

https://dspace.org/

The changing role of headteachers at primary schools in Gautemg, 1994 - 1999

Bhana, Neeru Mohan

2014-03-10
http://hdl.handle.net10539/14088

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

THE CHANGING ROLE OF HEADTEACHERS

AT PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN GAUTENG,

1994 - 1999

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of the Witwatersrand, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education (Educational Management).

Neeru Mohan Bhana

(February 1999)

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this report is my own unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree of Master of Education (Educational Management) at the University of the Witwatersrand, Gauteng. It has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.

Neeru Bhana

Neeru Mohan Bhana

26/02/99

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Deep appreciation and sincere thanks to:

Dr Linda Chisholm for her invaluable guidance and expert supervision of this study.

Dr Shirley Sebakwane for her initial guidance in the formulation of the research proposal.

Ms Carol-Anne Spreen for guidance in research design.

The principals and staff who willingly participated in the study.

Dr J. Pillay, Head of Auxiliary Services at the District C1 offices of the Gauteng Department of Education, for his continual support.

Ms Selma Nagan for her assistance, encouragement and support throughout this period of study.

Kirti, Jateen and Deeksha Bhana, for the encouragement and enthusiasm in believing in me and supporting me throughout.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to Deelip Bhana, my best friend. He has inspired me with his continuous yearning to learn, to find new information and to perfect whatever had to be done. A special thank you for his patience, positive encouragement, assistance and care in all my endeavours.

ABSTRACT

This research report argues that the devolution of the functions of finance, governance and curriculum through the decentralisation process to schools has affected the role of headteachers in different ways. The report examines the international perspective on decentralisation and then traces the policy development related to decentralisation in South Africa. The major policy documents traced were the White Papers on education, the Hunter Report and the South African Schools Bill crucial aspects of which were finally enacted into the South African Schools Act of 1996. These policies are reviewed from the perspective of the decentralisation of finance, governance and curriculum.

Keeping the context of the South African Education background in mind, the state proposes that the demand for community control, greater participation and involvement would best be promoted in a decentralised system of education. This report argues how the historical background, caused through the racial division of schools, influenced the implementation of the policy of decentralisation at different schools and the impact this has had on the role of the head. The research finds that the present decentralisation policy further disadvantages the so-called disadvantaged schools, thus making the impact of the policy greater for the heads of these schools.

It is proposed that with decentralisation heads assume increased administration functions and decreased instructional functions. Increased accountability and the sharing of power with staff further intensify the role of the head. A more collaborative approach to school development has demanded that heads change their managerial styles. Heads drive changes in schools. The manner and degrees of change vary according to the head's capacity, understanding of the policy documents, attitude in creating a positive culture and resources available.

KEY WORDS

Accountability	Administration	Curriculum	entralisation
Devolution	Finance	Govern	eacher
Leadership	Legitimation	Manageme	wer-sharing

CONTENTS PAGE

Title Page i

Declaration ii

Acknowledgements iii

Dedication iv

Abstract and Keywords v

Chapter 1: Introduction 1

Chapter 2: Literature Review and Methodology 3

Chapter 3: International Perspectives on Decentralisation 11

Chapter 4: South African Education and Decentralisation 22

Chapter 5: School Background and Organisation 24

Chapter 6: School Financing 36

Chapter 7: School Governance 46

Chapter 8: School Curriculum 57

Chapter 9: Leadership and Management 70

Chapter 10: Accountability and Power Sharing 79

Chapter 11: Conclusion 83

References 89

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to understand whether and if so how the policy initiatives of the devolution of power to schools and school-based management have resulted in the changing role of headteachers regarding governance, curriculum, and finance at primary schools in the Central Region, District 1 (C1), Gauteng. The study also explores whether there are growing tensions between the heads' administrative and instructional roles.

Since April 1994 there has been major restructuring in the South African Education System. One of the strongest demands of the anti-apartheid educational struggle was to change the authoritarian, ineffective and illegitimate system of governance and management and replace it with a system that embodies and promotes the values of democracy, equity, redress and effectiveness (de Clerq, 1997, p.12). The changes in policy and the greater emphasis on participation are a consequence of the wider transition to democracy. The demand for community control of, and for, the involvement of legitimate stakeholders in the day to day management of schools it was sometimes argued would best be facilitated within a decentralised system of education. The state promoted policies which shifted responsibility from the centralised state policy to a decentralised system. The South African Schools Act of 1996 clearly illustrates a major policy initiative of the devolution of power through the downward shift of the legal authority to schools. In respect of governance and professional management of public schools, the Act states that "... the governance of every public school is vested in its governing body. A governing body stands in a position of trust towards the school." (South African Schools Act 84 of 1996, Government Gazette No. 17579).

