student population, and the relationship between the school and central administration.

6.5 Areas for further study

As this is a case study there is room for replication of the study for generalisation of findings under different schooling contexts. There is need to determine how school principals can participate more in monitoring teaching and learning in the schools. Research is needed to explore why school principals prefer spending more time doing administrative school work than monitoring teaching and learning. Further studies are needed to explore how school principals succeed in sharing their leadership roles in the monitoring of teaching and learning without affecting the quality of teaching and learning. There is a need to develop detailed case studies where learners of diverse backgrounds are located. Researchers need to determine how school principals within diverse schools encourage teacher leadership and remove barriers so that teachers can take on leadership roles in the school. How school principals lead in high-stake environments is critical to the success of

learner learning, particularly in inner-city and township secondary schools. Research can determine how such challenges can be used to provide opportunities for learner learning particularly for economically disadvantaged children and children of migrants. There is need to continue the works of Bush et al., (2009) and Flesich, (2008) to understand notions and role school leadership plays in approaching the challenges and the issues within accountability-oriented policy contexts. This research should feed the discussion surrounding the effectiveness of national educational policies that are designed to insure access, equity, integration and citizenship in learning outcomes. As school principals go about building networks to sustain diverse learners in challenging teaching and learning contexts, what types of relationships do school principals develop with their communities to support student learning? How do school principals monitor teaching and learning in social contexts that are breeding grounds for racial bias like inner-city and township areas in South African cities and how do they navigate racial prejudice and other divisive issues that bias people?

REFERENCES

Anthony S. Bryk and Barbara Schneider (2004) Trust in Schools. A Core Resource for improvement .New York, Russell foundation.

Barr, R., & Dreeben, R. (1983) *How schools work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bascia, N., (1997) *Invisible leadership*: Teachers union activity in schools. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 43(2-3), 69-85.

Banner, D.K., & Gagne`, T.E. (1995) Designing effective organizations: *Traditional and transformational views* .Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Blase, J., (1993) The micropolitics of effective school–based leadership: Teachers` perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 29(2), 142-163.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999) Principals` instructional leadership and teacher development: Teacher perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35,349-378.

Blase, J., &Kirby, P. (2000) Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do. Thousand Oaks, CA: Crown Press.

Bidwell. B.J., & Kasarda, J.D. (1980) Conceptualising and measuring the effects of school and schooling. *American Journal of Education,* 88,401-430.

Brophy, J., & Good, T.L. (1986) Teacher behaviour and student achievement. In M.C.Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp.318-375). New York: Macmillan.

Brown, J.S., & Duiguid, P. (1991) Organizational Learning and communities of practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organisation Science*, 2, 40-57.

Brown, M., Rutherford. D. & Boyle. B. (2000) Leadership for school improvement: The role of the head of department in UK secondary schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 11(2), 237-258.

Bryk, A.S., & Driscoll, M.E. (1988) *The school as community: Theoretical foundations, contextual influences, and consequences for students and teachers.*.Madison: University of Wisconsin, National Center for Effective Secondary Schools.

Bryk, A.S., &Schneider, B. (2002) *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Burns, R., &Mason, D. (1998) Class formation and composition in elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35, 739-772.

Burns, R., &Mason, D. (2002) Class composition and student achievement in elementary Schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(1), 207-233.

Bush, T., and Heystek. J. (2006) *School Leadership and Management in South Africa: Principals Perception* International studies in Educational Administration 34 (2) 63-76.

Bush, T. and Glover. D. (2009) *Managing teaching and learning* A Concept Paper MGSCL, Johannesburg.

Bush, T., Bisschoft, T., Clover,D., Heystek, J., Jourbet, R.,& Moloi, K.C.,(2005) School Leadership, Management and Governance in South Africa: A Systematic Literature Review. MGSLG, Johannesburg.

Bush, T., Joubert, R., Kiggundu, E., Van Rooyen, J., (2008) Leading and Managing Literacy and Numeracy. The Zenex Foundation, Johannesburg.

Bossert S., Dwyer D., Rowan, B., & Lee G.(1982) The instructional management role of the Principal Educational Administration quarterly, 18(3), 34-64.

Boyd, W.L. (1982) *What can principals do and don't do; Implications for effective schools* The Canadian Administrator, 22(6), 1-4.

Bresdeson, P, V. (1989) Redefining leadership and the roles of school: Responses to changes in the professional work life of teachers .*High school Journal*, 23 (1), 9-20.

Camburn, E., Rowen, B., and Taylor, J. (2003) *Distributed Leadership in Schools: The Case of Elementary Schoolings Adopting Comprehensive School Reform Models*" Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 25(4), 347-73).

Christie, P. and Lingard, B. (2001) *Capturing Complexity in Educational Leadership,* Paper Presented to the American Educational Research Association Conference.

Chrispeels, J.A., Brown, J.H., &Castillo, S. (2000) School leadership teams: Factors that influence their development and effectiveness. In K.Leithwood (Ed), *Understanding schools as intelligent systems* (pp.39-73).Stamford, CT: Jai Press.

Coburn, C.E. (2001) Collective sense making about reading: How teachers mediate reading policy in their professional communities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 23(2), 145-170.

Cogan, M., Anderson, A.H. and Krajewski,R. (1993) "*Clinical Supervision; Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers (3rd ed.)*" FortWorth, TX; Harcourt Brace.

Conley, D.T., & Goldman, P. (1994) Ten propositions for facilitative leadership. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp.237-262).Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Coleman, J.S. (1966) Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C:U.S. Government Printing Office.

Coleman, J.S. (1988) Social capital in the creation of human capital. American Journal of Sociology, 94(Supplement), S95-S120.

Cooper, B.S. (1993) When teachers run schools. In T.A.Astuto (Ed.), *When teachers lead* (pp.25-42).University Park, PA: University Council for Education Administration.

Cooper, H.M., and Good, T.L. (1983) *Classroom Expectations, Definitions, Past Research and the Research Model* In Cooper & T. Good (Eds.), Pygmalion Grows Up; Studies in the Expectation Communication Process. New York; Longman.

Cotton, K.(1995) *Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis.* 1995 Update. School Improvement Research Series Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Creemers, B.P.M., & Reezigt, G.J. (1996) School-level conditions affecting the effectiveness of instruction. *School Effectiveness and School improvement*, 7(3), 197-228.

Cuban. (1988) *The Managerial Imperative and Practice of Leadership in Schools*" Albany. NY, Sunny Press.

Cross City Campaign For Urban School Reform, (2005) A delicate balance; District policies and classroom practices. Chicago: Author.

Crowther F., Kaagan, S., Fergurson, M. and Hann, L. (2002) *Developing Teacher Leaders* Thousand Oaks, CA: Crown Press.

Danielson, C. (2002) *Enhancing Student Achievement: Framework for School Improvement* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Dalin, P. And Rolff,H. G. (1992) How schools improve. An international report. Cassel, university of Chicago.

Datnow,A.,Parker,V. and Wohlstetter, P. (2007) *Achieving with Data: How High–Performance School Systems Use Data to Improve Instructions for Elementary Students* Centre on Educational Governance, Rossier school of Education, University of Southern California commissioned by New school Venture Fund.

Darling-Hammond, L., &Youngs, P. (2002) ``Defining highly qualified teachers": What does `scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher*, 31(9), 13-25.

Day, C., & Harris, A. (2002) Leading schools in data-rich world. In K.Leithwood & P.Hallinger (Eds.), *Second international handbook of education leadership and administration*, part one. Norwell, MA: Kluwer.

Day, C., Harris, A., Hatfield, M., Tolley, H., & Beresford, J. (2000) *Leading schools in times of change*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Dei, G.S. (1996) *Anti-racism education*: Theory and practice. Halifax, Nova Scovia: Fernwood.