The South African Schools Act gives every school governing body of a state school basic powers. These basic powers are to ensure that, every governing body of a state school will promote the best interests of the school through the provision of

quality education at the school. This it will do by drawing up a constitution and developing a mission statement; adopting a code of conduct for learners; recommending the appointment of staff; preparing an annual budget; establishing and administering a school fund; raising revenues including voluntary contributions to the school in cash and kind; preparing an annual audited statement of income and expenditure (Tikly,1997, p.3). This would imply a change in control from the centralised state to local levels resulting in school-based management.

Seeming misgivings about school-based management by headteachers in Lenasia prompted this study. School based management is likely to impact upon the role of the headteacher in a varied manner. The initial expectations of the sudden change in role function seemed to leave headteachers confused and insecure. Headteachers expressed much concern regarding the dynamics of change. Their roles appeared to be more diverse and complex. They seemed to be struggling in redefining their roles. There was little congruence between what they ought to be doing and what they were doing. Much doubt was also expressed whether their roles were adequately reformed, as there were no job descriptions for head teachers.

It is against this background that I investigate whether, and if so, how, the new policy initiatives of decentralisation and the resultant school-based management have created changes, in the role of the headteachers.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

There is a considerable body of literature dealing with the effect of decentralisation on the headteacher's role. The analysis of the changing role of the headteacher, with specific reference to governance, finance and curriculum is a difficult and complex task. Most of the literature to be reviewed is based on the experiences of headteachers in overseas countries. Government policy and educational reforms have influenced the change in the leadership role. In many countries, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Belgium, Australia, to name but a few, a clearer trend towards the decentralisation of control over education has emerged. With the devolution of power and authority to schools, and the assumption that school-based management of resources would improve the efficiency in education, the role of the headteacher has been changed. The headteacher has to develop abilities to adopt new managerial roles as the process of decentralisation unfolds.

Bradley (1992) maintains that initial studies that examined the changing role of the headteacher supports the claim that headteachers have experienced more change in their role under school reform than any other group. According to Earley, et al (1990), headteachers agree that their roles have altered and are distinctly different with school-based management (Murphy & Louis, 1994, p.25).

In Britain the1988 Education Reform Act *(ERA)* and the subsequent reforms in the late 1980's and early 1990's had established educational institutions as self-managing organisations, responsible for their own finances, the "hiring and firing" of teaching and non-teaching staff and consequent altered employment arrangements. This had resulted in the change in the work culture of headship. These changes have also brought interpersonal skills and human relations as part of the headteacher's function.

The *ERA* in Britain forced major changes to be started, placing additional demands on

headteachers. These additional demands with the implementation of the National Curriculum and its assessment arrangements, included financial management, additional governor powers, providing school-based inset teacher approval and the preparation for the *OFSTED* inspections.

Primary school headteachers had to develop the capacity for instructional leadership in other staff members. Maw (1994) found that the deputy head's role in the primary school was becoming defined in management terms and is focused on providing curriculum leadership. One possible implication of this was that women would not be attracted to progressing beyond deputy leadership in primary schools, as the headteachers' role requires less involvement with teaching and more with external networking and resource management (Levačić, 1995, p.119).

Levačić (1995) found that despite the role change 80% of the senior managers reported greater financial awareness and flexibility, more efficient use of resources and improved planning as the major benefits of local management. Bullock and Thomas (1994) found that attitudes of headteachers ranged from enthusiasm to concern with the greater complexity of the role. We can therefore conclude that local management has significantly enlarged the role of the headteacher (Levačić, 1995, p.136).

Most headteachers need to become aware of the changing relationships between professionals in the field of education and the need for new leadership and management skills. According to Cohen and Spillane (1992) most policy initiatives for change present a paradox. They offer appealing visions of a new order but also contain a critique of existing realities. This critique reveals a lack of many capacities that would be required to realise and sustain the new vision (Cohen & Spillane, 1992, p.76). According to Hallinger (1992) many studies suggest that the heads' own experience, training and beliefs may severely limit them in bringing about a new order of schools. Connely (1993) added that exacerbating this problem is the fact that principals have to re-conceptualise their roles radically, with limited resources at their disposal. Weinding (1992) found that principals readily acknowledge that they do not possess the skills necessary to carry out their responsibilities (Murphy & Louis, 1994, p.43).

When considering the crucial issues of the decentralisation policy regarding governance, finance and curriculum, the literature review shows that decentralisation has had an impact in different ways, in different countries. An investigation will reveal how changes would be effected in the role of headteachers in South Africa across different types of schools. We can then review whether common abilities or differences are to be found in the different schools run by the ex-departments (Department of Education and Training (black education), Transvaal Education Department (white education), House of Representatives (coloured education), House of Delegates (Indian education). In South Africa, the largest single change for schools will possibly be in attitude and culture reflecting a shift from a centrally controlled environment, before 1994, to one in which the heads locally manage the provision of education.

To conduct the study, information was obtained first on the decentralising policy initiatives in South Africa and secondly on how headteachers' roles may or may not have changed, because of the devolution of power to schools. The research design included a documentary analysis of policy and semi-structured interviews.

They conducted the interviews with specific reference to the change in roles of headteachers in relation to governance, finance and curriculum. The interview, according to Cannell & Kahn (1968) is a two-person conversation initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research-relevant information and focused by him/her on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction or explanation (Cohen & Manion, 1995, p.271).

This method involved the gathering of data through direct verbal interaction. Interviews were particularly useful in terms of the amount of information they produced. The interview had definite benefits in terms of information retrieval, in that it allowed the interviewer to glean background information helpful to understanding the organisational context of the school. The interview method was used because of its adaptability. Through verbal interaction, responses were developed and clarified. Ideas expressed were followed up, responses probed and complex material elicited. While the interview yielded rich material, the interviewer was aware of the subjectivity and bias that are always part of the research. It is, necessary that we

acknowledge the fact that bias can creep in rather than attempt to eliminate it altogether (Bell, 1987, p.73).

The interview was also used because of its convenience as a means of collecting data. It was possible to prearrange interviews. Interviews allowed face-to-face contact between interviewer and respondent which provided a personalised element to the research. This created an amiable rapport between researcher and respondent. At the same time, it gave the respondent the opportunity to comment on the research and thereby provided some feedback on how the informants regarded the interviewer and her work. The interviewer was sensitive to such feedback, thus defensiveness on the part of the respondents was identified and steps taken to overcome its cause and impact on the data that was being collected.

In the interviews that were conducted, the prospect of being interviewed was attractive rather than tiresome because the interview was used as an expressive medium by the respondents. A high degree of participation and cooperation resulted from the positive motivation of the respondents due to good rapport between myself and the respondents. I maintained the interest of the interviewee, by individualising information relevant to the research for each school.

My interviews elicited much information on the organisational context of the school. In studying the organisational context, additional information on aspects of power sharing, responsibility and accountability was attained. I obtained information on how headteachers and teachers view the decentralisation policy, with particular emphasis on how governance (the role of governing bodies), funding and curriculum management at schools have affected the headteacher's role. Much emphasis was placed on the increased administrative and decreased instructional roles of the head.

Selection of Sample

This study of 5 headteachers and 10 teachers (2 from each school) was conducted at five primary schools of the Central Region, District 1 (C1), in the Gauteng Province of South Africa. The ex-education departments were, prior to 1994, divided along the lines of the different parliamentary houses for the respective racial groups (included are Whites, Indians and Coloureds), excluding blacks (included are only the African

people). The African people were supposed to have been accommodated in the numerous homeland government structures. The sample was chosen to represent, proportionately, the ex-education departments. Two schools were chosen from the ex-Department of Education and Training (DET) , one school each from the ex-Department of House of Delegates (HOD), House of Representatives (HOR), and House of Assembly (TED).

The variables considered in selecting the sample of headteachers were the age of the headteacher, size of the school and the length of experience of headteachers. The age of the headteacher is used as a variable because the age of an individual affects the manner in which one views change. The ages of the heads ranged from forty-five to fifty years. The size of the school influenced the administration load of the headteacher. The enrolment at schools varied from 840 to 1200. Schools with similar enrolments facilitated comparison between the head's administration and teaching roles.