Densombe, M. (2003) *The Good Research Guide*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

DeMoss, K. (2002) Leadership styles and high-stakes testing: Principals make a difference. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(1), 5-8.

Department of Education (2004) *Educational Management and Leadership Development Draft Policy Framework* Directorate: Education, Management and Governance Development.

Department of Education (may.2005) *The South African Standard for Principalship* Directorate: Education Management and Governance Development.

Dillard, C .B. (1995) Leading with her life: An African American feminist (re) interpretation of leadership for an urban high school principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31(4), 539-563.

Donmoyer, R. and Wagstaff, J.G. (1990) *Principals Can be Effective Managers and Instructional leaders* NASSP Bulletin, 74(525)20-29.

Driscoll, M., & Kerchner, C. (1999) The implications of social capital for the school, communities and cities: Educational administration as if a sense of place mattered. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp.385-404). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Duke, D., Showers,B.,& Imber, M.(1980) Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement . *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16, 93-106.

Drfoos, J.G. (1994) *Full–service schools*. *A revolution in health and social sciences for children, youth, and families.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dwyer, D.C. (1984) *The Search for Instructional Leadership: Routines and Subtleties in the Principals Role* Educational Leadership,41(5),32-37.

Earl, L. and Katz, S. (2006) *Leading in a Data Rich World; Harnessing Data for School Improvement* Thousand Oakes, CA: Corwin.

Edmonds, R. (1979) Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational leadership*, 37(1), 15-24.

Elmore, R.F. (2004) School reform from the inside out: Policy practice and performance. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Englert, R. M. (1993) Understanding the urban context and the conditions of practice of school administration .In P. Forsyth & M. Tallerico (Eds.), *City schools: Leading the way* (pp.1-63). Newbury Park, C A: Corwin.

Epstein J. (1996) Perspectives and previews on research and policy for the school, family and community partnerships .In A. Booth & J. Dunn (Eds.), *Family-school links* (pp.209-246). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Epstein J.L. (2001) *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* .Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Eisner, E.W. (1985) *The Art of Educational Evaluation: A Personal View*" Barcombe, U.K. Falmer.p.45.

Finn, J. (2002) Small classes in American schools: Research, practice and politics. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(7), 551-560.

Firestone, W.A. (1989) "*Using reform: Conceptualising District Initiative* Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,11(2),151-165.

Firestone, W.A. & Fisler, J.L. (2002) Politics, community, and leadership in a school-University partnership .*Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(4), 449-493.

Fleisch, B. (2008) Primary Education in Criss; Why South African children Underachieve in Reading and mathematics. Juta. Cape Town.

Francine de Clercq (2007) *School Monitoring and Change: A Critical Examination of Whole School-Evaluation In Educational Change* Faculty of Education, University of Johannesburg, Vol.11(2) 97-113.

Foster, M. (1993) Educating for competence in community and culture: Exploring the views of exemplary African American teacher's .*Urban Education*, 27(4), 370-394.

Foster, M. (1995) African American teachers and culturally relevant pedagogy. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp.570-581).New York: Macmillan

Fullan, M .G. (1991) *The new meaning of educational change* .New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1985) `Change processes and strategies at the local level,' *The Elementary School Journal*, 85(3), 391-421.

Garcia, E .E. (1995) Education of Mexican American students; Past treatment and recent developments in theory, research, policy and practice. In J.A. Banks & C.A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp.372-387). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Gezi, K. (1990) The role of leadership in inner-city schools. Educational Research Quarterly, 12(4), 4-11.

Glickman, C.D. (1985) *Supervision of Instruction; Development Approach* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Glickman, C.D. (Ed.) (1992) *Supervision in transition*. Alexandria, VA; ASCD.

Glickman, C. (1989) Has Sam and Samantha's time come at last? *Educational leadership, 46*(8), 4-9.

Goldstein, L.S. (1999) *The Relational Zone: The Role of Caring Relationship in the Co-construction of Mind* American Educational Research Journal, 36(3) 647 – 673.

Gordon, S.P. (1997) Has the field of supervision evolved to a point that it should be called something else? In J. Glanz & R.F. Neville (Eds.), Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues and controversies (pp.114-123). Noword, MA: Christopher–Gordon.

Gronn, P. (2000) Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management and Administration,* 28 (3), 317-338.

Grossman, P., Wineburg, S., &Woolworth, S. (2001) Toward a theory of teacher community. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 942-1012.

Hargreaves, E. (2005) Assessment *for Learning? Thinking Outside the (black) Box* Cambridge Journal of Education 35 (2), 213–224.

Hargreaves, A.,& Fink, D. (2004) *The seven Principals of Sustainable Leadership* Educational leadership 61(7),8-13.

Hariparsad, I., Bisschoff, T., Conley, L. du Plessis, P., Grobler, B., Hlongwane, S., Loock, C. and Meistry, R. (2006) *Quality Assurance in South Africa Schools: an Integrated Research Report* Research papers CCEAM Conference, Cyprus, October.

Hallinger, P., Bickman, L., & Davis,K. (1996) School context, principal leadership, and student reading achievement. *Elementary School Journal*, 96(5), 527-549.

Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. (1998) *Exploring the Principals Contribution to School Effectiveness* School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9(2), 157 – 191.

Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. (1999) *Can Leadership Enhance School Effectiveness?* In T. Bush, L. Bell, R. Bolam, R. Glatter, & P. Ribbins (Eds), Educational Management Redefining theory, Policy and Practice (pp. 178–190). London: Paul Chapman.

Hallinger, P., and Murphy, J. (1985) *Assessing the Instructional Management Behaviour of Principals* Elementary school journal,86(2), 217-247.

Hallinger, P. and Murphy. (1986) *The Context of Effective Schools* American Journal of Education, 94(3), 328-355.

Hallinger, P. (2003) *Leading Educational Change* Reflections on the Practice of Instructional and Transformational Leadership. Cambridge Journal of Education, 33(3), 329-351.

Hallinger, P. and Heck, R.H. (1996a) *Reassessing the Principals Role in the School Effectiveness; A Review of Empirical Research, 1980-1995* Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(1), 5-44.

Hallinger, P.,& Heck, R.(1999b) The principal's role in school effectiveness :An assessment of Methodological progress, 1980-1995. In K. Leithwood et al. (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp.723-783). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hamilton, M.L., & Richardson, V. (1995) Effects of the culture in two schools on the process and outcomes of staff development. *Elementary School Journal*, 95(4), 367-385.

Hannay, L.M. & Denby, M. (1994, April) *Secondary school change: The role of department heads*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Hart, A., and Ogawa, R. (1985) *The Effect of Principals on the Instructional Performance of Schools* The Journal of Educational Administration, 13 (1), 59-71.

Hart, A.W. (1995) Preconceiving school leadership: Emergent views. *Elementary School Journal*, 96, 9-28.

Heath, A.W. (1983) *Ways with words: Language, Life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heck, R.H., Larsen, T.J., Marcoulides, G.A. (1990) Instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model .*Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 94- 125.

Heck, R.H., Larsen, T.L., & Marcoulides, G.A. (1990) Instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of casual model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(1), 5-44.

Heck, R.H., & Marcoulides, G.A. (1993) Principal leadership behaviours and school achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(553), 20-28.

Henderson, A.T., & Berla,N. (Eds.). (1994) *A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement.* Washington, D.C: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Heller, M.F. and Firestone, W.A. (1995) *Who 's in Charge Her? Sources of Leadership for Change in Eight Schools* Elementary School Journal, 96(1), 65-86.