The length of experience was an essential variable in this study as the headteacher could comment on the role of headteachers before 1994, and then evaluate whether they have begun adopting new roles. This variable was a limiting factor in the selection of the sample as many headteachers who were in office before 1994, in the schools in Gauteng, Central District 1, had taken the voluntary severance package (commonly called VSP). Gender was not one of the variables considered in selection of the sample and thus both male and female heads and I interviewed teachers. The selection of the sample was done from the information received telephonically from various schools. Once a tentative sample was chosen, schools that met the criteria set out were contacted telephonically to make an appointment for the initial interview and to obtain consent from the heads and the teachers to be interviewed.

The variable to decide the teacher-sample was the respective teachers' lengths of experience at the school where the headteachers have been selected. At each school I interviewed two teachers. The information elicited from the interviews with the teachers added credibility to the information on the organisational context as well as changes in the role of the headteacher in respect of governance, finance and curriculum. Where there were discrepancies between the information elicited at any

school, I further probed and clarified this.

Two sets of interviews were conducted with each respondent:

In the introductory interview with each headteacher and teacher, I explained the objectives of the research as well as the aspects that were to be researched. Consent was obtained from the heads and the teachers in respect of their willingness to participate in the research. One limiting factor that I noted in the teacher selection was that while at Soweto A School the teachers volunteered to be interviewed, at all other schools the head asked specific teachers if they would be willing to be interviewed. At two schools, one teacher each felt intimidated at being interviewed and thus a replacement had to be sought. The headteachers were extremely helpful and accommodating in all respects. I gathered much of the background information in this initial interview.

The second interview lasted approximately forty-five minutes with teachers and between an hour and one and half hours with the headteachers. I obtained detailed information from both the teachers and the headteachers.

Field notes were made to record the information from the interviews and were used as a basis of analysis.

This study was limited in terms of the time and resources available. Having included a larger number of schools within the Central District 1 would have been more helpful. As it stands only one school was chosen from each of the ex-departments, except the ex-Department of Education and Training, from which two schools were chosen. This restriction results in the conclusions being tentative ones. The interviewees' responses are not necessarily fully representative of the entirety of the heads or teachers in the district. Wider research samples need to be investigated to produce results for purposes of generalisation.

A second limitation was that many heads were still groping with the implementation of the new policy initiatives. The heads were unsure of the manner of implementation and the direction to be followed. While they were aware that there

were changes in their roles, it did not become evident that this was the result of the decentralisation process. This study should, if practicable, be conducted later when the devolution of power and school-based management had been fully or largely implemented. Most heads would, in a year or two, feel more comfortable with the different aspects researched. Pilot programmes for the implementation of any policy initiatives usually last between one and four years. The heads have, therefore, not had adequate time for the complete adoption of the decentralisation policy and the resultant school-based management system. Not expecting thorough implementation of the decentralisation process at this stage would be reasonable. That the outcomes are what was found should be viewed according to the point in time (snapshot effect) during which I conducted this study.

The third limitation is that while certain aspects, such as increased administration functions, accountability, flexibility and power relations resulted from the adoption and implementation of decentralisation policies, attributing these perceived changes to other factors is possible. There have been no controls and therefore one may question the cause of the outcomes.

Methodologically, while the interview was the most important research tool, and every effort was made to interpret and report the views of the interviewees objectively, it is always possible that bias of the interviewer may affect the reporting of the information.

Key categories researched were the ***organisational context,*** which included basic data of the school and staff as a whole, and information about the headteacher and management and the ***assessment of changes in respect of*** governance, finance, curriculum and the administrative role. I will deal with all these aspects in greater detail in the chapters on analysis and discussion.

An international perspective on decentralisation will be presented. I will then examine why decentralisation has been introduced internationally and in South Africa. The policy documents, such as the White Papers, the Hunter Report and the South African Schools Act, will then be analysed to illustrate how the decentralisation policy has affected finance, governance and curriculum in South Africa. The chapters

on finance, governance and curriculum will report on the results of the investigation on the changes brought about by the decentralisation policy in the head's role. The chapters on increased administration functions illustrate the change in management styles of heads.