Hoadley, U. (2007) *Managing Curriculum and Instruction in South Africa Secondary Schools* In a paper presented at the Teacher Development and Institutional Change in an Evolving Education Context Conference, Kopanog, May.

Hoerr. T. (1996) *Collegiality* Phi Delta Kappan, 77 (5), 380-382.

Holland, P.E. (1989) Implicit assumptions about the supervisory conference: A review and analysis of literature of literature. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 4.362-379.

Houlihan, T. (2002) *Reporting for No Child Left Behind: What's the Impact on Education?* Opening Remarks at Stats –DC2002 Goals, Washington, D.C.

Hoy, A.W., &Hoy, W.K. (2003) "*Instructional leadership: A Learning –Cantered Guide*" Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Ingersoll, R. (1999) The problem of underqualified teachers in American secondary schools. *Educational Researcher*, 28(2)483-495.

Jencks, C., Smith, M .S .,Ackland, H., Bane, M. J .,Cohen, D., Grintlis, H., et al.(1972) Inequality: *A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.

Jermier, J.M.& Kerr,S.(1997) Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement–contextual recollections and current observations. *The leadership quarterly*, 8, 95-101.

Kirby, P.C. & Cobert, R. (1992, April) *Principals who empower teachers'* .Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Knapp, S.D., & Associates. (1995) *Teaching for meaning in high–poverty classrooms.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Knapp, M.S., Copeland, M.A., Ford, B., Markholt, A., Mclaughlin, M.W., Milliken, M., et al (2003) *Leading for learning sourcebook: Concepts and examples* .Seattle: Centre for Teaching and Policy.

Knapp, M.S., & Woolverton, S. (1995) Social class and schooling. In J.A. Banks & C.A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp.548-569).New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994) *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco; Jossey-Bass.

Lafee, S. (2002) *Data-Driven Districts (electronic version) School Administrator* 59(11), 6-79-10, 12, 14-15.

Lambert, L. (2002) *Framework for Leadership* Educational leadership, 59 (8) 37-40.

Lashway, L. (2002a) *Developing Instructional Leaders* Eric Clearing House on, Educational Management, Report Number; EDO-EA-02-09.

Lataile-Demore, D. (2004) *Combined Grade Classrooms: Research Monograph* 9 Quebec; Government of Ontario.

Lee, J., and Dimmock, C. (1999) *Curriculum Leadership and Management.*19 (4)455-481.

Lee, V.E.Bryk, A.S., &Smith, J.B. (1993) The organization of effective secondary schools. In L.Darling–Hammond (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education*. (vol.19, pp.135-169). Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Leithwood, K., C. Day, Sammons, A. Harris, A., and D Hopkins (2006) Successful school leadership: What *is it and how it influences pupil learning*. London; DfES and Nottingham: NCSL

Leithwood, K. Jantzi D., and Steinbach, R. (1999) *Changing leadership for Changing Times* Open University Press, Buckingham.

Leithwood, K. Day, C., Sammous P., Harris, A., Hopkins, D. (2005) *Seven Claims about Successful School Leadership* Department for Education and Skills, London.

Leithwood, K., Aiken & Jantzi D. (2001) *Making Schools Smarter; A System for Monitoring School and District Programs. (2nded.)* Thousand Oaks, CA Crorwin.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S. and Wahlstrom, K. (2004) How leadership influences student learning. *Learning from leading Project*, Wallace Foundation, New York.

Leithwood, K., Riehl,C., (2006) What we already know about educational leadership. In W.A.Firestone and Riehl, C., (Eds), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp.).New York: Teachers College Press.

Levine D.U., & Lezotte, LW. (1990) *Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice.* Madison, WI: National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.

Lieberman, A., Darling-Hammond, L., &Zuckerman, K. (1991) *Early lessons in restructuring schools.* New York: National Center on Restructuring Education, Schools, and teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Little J.W. (1982) Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19 (3), 325-340.

Little J.W. (2001) *Locating learning in teachers communities of practice: Opening up problems of analysis in records of everyday work.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.

Lomotey, K. (1989) *African American principals: School leadership and success* .New York: Greenwood Press.

Louis, K.S., Marks, H.M., &Kruse, S. (1996) Teachers professional communityin restructuring schools .*American Educational Research Journal*, 33(4), 757-798.

Louis, K.S., & Smith, B. (1992) Cultivating teacher engagement: Breaking the iron law of social class. In F.M.Newmann (Ed.), *Student engagement and achievement in American secondary schools* (pp.119-152).New York: Teachers College Press.

Lissitz, R.W., & Schafer, W.D. (2002) Assessment *in Education Reform* Both Means and Boston; Allyn& Bacon.

Lunenburg.F.C. & Irby B.J. (2006) The *Principalship; Vision to Action* Belmont, CA: 94002- 3098, Thomson Wadsworth.p.181-184.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R., &Kranz, J. (1990) What do we know about school based management? A case study of the literature–A call for research .In W.Clune & J.Wited (Eds), *Choice and control in American education* (vol.2pp.112-132).New York: Falmer.

Marks,H., and Printy,S. (2003) *Principal leadership and Instructional School Performance: An Integration of Transformation and Instructional Leadership* Educational Administration Quarterly,39(3),370-397.

Mark, H. M., & Louis, K.S. (1997) Does empowerment affect the classroom? The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional practice and student academic performance. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 10(4), 251-270.

March, J.K. and Peters, K.H. (2002) *Effective Schools-Curriculum Development and Instructional Design in the Effective Schools Process* Phi-Delta Kappan,83(5), 379 . Retrived may 21, 2010 from Questa data base, http://www.questia.com .

Mascall, B. and K. Leithwood. (In press) The effects of total leadership on student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.

Maxwell, J.A.(1996). *Qualitative Research Design :An Interactive Approach* .Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mayrowetz, D., & Weinstein, C.S. (1999) Sources of leadership for inclusive education: Creating schools for all children. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 423-449.

McLaughlin, M.W., & Mitra, D. (2001) Theory-based change and change–based theory: Going deeper, going broader. *Journal of Educational Change*, 2,301-323.

McMillan, H .and Schumacher, S. (2006) *Research in Education; a Conceptual Introduction* (6thEd). New York, Longman.p.315.

Mclntire, T. (2002) *The Administrator Guide to Data–Driven Decision Making* .Technology & Learning, 22(11)18-28, 32-33.

Merriam, S.B. (1998) Qualitative Research and Case study Applications in Education Revised and Expanded from Case study Research in Education .Jossey-Bass Publishers, 350, Sansome St. San Francisco

Mitchell, A. (1998) African American teachers: Unique roles and universal lessons. *Education research and Urban Society*, 31(1)104-122.

Miner, J.B. (2002) *Organisational Behaviour: Foundations, Theories and Analyses* New York; Oxford University Press.

Milbrey Walin Mclaughlin & Joan Talbert (2006) Building school-based teacher learning communities' professional strategies. New York, Teachers College Press.

Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., &Gonzalez, N. (1992) Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms .*Theory Into Practice*, 31(1), 132-141.

Moller, G., & Katzenmeyer, M. (1996) The promise of teacher leadership .In R.H.Ackerman, G.Moller, & M. Katzenmeyer (Eds.), *every teacher as a leader: Realizing the potential of teacher leadership* (pp.1-18).San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morrison, K. (1995) *The Deputy Head Teacher as the Leader of the Curriculum in Primary Schools* School Organisation15(1)65-76.

Mortimore, P. (1993) School effectiveness and the management of effective learning and teaching. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 4 (4), 290-310.

Monk, D.H. (1994) Subject area preparation of secondary mathematics and science teachers and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 13(2)125-145.

Moyles, J. (2002) Observation as a research tool,' In Coleman, M. and Briggs, A.R.J. (eds.), *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and management.* London: Paul Chapman.

Murphy, J. (1988) Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of instructional leadership .*Educational Evaluation and policy Analysis*, *10*(2), 117-139.

Murphy, J. (1990) *Principal Instructional Leadership* In R.S. lotto & P.W. Thurston (Eds.).Advances in educational administration: Changing perspectives on the school (vol, pt.B, pp.163-200).Greenwich, CT; JAI.

National College for school leadership (2007) *Programme Details for Primary Middle Leaders Course* NCSL, Northing ham.

National College for School Leadership (2005) *Annual Review of Research 2004 – 2005*" Nottingham, NCSL.

Nais, J., Southworth, G., & Campbell, P. (1989) *Staff relationships in the primary school.* London: Casell.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (n.d.).Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/office/OESE.esca/

Newman, F.M., &Associates. (Eds.). (1996) *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality.* San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.

Neuman, W. (1997) *Social Science Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* Bostom and London. Allyn and Bacon.

Nye, B., Hedges, L.V., & Konstantopoulos, S. (1999) The long–term effects of small classes: A five–year follow-up of the Tennessee class size experiments. *Educational and policy analysis,* 21(2), 127-142.

North-West Regional Education Laboratory (2001) *Effective Schooling Practices, A Research Synthesis (Section 3)* http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/esp/esp95toc.html.

Oduro, G., and Macbeth. (2003) *Traditions and Tensions in Leadership: the Ghanaian Experience* Cambridge journal of Education, 33(3)441-445.

Office For Standards in Education (2003) *Leadership and Management: What inspection Tells Us* Otsted, London.

Ogawa, R.T., & Bossert, S.T. (1995) Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31(2), 224-243.

Ogawa, R.T., Golding, E. B. & Conley, S. (2000) Organizing the field to improve research on education administration .*Education Administration Quarterly*, 36(3), 340-357.

Ogbu, J.U. (1995) Understanding cultural diversity and learning. In J.A. Banks & C.A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp.582-593).New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Ornstein, A.C. & Hunkins, F.P. (1998) *Curriculum Foundations: Principles and Issues, 3rd ed.* Needham Heights, MA; Allyn & Bacon.

O'Sullivan, M. (2004) *The Usefulness of Lesson Observation in a Primary Teachers*" INSET Programme in Namibia, Journal of Education for Teaching. 30(1) 5 – 55.

O'Sullivan, M. (2006) *Lesson Observation and Quality in Primary Education as Contextual Teaching and Learning Processes* International Journal of Education Development, 26, 246 – 260.

Patton, M.Q. (1990) *Qualitative Research and Research Methods* .2nd edn. Newbury Park CA: Sage.

Patton, M.Q. (2002) *Qualitative Research and Research Methods* .2nd edn. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Pajak, E. (1989) *Identification of supervisory proficiencies project*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Pajak, E. (1993) *Approaches to clinical supervision*: Alternatives for improving instruction. Norword, MA: Christopher–Gordon.

Popham,W.J. (2003b) *Test Better, Teach Better: The Instructional Role Assessment* Alexandria, VA; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Portin, B., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M., & Gundlach, L. (2003) *Making Sense of Leading Schools: A Study of the School Principalship: Centre for Reinventing Public Education* University of Washington.

Prestine, N.A. & Bowen, C. (1993) Benchmarks for change: Assessing essential school restructuring efforts .*Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 15(3), 298-366.

Prestine, N.A.,& Neslon, B.S.(2005) How can educational leaders support and promote teaching and learning ?In W.A. Firestone and C. Riehl (Eds.),*A new agenda for research in educational leadership*(pp.46-60).New York : Teachers College Press.

Purkey, S.C., & Smith, M.S. (1983) Effective schools: A review .*Elementary School Journal*, 86, 427-453.

Reavis, C. & Griffith, H. (1993) Feeling the ripples, riding the waves: Making an essential school. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger, K. (Eds.), *Restructuring schooling* (pp.32-62).Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Reitzug, U.C. (1997) Images of principal instructional leadership: From Supervision to Collaborative inquiry. *Journal of Curriculum Supervision,* 12,356-366.

Reitzug, U.C. and Cross, B. (1993,) *Deconstructing Principal Instructional Leadership From Supervision to Critical Collaboration* Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the University Council for Educational, Administration, Houston,TX.

Resenholtz, S. (1989) *Teachers Workplace, The social organisation of schooling* .New York, Longman.

Resenholtz, S.J. (1985) *Effective Schools: Interpreting the Evidence* American Journal of Education, 93, (3), 352-388.

Reyes, P., Scribner, J., & Scribner, A.P. (Eds.). (1999) *Lessons from high-performing Hispanic schools: Creating Learning communities.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Reynolds, D. (2007) *Schools Learning from their Best: The Within School Variation Project*, Nottingam, NCSL.

Reynolds, D., Hopkins, D.and Stoll, L. (1993) Linking School effectiveness knowledge and School improvement practice: towards a synergy, *school effectiveness and school improvement*, 4, 37-58.

Reyes, P., Scribner, J., &Wagstaff, L. (1999) *A vision for tomorrow: Successful migrant education practices*. Austin: Texas Education Agency.

Reyes, P., Velez, W.,& Pena, R.(1993) School reform: Introducing race, culture, and ethnicity into the discourse .In C.A. Capper (Ed.), *Educational administration in a pluralist society* (pp.66-85).Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rhodes, C. Brundrett, M.(in press) *Leadership for learning* In :Bush,T., Bell, l., Middlewood,D.(Eds.),The principals of Educational leadership and management. Sage, London.

Robinson,V. (2007) *School Leadership and Student Outcomes: Identifying what works and why?* Australian Council of leaders, Melbourne.

Rosenblum, S., Louis, K.S. & Rossmiller, R.A. (1994) School leadership and teacher quality of work life in restructuring schools. In J.Murphy & K.S.Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp.99-122).Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sammons, P., Hillman, & Mortimore, P. (1995) *Key characteristics of effective schools*: review of school effectiveness research. London: Office for Standards in Education.

Schreens, J. (1992) *Effective schooling*. Research, theory and practice. London: Falmer Press. Schreerens, J., & Bosker, R.J. (1997).*The foundations of educational effectiveness*. New York Elsevier.

Scheurich, J.J. (1998) Highly successful and loving, public elementary schools populated mainly by low-SES children of color: Core beliefs and cultural characteristics. *Urban Education*, 33 (4), 451-491.

Schon, D.A. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a new Design for Teaching and Learning in the Profession* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D.A. (1988) Coaching reflective teaching .In P.P.Grimmett & G.F.Erickson (Eds.), Reflection in teacher education (pp.19-3).New York: Teachers College Press.

Scribner, J.P., Hager, D.R., & Warne, TR. (2002) The paradox of professional community: Tales from two high schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 38 (1), 45-76.

Sebring, P.B., & Bryk, A.S. (2000) School leadership and the bottom line in Chicago. Phi Delta Kappan, 81,440-443.

Sheppard, B. (1996) Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42 (4), 325-344.

Short, E.C. (1995) A review of studies in the first 10 volumes of the *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,* 11(1), 87-105.

Strauss, A. (1987) *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stuart, A. Karaberisck & Richard Stuart Newman, (2001) Helping seeking in academic setting goals, groups and contexts. New Jersey, Routlege.

Skrla, L., Scheurich, J.J., & Johnson J.F., Jr. (2000) *Equity-driven, achievement-focused school districts: A systemic school success in four Texas school districts serving diverse student populations.* Austin: The University of Texas, Charles A. Dana Research Centre.