With decentralisation come increased accountability and the shifting of power to the local levels. These aspects have added much stress to the head's role. Finally a summary of results is presented.

CHAPTER 3

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON DECENTRALISATION

This chapter examines different perspectives on the decentralisation debate and its relation to the South African education system. Some thoughts are being presented on why decentralisation has been implemented internationally. Education policies in South Africa show much congruence with international trends.

Decentralisation policies in education are presently being advocated internationally. A recent World Bank Report on education declared: "decentralisation ... the key that unlocks the potential of schools to improve the quality of education" (Lockheed, et al, 1989, p.1). It is argued by both the World Bank and the South African Government that the decentralisation of the education system represents a progressive advance on centralised approaches to education. However, Sayed (1992) argues that such an approach fails to take into account the specifics of the South African education system and, in fact, frees the state from the responsibility for the provision of education. He believes that given the historical legacies of apartheid education a strong interventionist state is necessary for effecting the transformation of South African education (Sayed, 1992, p.2). While this appears to be the logical manner to achieve effectiveness, redress and equity, in the present political climate it is difficult to believe that the people would accept change through a strong interventionist policy. The principles and values of democracy had to be interwoven into the change process.

Decentralisation has a multiple agenda depending on the purpose that the decentralisation policy is serving. Some writers/researchers, like Weiler (1989), focus on issues of power, legitimation and conflict giving decentralisation a political dimension. Weiler (1989), Mc Ginn and Street(1995), Samoff and Jansen (1991), Sayed (1992) all view decentralisation as a policy driven by the political process. Both Weiler (1989) and Samoff, et al, (1991) look at decentralisation in a conflict

paradigm. Their focus on decentralisation is political and theoretical. They view it for mobilising political support for public schools. Weiler (1989) does not believe that effectiveness has driven decentralisation. The state is concerned with retaining its power and therefore it looks after the interests of the dominant groups. Samoff and Jansen (1989) add that the Third World countries decentralise in an attempt to gain support of the majority. They believe and I agree that limited decentralisation is a powerful strategy for control that reinforces rather than undermines legitimacy.

Ferris (1992), on the other hand, views decentralisation as driven by effectiveness. He believes that by controlling the degree to which functions are decentralised, the policy could be advantageously implemented. Moreover, Ferris (1992) sees the success of decentralisation in the fact that the interests of the state are different from those of the decision makers. Ferris's emphasis is on implementation of shared governance depending on capacities and competencies. Street (1995) views decentralisation in a political perspective, taking into account also the redistribution of social power. Much emphasis is on popular participation, democracy and growth as necessary components of socialist construction. I will discuss these authors' views and approaches in detail, as they put forward a combination of factors as they operate in South African Schools. Depending on the perspective chosen, the outcomes would be different. Investigating how these various perspectives can be related to the South African context is interesting.

In South Africa, the state introduced decentralisation as a political move. To promote the values of democracy, equity, and redress and to change the authoritarian, ineffective system of educational governance the policy of decentralisation was implemented. Before 1994, the state experienced much defiance in education. The different schools experienced much fragmentation. It, therefore, became necessary to bring about participation of the different role players in the process of change through the policy of decentralisation. I, thus, believe that examining the views of these authors in detail is necessary and relate how their perspectives apply to the South African situation.

Many have argued that the state needs to decentralise or delegate its power and authority to lower levels, because the levels closest to the problem will have access

to better information and understanding to devise solutions (Fiske, 1996, p.6). Some authors have put forward rational and technical explanations, while others have stressed the political nature of this move. The consensus (technical) perspective argues that the state decentralises to improve the effectiveness of service delivery and increase local participation, because people on the ground are better positioned and informed to contribute to the solutions of their problems (Conyers, 1984). However, there is no evidence of the success of decentralisation as a quick solution to the management problems of the state. The implementation of the decentralisation policy is an expensive option, despite the scarce resources of the state at present. For the increased participation, the School Governing Body has to provide the extra resources.

The political (conflict) perspective, on the other hand, argues that effectiveness concerns do not drive decentralisation but is a political process which involves power and control over the use of scarce resources (Weiler, 1989, p.437).