Smith, W. and Andrews, R. (1989) Instructional *Leadership; How Principals make a Difference* .Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Smrekar, C.E., & Mawhinney, H.B. (1999) Integrated services; Challenges in linking schools families, and communities. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed., pp.443-461).San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smylie, M.A., Conley, S., & Marks, H.M. (2002) Exploring new approaches to teacher leadership for improvement. In J. Murphy (Eds.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp.162-188).Chicago: National Society for the study of Education.

Smylie, M .A., Lazarus, V., & Brownlee-Conyers, J.(1996) Instructional outcomes of school–based participative decision making .*Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*,18(3),181-198.

Smyth, J. (1997) *Is Supervision more than the Surveillance of Instruction?* Perspectives, Issues and Controversies (pp.286-295): Norwood, MA; Christopher-Gordon.

Solomon, R.P. (2002) School leaders and antiracism: Overcoming pedagogical and political obstacles. *Journal of School leadership*, 12(2), 174-197.

Spillane, J., Hallett, T., and Diamond J. B. (2003) Forms of capital and the construction of leadership: Instructional leadership in urban elementary schools. *Sociology of Education*, 76 (1), 1-17.

Spillane, J., Halverson, R. and Diamond J. B. (2001) Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective .*Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23-28.

Spillane, J., Halverson, R. and Diamond J. (2004) *Towards the Theory of School Leadership Practice, Implications of a Distributed Perspective* Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36(1), 3-34.

Spillane, J.P., (2006) *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J.P., & Louis, K.S. (2002) School instructional improvement processes and practices: Professional learning for building instructional capacity. In J.Murphy (Eds.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp.83-104).Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Spiro, R.J., Feltovich, P.L., &Anderson, D.K. (1989) Multiple analogies for complex concepts: Antidotes for analogy–induced misconceptions in advanced knowledge acquisition. In S.Vosniadou & A.Ortony (Eds), *Similarity and analogical reasoning* (pp.489-531).New York: Cambrige Press.

Southworth,G. (2002) *Instructional Leadership in Schools. Reflections Empirical Empirical Evidence*" School leadership and management, 22(1), 73-92.

Southworth, G. (2004) *Learning-Centred Leadership* in Davies, B. (Ed), The Essentials of School Leadership, in London, Paul Chapman Publishing.

Stein, N.K., & Nelson, B.S. (2003) *Leadership Content knowledge Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*" .25(4), 423-488.

Stiggins, R. (2001) *Student Involved Classroom Assessment* .New York: Merrill.

Sweeney, J. (1982) *Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership* Educational leadership .346-552.

Talbert, J.E., &Bogotch, I.E. (1994) School level effects of teachers` participation in decision making .*Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*,16(3),302-319.

Tomlison, C.A. (2003) *Fulfilling the Promise of the Differentiated Classroom: Strategies and Tools for Responsive Teaching* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Townsend. (2001) Satan or saviour? Analysis of two decades of school effectiveness research. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 12(1), 115-129.

Valenzuela, A. (1999) *Subtracting schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Van de Grift, W., & Houtveen, A.A.M. (1999) Educational leadership and pupil achievement in primary education. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 10(4), 373-389.

Van Velzen, W., Miles, M., Elhom, M., Hameyer, U. and Robin (1985) *Making School Improvement Work*, Leuen, Belgium ACCO.

Wasley, P.A. (1991) *Teachers who lead: The rhetoric of reform and the realities of practice*. New York Teachers College Press.

Wasley, P., Hampel, R., &Clark, R. (1996) *The Puzzle of Whole School Change. Providence*", RI, Coalition of Essential schools, Brown University.

Walberg, H.J. (1984) Improving the productivity of American schools .*Educational leadership*, 41(8), 19-27.

Wang, M., Haertel, G., & Walberg, H. (1992)Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(3), 249-294.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity* .New York: Cambridge University Press.

Westbury, M. (1994) The effect of elementary grade retention on subsequent school achievement and ability. Canadian Journal of Education, 19(3) 241-250.

Wiles, J. and Bondi, J. (2002) *Curriculum Development: A guide to Practice* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Meril/PreniceHall.

Williams, B. (Ed.) (2003) *Closing the Achievement Gap: A Vision for Changing Beliefs and Practices (2nded.)* Alexandra, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wilson, B., & Corcoran. (1988) *Successful secondary schools: visions of excellence in American public education*. New York: Falmer.

Winter, P.A., & Morgenthal, J.R. (2002) Principal recruitment in a reform environment: Effects of school achievement and school level on applicant attraction to the job. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38(3), 319-340.*

Wise, C., and Bush, T. (1999) *From Teacher to Manager in Secondary Schools* Educational Research, 41(2), 193-195.

Yin, R.K. (1994) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* Thousand Oakes: Sage Publications, Inc.p.36.

Appendices

Appendix I: Ethics Clearance Letter

Wits School of Education

27 St Andrews Road, Parktown, Johannesburg, 2193 • Private Bag 3, Wits 2050, South Africa

Tel: +27 11 717-3007 • Fax: +27 11 717-3009 • E-mail: enquiries@educ.wits.ac.za • Website: www.wits.ac.za

STUDENT NUMBER: 396259

Protocol number: 2010ECE88**C**

16 August 2010

Mr. Felix Omal

P O Box 1870

JOHANNESBURG

2000

Dear Mr. Omal

Application for Ethics Clearance: Master of Education

I have a pleasure in advising you that the Ethics Committee in Education of the Faculty of Humanities, acting on behalf of the Senate has agreed to approve your application for ethics clearance submitted for your proposal entitled:

The role of a school principal in the monitoring of teaching and learning in a township Secondary school in Soweto

The Protocol Number above should be submitted to the Graduate Studies in Education Committee upon submission of your final research report.

Yours sincerely

M Mabeta

Matsie Mabeta
Wits School of Education

Cc Supervisor: Mr. Z. Mbokazi (via email)

Appendix II: Permission Letter

UMnyango WezeMfundo
Department of Education

Lefapha la Thuto
Departement van Onderwys

Enquiries: Nomvula Ubisi (011)3550488

Date:	1 July 2010
Name of Researcher:	Omal Felix
Address of Researcher:	149 Pitchard Street, 1st Floor
	Johannesburg
	2001
Telephone Number:	+27831375829
Fax Number:	N.A.
Research Topic:	The Role of a School in Monitoring Teaching and Learning in a Township Secondary School in Soweto
Number and type of schools:	One Secondary School
District/s/HO	Johannesburg West

Re: Approval in Respect of Request to Conduct Research

This letter serves to indicate that approval is hereby granted to the above-mentioned researcher to proceed with research in respect of the study indicated above. The onus rests with the researcher to negotiate appropriate and relevant time schedules with the school/s and/or offices involved to conduct the research. A separate copy of this letter must be presented to both the School (both Principal and SGB) and the District/Head Office Senior Manager confirming that permission has been granted for the research to be conducted.

Permission has been granted to proceed with the above study subject to the conditions listed below being met, and may be withdrawn should any of these conditions be flouted:

1. ***The District/Head Office Senior Manager/s concerned must be presented with a copy of this letter that would indicate that the said researcher/s has/have been granted permission from the Gauteng Department of Education to conduct the research study.***
2. ***The District/Head Office Senior Manager/s must be approached separately, and in writing, for permission to involve District/Head Office Officials in the project.***
3. ***A copy of this letter must be forwarded to the school principal and the chairperson of the School Governing Body (SGB) that would indicate that the researcher/s have been granted permission from the Gauteng Department of Education to conduct the research study.***

Office of the Chief Director: Information and Knowledge Management
Room 501, 111 Commissioner Street, Johannesburg, 2000 P.O.Box 7710, Johannesburg, 2000
Tel: (011) 355-0809 Fax: (011) 355-0734

Appendix III: Participant's Information Leaflet

The core purpose of schooling is the promotion of effective teaching and learning. The aim of this study is to explore the different kind's roles a school principal plays in monitoring teaching and learning. The school principal, working with the school management teams and others has a primary responsibility to promote a successful learning culture within the school, and to develop the school as a learning organisation. At the heart of the school principal's role is a fundamental responsibility to enhance the quality of teaching and learning and to raise levels of learner achievement in any context. International studies strongly argue that strong school leadership is the key improved learner achievement. However in the South African context little is known about the complex roles of school principals in monitoring teaching and learning in difficult learning contexts. Thus study this is set to explore the different kinds of roles a school principal plays in monitoring teaching and learning in local township setting.

One Soweto township secondary school has been selected as case study for the research .This secondary school was chosen on the basis of good performance in the National Matric Examinations as per the Gauteng Department of Education for the past three years. The school principal, deputy school principal, three heads of departments and four classroom teachers of the school will be selected as participants for the study. The participants will be informed that their participation in this study is voluntary, under conditions of anonymity and the names of the school will not be mentioned to any other parties.

The information for the study will be collected using observation schedules and an audio–tape recorder for the semi-structured interviews. One–on-one interviews will be conducted with the school principal, assistant school principal, three heads of Departments and four classroom teachers, each lasting forty-five minutes. The school principal will be requested to grant access to his deputy school principal, the heads of departments and the classroom teachers in order to conduct one-on-one interviews and observations. The interviews and observations will focus on the role of the school principal in monitoring teaching and learning in the school.

The school principal and the deputy will be chosen because they are highly involved in the leading and managing teaching and learning in the school. The selected heads of departments will be chosen because they are the bridge between the school administration and the classroom teachers, are considered subject specialists and guide teachers in their subject specialist areas. The selected classroom teachers will be chosen because they are actually involved in the daily teaching and learning in the classrooms. In addition these classroom teachers have been producing good results in their subject areas over the three years in the school.

The results of the study will be presented to the University of the Witwatersrand for examination, together with the research report and it will also be made available to the Gauteng Department of Education. If you agree to participate, please complete the form on the following page. If you have any questions please feel free to contact.

Felix Omal
Tel: 011-7173092
Mobile: 0731375829
E-mail: omalfelix@gmail.com

Appendix IV: Participant's Informed Consent

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg,
School of education,
Division of education leadership and policy studies
Wits school of education,
Park town,
October, 2010

Participant's informed consent.

I hereby confirm that I have been informed by the researcher Felix Omal about the nature of the study. I have also received, read and understood the information and consent sheets regarding the educational study. I am aware that all the information given will remain confidential and anonymously processed in this study. I may at any stage, without prejudice, withdraw my consent and participation from the study I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and (of own free will) declare myself prepared to participate in the study and voluntarily agreed to participate in the study.

I have received the telephone number of a person to contact should I need to speak about any issues which may arise in my involvement in this study .I understand that this consent will not be linked to the interview and that my answers will remain confidential. I understand that all possible feedback will be given to me on the results of the completed research.

I agree to participate in the study, I give my permission to:

a) Be interviewed

b) Be tape-recorded

c) Be observed in the learning context

I also agree that the data will be used for:

a). Research reports

b) .publications

I agree to these with the understanding that confidentiality of my identity will be protected.

Position of Participant in the secondary school _____

Signature of Participant: _____.

Appendix V: invitation of school principal to participate

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg,
School of education,
Division of education leadership and policy studies
Wits school of education,
Park town,
October, 2010

Dear Sir/Madam

My name is Felix Omal of the Wits school of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am involved in the study on the role of a school principal in monitoring teaching and learning in a Township secondary school.

Your secondary school has selected on the basis of your good performance in the National Matric examinations as per the Gauteng Department of Education over the past three years (for information see the subject sheet attached).I would like you to participate in this study.

Should your secondary school participate, the study will require that I conduct one-on-one interviews with you as the head of the secondary school, each interview lasting forty-five minutes. As the head of the secondary school, I will request that you grant me access to your deputy principal, three heads of departments and four classroom teachers in order to conduct one-on-one interviews with them. These interviews will focus on the role of the school principal in monitoring teaching and learning the school classroom teachers, heads of departments the school administration has experienced in the secondary school. The study will require that I spend two weeks involved in observation at the secondary school .I will visiting your secondary school to describe the study in detail and answer any questions that you or your may have. Please indicate your willingness to participate in this study by filling in the slip below.

Sincerely,\

Omal Felix
University of the Witwatersrand

School principals Consent slip

I…….as (position) ……on the behalf of……secondary .school, understand the nature, the requirements and benefits of the participating in the study, consent to participate in the study.

Signature……..

Date……

Appendix VI: Invitation of Deputy School principal to participate

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg,
School of education,
Division of education leadership and policy studies
Wits school of education,
Park town,
October, 2010

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Felix Omal of the Wits school of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am involved in the study on the role of a school principal in monitoring teaching and learning in a Township secondary school.

Your secondary school has selected on the basis of your good performance in the National Matric examinations as per the Gauteng Department of Education over the past three years (for information see the subject sheet attached).I would like you to participate in this study.

Should your secondary school participate, in the study will require that I conduct one-on-one interviews with you as the deputy head of the secondary school, each interview lasting forty-five minutes. These interviews will focus on the role of the school principal in monitoring teaching and learning the school classroom teachers, heads of departments the school administration has experienced in the secondary school. The study will require that I spend two weeks involved in observation at the secondary school .I will visiting your secondary school to describe the study in detail and answer any questions that you or your may have. Please indicate your willingness to participate in this study by filling in the slip below.

Sincerely,

Omal Felix
University of the Witwatersrand

Deputy Principals Consent slips

I…….as (position) ……on the behalf of……secondary .school, understand the nature, the requirements and benefits of the participating in the study, consent to participate in the study.

Signature……..

Date……

Appendix VII: invitation of Heads of Departments to participate

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg,
School of education,
Division of education leadership and policy studies
Wits school of education,
Park town,
October, 2010

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Felix Omal of the Wits school of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am involved in the study on the role of a school principal in monitoring teaching and learning in a Township secondary school.

Your secondary school has selected on the basis of your good performance in the National Matric examinations as per the Gauteng Department of Education over the past three years (For information see the subject sheet attached).I would like you to participate in this study.

Should your secondary school participate, in the study will require that I conduct one-on-one interviews with you as one of the heads of department in the secondary school, each interview lasting forty-five minutes. These interviews will focus on the role of the school principal in monitoring teaching and learning the school classroom teachers, heads of departments the school administration has experienced in the secondary school. The study will require that I spend two weeks involved in observation at the secondary school .I will visiting your school to describe the study in detail and answer any questions that you or your may have. Please indicate your willingness to participate in this study by filling in the slip below.

Sincerely,

Omal Felix
University of the Witwatersrand

Heads of departments Consent slip

I…….as (position) ……on the behalf of……secondary .school, understand the nature, the requirements and benefits of the participating in the study, consent to participate in the study.

Signature……..

Date……

Appendix VIII: invitation of classroom teachers to participate

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg,
School of education,
Division of education leadership and policy studies
Wits school of education,
Park town,
October 2010

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Felix Omal of the Wits school of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am involved in the study on the role of a school principal in monitoring teaching and learning in a Township secondary school.

Your secondary school has selected on the basis of your good performance in the National Matric examinations as per the Gauteng Department of Education over the past three years (For information see the subject sheet attached).I would like you to participate in this study.