Weiler (1989) rejects the assumption of the consensus (technical) perspective, that the state is a neutral arbitrator between the different conflicting groups and that it adopts a technical approach to decentralisation. He does not see decentralisation as providing for genuine redistribution of power and resources so much as a subtle change in the locus of power of groups in and around the state. He argues that the (European) state is primarily concerned with retaining its political power and control, while appearing to decentralise (less important decisions) for conflict management and compensatory legitimation (de Clercq, 1997, p.4). In many policy issues in South Africa, there has been much legitimation, as core elements are legislated at national or provincial level. Essentially centralisation promotes control over national/state policies, while decentralisation fosters legitimation.

Weiler (1989) states that "the notion of decentralisation as redistribution of power seems largely incompatible with the interests of the modern state in maintaining effective control and in discharging some of its key functions with regard to the system of economic production and capital accumulation"(Weiler, 1989, p.37).

The persistence of decentralisation in the strategies of the modern state rests on its

important political utilities. As an instrument of conflict management, decentralisation was a means of desegregating unitary centres of conflict. As a tool of compensatory legitimation, the language of decentralisation is used to bolster the eroding legitimacy of the eroding state. In presenting the state as attentive to local needs, variations and pressures, decentralisation provides a source of legitimacy to the state (Samoff & Jansen, 1991, p.3)

The critical political perspective assumes that the state is political and represents mainly the interests of the dominant groups in a capitalist society. Samoff and Jansen (1989), who also adopt a political approach to decentralisation, criticise this state-centred view because it presents the state as monolithic and in political control. They argue that the state embodies the balance of power relations in society and that the pressures from the various social groups and oppositional alliances constantly influence its behaviour and actions. According to them, the state in the third world countries decentralizes in an attempt to deal with popular mobilisation, as in South Africa. If implemented carefully, limited decentralisation is a powerful strategy for control that reinforces rather than undermines legitimacy.

Through compensatory legitimation conflict management is also passed on from the state to local levels. Decentralisation thus becomes a significant political strategy for coping with a highly-conflicting situation. The overt advantage of decentralisation, from the point of view of conflict management, is that it allows the state to diffuse the sources of conflict and to provide additional layers of insulation between them and the rest of the system. With the responsibility of governance at the local level, the conflicts related to decision making, for example, promotion of staff, have been diffused to the schools and districts.

Decentralisation also serves to mobilise political support for public schools. Aspects of the political power are diffused to the local level. Through the diffusion of political power, the state may lose some control. However, Weiler asserts that "the state's interest in control is likely to limit the extent of any real decentralisation." (Fiske, 1996, p.7). This is true in most countries where decentralisation has been implemented. States are often reluctant to lose control and therefore decentralisation is usually implemented to a limited extent.

Weiler's (1989) theoretical focus is on the modern capitalist state. Whether the same assumptions, concerning the state and decentralisation are appropriate in the underdeveloped and dependent peripheral societies remains to be demonstrated.

Weiler's (1989) state-centred argument largely ignores the range and potential of social groups and oppositional alliances which determine and influence the behaviour of the state. Such opposition is merely assumed. Yet, the diversity and unpredictability of political alliances outside the state demand explicit consideration in any form of decentralisation. Weiler also exaggerates the distance between "decentralisation rhetoric and centralised behaviour." Decentralisation can be a powerful means for dis-empowering the alleged beneficiaries of the policy. Whether or not the stated goals of a decentralisation reform are achieved, both its rhetoric and the pattern of its implementation may function to consolidate the authority and centrality of the state and its officials (Samoff& Jansen, 1991, p.3).

In the past decade, many countries have tested different forms of state decentralisation for different reasons and in different contexts. They often claimed for ideological reasons that decentralisation of educational authority is an attempt to enhance educational performance and managerial efficiency because it incorporates new agents or sources such as teacher empowerment. Through local decision-making, financial educational costs are reduced. Decision making authority is given to school stakeholders in return for their financial contribution and a need to deflect conflicts and achieve compensatory legitimation.

Ferris (1992) argues that the state could legitimately appear concerned about problems of public accountability, especially if the new levels of authority use their authority to pursue their own interests which are different from its own. The state can make these lower levels more accountable and minimize their potential for opportunism. It can circumscribe and monitor the decentralisation agents by limiting to whom, what and how much to decentralise. Thus, Ferris (1992) emphasises more the implementation issues of decentralisation.