Should your secondary school participate, in the study will require that I conduct one-on-one interviews with you as one of the classroom teachers in the secondary school, each interview lasting forty-five minutes. These interviews will focus on the role of the school principal in monitoring teaching and learning the school classroom teachers, heads of departments the school administration has experienced in the secondary school. The study will require that I spend two weeks involved in observation at the secondary school .I will visiting your secondary school to describe the study in detail and answer any questions that you or your may have. Please indicate your willingness to participate in this study by filling in the slip below.

Sincerely,

Omal Felix
University of the Witwatersrand

Classroom teachers Consent slip

I…….as (position) ……on the behalf of……secondary .school, understand the nature, the requirements and benefits of the participating in the study, consent to participate in the study.

Signature……..

Date……

Appendix IX: Schedule of Observation and interviews in the field of study

Date/ time from 1stt---13th October 2010	Participants in school A	Field activities in school A carried out by the researcher
1monday	Educator 1 Educator 2 Educator 3 Educator 4	Observations in classrooms , in the staffroom & school compound
2 Tuesday	Educator 1 Educator 2 Educator 3 Educator 4	Interviews held in the sick bay
3 Wednesday	HoD 1 HoD 1 HoD 3	Observations in classrooms , in the staffroom & school compound
4thursaday	HoD 1 HoD 1 HoD 3	Interviews held in the sick bay
5 Friday		
6 Saturday		
7 Sunday		
8 Monday	Deputy school principal 1	Observation in the classroom , in the staffroom & school compound
9 Tuesday	Deputy school principal 2	Observations in the classroom , in the staffroom & school compound
10 Wednesday	Deputy school principal 1 Deputy school principal 2	Interviews held in the deputy school principal are office.
11 Thursday	School principal school A	Observation in the classroom , in the staffroom & school compound
12 Friday	School principal school A	Interview held in the school principal's office.
13 Saturday		
School B the order of observations and interviews Date/	Participants in school B	Field activities in school B carried out by the researcher

time from 15th to 25th October 2010		
15 Monday	Educator 1 Educator 2 Educator 3 Educator 4	Observation in the classrooms , staffroom & in the school compound
16 Tuesday	Educator 1 Educator 2 Educator 3 Educator 4	Interviews held in the classrooms
17wednesday	HoD 1 HoD 1 HoD 3	Observations in the classrooms , staffroom & in the school compound
18 Thursday	HoD 1 HoD 1 HoD 3	Interviews held in the sick bay
19 Friday	Deputy school principal 1	Observations in the classrooms & administration offices
20 Saturday		
21 Sunday		
22 Monday	Deputy school principal 2	Observations in the school compound & staffroom
23 Tuesday	Deputy school principal 1 Deputy school principal 2	Interviews held in the deputy principal's office
24 Wednesday	School principal school B	Observation in the classroom , in the staffroom & school compound
25 Thursday	School principal school B	Interview held in the school principal's office.

Appendix X: Observation Protocol for the School leadership

The observation protocol is divided into three sections addressing three questions concerning;

1. The management of teaching and learning
2. The methods of monitoring teaching and learning
3. The distribution of monitoring of teaching learning

The observation is intended to last for a maximum of one day

Management of teaching and learning

1. What time does the school principal arrive at the school on working days?
2. What time does the school l principal leave the school compound at the end of the day?
3. When the school principal is present at the school compound where does he/she spend most of his /her time?

4How much time does the school principal spend in the school premises?

5. Where are the offices of the school administration located?

7 How many people are in these offices most of time?

8. When the school principal arrives in the school compound what does he/she first?

9 When school head is in the office what does he do thought out the day?

10 What are school activities that occupy the school principal thought out the day?

12. When does he do his monitoring routines of checking what is going on in the school classrooms?

13. Where does the school principal meet with other teaching staff members in the school and for how long?

14. When the school principal is with the staff members what are issues discussed?

15. When does the school principal meet with parents and how long?

17. What are the activities that defocus him or her from his /her work in the day?

18. What time is the school principal very busy and what is the activity?

The methods of monitoring teaching and learning

1. What methods does the school principal use when monitoring teaching and learning in the classrooms?
2. When does the school head begin monitoring teaching and learning in the school?

3. When the school principal is doing his monitoring duties does he inform the school teachers?

4 How does he monitor the teaching and learning in the day?

5 What difficulties is the school principal experiencing in using these monitoring tools in the leading and management of teaching and learning in the school?

6. Who designs the school monitoring devices and instruments to monitor the teaching and learning in the classrooms?

5. What administrative tools does the school principal use to monitor learner attendance in the classrooms?

6. How does the school principal ensure that the teaching and learning process in the school is not disrupted?

9. How does school principal check teacher attendance in the school?

10. What are the conditions that affect learning in the classrooms?

<u>The distribution of monitoring of teaching learning</u>

1. What school structures are there facilitate to the monitoring of teaching and learning in the school?

2. How many school personnel are involved in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the school??

3. How are these personnel involved in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the school?

4. How does the school principal coordinate the monitoring of the teaching and learning process in the school?

5. Are there teaching staff going to the school principals office for consultations on academic issues or other issues?

6. Is the school principal's office easily accessible by teaching staff and learners in the school?

Appendix XI: Observation Protocol for Heads of Department

The observation protocol is divided into three sections addressing three questions concerning;

1. The management of teaching and learning
2. The methods of monitoring teaching and learning
3. The distribution of monitoring of teaching learning

The observation is intended to last for a maximum of one day.

Management of teaching and learning

1. What time do the HoD's come to the Classrooms?
2. What time do the HoD's leave the classrooms at the end of the day?
3. When the HoD's are present in the school compound where do they spend most time?
4. How much time do the HoD's spend in the school classrooms?
5. Where are the offices of the school HoD's located?

7 How many people are in these offices most of time/?

8. When the HoD's arrive in the school what they do first?

9 When HoD's are in the school what do they do thought out the day?

10 What are school activities that occupy the HoD's thought out the day?

12. When do they do their monitoring routines of checking what is going on in the classrooms

13. When do the HoD's meet with other teaching staff members?

14. What are the activities that defocus them from their work in the day?

15. What time are the HoD's busy and what are they busy doing then?

16. What are the conditions that affect learning in the classrooms?

The methods of monitoring teaching and learning

1. What the methods are the HoD's using to monitor teaching and learning in the classrooms?
2. What are the difficulties they are experiencing in using these monitoring tools in the classrooms?
3. In the monitoring tasks do these HoD's provide feedback to the teachers?
4. How are they monitoring tools affecting learner attendance and teacher punctuality?

The distribution of monitoring of teaching learning

1. What are the monitoring administrative structures in the school that drive the learning and teaching in the classrooms?
2. Who are the persons who actually do the monitoring of learning and teaching in the classrooms?
3. Who monitors the hods in the school classrooms?

Appendix XII: Observation Protocol for the School Teachers

The observation protocol is divided into three sections addressing three questions concerning;

1. The management of teaching and learning
2. The methods of monitoring teaching and learning
3. The distribution of monitoring of teaching learning

The observation is intended to last for a maximum of one day

Management of teaching and learning

1. What roles does a classroom teacher play in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms?
2. How are classroom teachers coordinating monitoring roles with school administration in dealing with discipline issues and other learner problems?

Methods of monitoring teaching and learning

1. What methods are classroom teachers using to monitor teaching and learning in the classrooms?
2. Are teachers getting feedback from the monitoring process by hods and the school principal?
3. When the monitoring of teaching and learning is going, do the learners in the classroom know that classroom monitoring is going on?
4. In the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms what are the issues your school principal or Hod or other persons who do the monitoring look for?
5. Are the teachers compiling and cooperating with the monitoring procedures
6. How are the school teachers monitoring learner's attendance and responses to classroom work during lessons?
7. What are the conditions that affect learning in the classrooms?

Distribution of monitoring of teaching learning

1. What are the monitoring administrative structures in the school that drive the learning and teaching in the classrooms?
2. Who else participates in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms?
3. When does the actual monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms in the classrooms?

Appendix XIII Semi-structured Interview Protocol for School Leadership

The semi-structured interview protocol is divided into three sections addressing three questions concerning;

1. The management of teaching and learning
2. The methods of monitoring teaching and learning
3. The distribution of monitoring of teaching learning

The interview is intended to last for a maximum of 45 minutes

Management of teaching and learning

1. As a school principal describe what do you consider as your important administrative duties in the school?
2. As a school principal explain what do you consider being your roles in the leading teaching and learning in the school? That is as a school head teacher describe what are your roles and tasks in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms

3 Do you think the current school monitoring policies and procedures are really worthwhile, understandable and implementable? If yes give reasons, if no give reasons. What school policies inform the monitoring procedures in the school classrooms?

4. What do you really think are the main reasons of monitoring teaching and learning as a school principal?
5. In carrying out your tasks of monitoring teaching and learning in the classrooms, explain the difficulties you at times encounter, and how do handle or have dealt with them?
6. How do you think the monitoring of teaching and learning should be carried out?
7. Would you distinguish between your management and leadership roles in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the school?
8. What are the conditions that affect learning in the classrooms?

Methods of monitoring teaching and learning

1. Describe the methods do you use when actually monitoring teaching and learning in the school?
2. What are the purposes of using these particular monitoring tools in the leading and managing of teaching and learning?
3. What difficulties do you experience in using these monitoring tools in the leading and management of teaching and learning in the school?

4. Who designs the school monitoring devices and instruments to monitor the teaching and learning in the school? Are monitoring tools externally imposed or internally devised? Describe

5. What administrative tools do you use to monitor learner performance?

6. What monitoring tools do you use to identify high performing learners and low performing learners?

7. How do you ensure that the teaching and learning process in the school is not disrupted?

8. Could you describe how your monitoring tools of teaching and learning have contributed to learner performance and achievement in this school? Give examples and possibly explain how successful your monitoring methods in the classrooms are

9. After monitoring teaching and learning in the classrooms what do you do with feedback findings? How do disseminate this information to the schoolteachers?

10. How do you ensure that your teaching staffs are accountable for their teaching and learning? That is as a school principal describe how you monitor teacher performance in the classrooms? Give examples

11. How do handle teacher absenteeism during school teaching and learning tome (mention ways)

<u>Distribution of monitoring of teaching learning</u>

1. What are the school monitoring structures that actually oversee the monitoring of teaching and learning in the school? Would you describe how your school administration performs its duties of monitoring teaching and learning in the school?

2. As a head teacher, how many people are actually involved in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms? Would you describe how you ensure that they are effective in their duties?

3. Are there often or none external monitoring teams or persons who come to monitor learner progress in the classrooms? If yes, how often and what do they do? (Explain). If no do encourage it (explain)

4. Do your teaching staff consult with you on matters of instruction and curriculum? If yes how often and give examples, if not what do you think are the reasons behind this?

5. As school principal would explain the purposes of how you monitor the teaching and learning process in the classrooms? That is are your school monitoring structures performing as expected? What are the merits and demerits of how you monitor teaching and learning in the school in terms of learner achievement, performance and teacher performance?

Appendix XIV: Interview Protocol for Heads of Department

The interview protocol is divided into three sections addressing three questions concerning;

1. The management of teaching and learning
2. The methods of monitoring teaching and learning
3. The distribution of monitoring of teaching learning

The interview is intended to last for a maximum of 45minutes

Management of teaching and learning

1. What roles does your school principal play in the monitoring of teaching and learning in your school? How would you describe the role does the school principal plays in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms?

3. Explain as a head of department what roles do you play in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms?

4. What are your monitoring tasks as a head of department in the school? As a head of department would you describe what you monitor in the classrooms?

5. As a head of department, who monitors you as you perform your work? Would you describe the difficulties you experience in monitoring the classrooms?

6. What are the conditions that affect learning in the classrooms?

Methods of monitoring teaching and learning

1. Would you describe the methods the school principal uses when monitoring teaching and learning in the classrooms? Would you explain why the school principal prefers to use these methods of monitoring teaching and learning in the classrooms?

2. As a Head of department describe the methods do you use to monitor teaching and learning in the classrooms? Would you explain why you prefer these methods of monitoring teaching and learning in the classrooms?

3. Would you describe the difficulties you experience in using these monitoring tools in the classrooms?

4. How do think that monitoring of teaching and learning should be done?

5. In the monitoring tasks do you provide feedback to your teachers? If yes how often, If no how do it then

6. Do you inform your teachers of your monitoring routines or simply surprise them, if yes give reasons, if no give reasons

7. Could you describe how your monitoring tools of teaching and learning have contributed to learner performance and achievement in this school? Give examples

Distribution of monitoring of teaching learning

1. What are the monitoring administrative structures in the school that drive the learning and teaching in the classrooms?
2. Who are the persons who actually do the monitoring of learning and teaching in the classrooms?
3. In case you are absent who does the monitoring tasks for you in the classrooms?
4. How do think monitoring of teaching and learning should be done in the classrooms?

Appendix XIIV: Interview Protocol for the School Teachers

The interview protocol is divided into three sections addressing three questions concerning;

1. The management of teaching and learning
2. The methods of monitoring teaching and learning
3. The distribution of monitoring of teaching learning

The interview is intended to last for a maximum of 45minutes

Management of teaching and learning

1. What role does the school principal perform in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms? How would you describe the role does the school principal plays in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms?
2. What role do the heads of department perform in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms? How would you describe the role does the Heads of departments play in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms?
3. As a classroom teacher would you describe the roles you play in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms?
4. What conditions do you think play an important role in keeping you encouraged at your work? 5. What are the conditions that affect learning in the classrooms?

Methods of monitoring teaching and learning

1. Describe the methods the school principal uses when monitoring teaching and learning in the classrooms? Would explain how effective these methods are?
2. Describe the methods the heads of departments use to monitor teaching and learning in the classrooms? Would explain how effective these methods are
3. Do you get feedback from the monitoring process?
4. Are you comfortable with the monitoring process in the teaching and learning? If no give reasons, if yes give reasons
5. How do think the monitoring of teaching and learning will make you a better teacher (give reasons)
6. When the monitoring of teaching and learning is going, do the learners in the classroom know that classroom monitoring is going on?
7. In the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms what are the issues your school principal or HOD or other persons who do the monitoring look for?
8. Could you describe how the monitoring tools of teaching and learning have contributed to learner performance and achievement in the classrooms? Give examples

9. In what way do you think the learner achievement is modelled around monitoring of teaching and learning?

Distribution of monitoring of teaching learning

1. What are the monitoring administrative structures in the school that drive the learning and teaching in the classrooms? Would explain how effective these structures are?
2. Who else participates in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms? How would you describe their effectiveness in carrying out monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms?
3. How do describe your participation as a school teacher in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms? Would you prefer to be actively involved or passively involved give reasons for your choice?
4. When does the actual monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms in the classrooms?
5. How does the HOD monitor your teaching and learning in the classrooms?
6. As a school teacher are you supportive of the monitoring styles and patterns used by the monitoring personnel in the monitoring of teaching and learning in the classrooms? If yes, give reasons. If no give reasons
7. Do you think that the persons who are carrying out the school monitoring process know and understand what they are doing, how do it, and when do it ? If yes explain. If no explain
8. How often has ever the school principal, assistant school principal or, HODs visited your classroom to specifically monitor your teaching and learning? If yes explain, if no explain