Ferris (1992) distinguishes two forms of decentralisation which shifts decision-making responsibility lower down within the official and school hierarchy, and is

intended to give more authority and control to administrators and professionals (officials at district level and/or school educators). The administrative-cum-political decentralisation devolves authority to agents within and outside the school structure (shared governance by multiple constituencies) and intends to make schools respond to both professional and public demands (Ferris, 1992, p.336).

This model makes schools account professionally to the school district and democratically to the school community through the school governing body. What will be needed to understand this model of shared governance is the composition and power relations of the school governing body. This will depend on many factors such as the capacity, competency and interests of the different constituencies to use their decision-making discretion. Thus, the structure of school-based decision-making can differ widely and will usually reflect the motivation of those who engineer the changes. The research conducted shows this adequately in the South African schools. The varying capacity of the different school governing bodies shows differences in the school-based decision-making and management of the schools.

The introduction of the decentralisation policy into the so-called disadvantaged South African schools without adequate capacity of schools and districts would further disadvantage these schools. This would be so as they do not have the capacity to handle right now the additional responsibility and accountability that decentralisation brings with it. In addition, resources are limited for redistribution at the provincial and district level.

Street (1995) looks at decentralisation in the social perspective, as redistributing social power among groups. Street (1995) believes that one should consider benefits, other than academic, of decentralisation as increased participation of groups of people. However, Street points out that decentralisation will only occur to the extent that it would control the interests of the dominant groups. In this way Street (1995) differs from Ferris (1992) in that Ferris deals essentially with the implementation issues and the social, political aspects of decentralisation.

According to Street (1995) two conceptual frameworks characterise the literature on decentralisation: the "dominant" perspective, which emphasizes the constraints on

achieving successful implementation, and the "alternative" perspective which places value on how the political dynamic of decentralisation in practice modifies both the system of domination and the possibilities of the social actors to affect this system. Depending on the perspective assumed, differing outcomes are valued and therefore different notions of success and failure arise. Since third world governments tend to focus on the narrow achievement of specified objectives, they may lose sight of the other benefits of decentralisation, such as redistribution of social power. Street (1995) concludes that often little is known about the meaning of decentralisation for different groups' social and political practices (Samoff & Jansen 1991 pp.3-4).

While Street (1995) presents a powerful analysis of decentralisation, there are several problems with the argument. First, the categorisation into two theoretical camps may be oversimplified. The great diversity of approaches and perspectives to decentralisation warrants more differentiated attention. The existence of two perspectives is presented as a theoretical choice, that is, choosing one perspective leads to one set of outcomes and choosing another simply leads to another set of conclusions. Arguing that social conflict is inherent in decentralisation projects requires an understanding of the choice of the preferred framework itself as a political decision. Street (1995) does not explain how decentralisation despite the increased participation did not improve the social or political situation of the oppressed. Decentralisation can become a conscious and central means of political control even when fully implemented. (Samoff & Jansen, 1989, p.4). Investigating this aspect in relation to the South African context is necessary, as the decentralisation process in South Africa seems to further disadvantage the socially oppressed.

Noting that the recent enthusiasm for decentralisation is not limited to those primarily concerned with strategies of control and legitimation is important. There is also support for decentralisation from the socialists who have argued that popular participation, democracy, and growth are necessary components of socialist construction. According to Mc Ginn and Street(1995), decentralisation is the outcome of political struggles and takes different forms to increase participation of certain groups and change the locus of power either in or outside the state. Shifting power from the central to the local levels can achieve the increased participation.

Mc Ginn and Street (1995) state that the state decentralises to the extent that the dominant groups in and around the government agree that such a move will enhance their interests. Either the old state structures have become an obstacle to the furtherance of their interests or oppositional groups pursuing their own interests create new circumstances which pressure the dominant groups to reconsider the existing arrangements (deClerq, 1997, p.15). In South Africa, which is characterised by great social inequality, decentralisation is unlikely to lead to genuine redistribution of power towards the disadvantaged. An examination of the specific political setting in which decentralisation is introduced will reveal the form and impact those decentralisation policies will have.

O'Day & Smith (1993), also believing in the need for coherence at school level, argue that the state should concentrate on setting down certain school standards in resources, practises and performances and also providing monitoring mechanisms to sustain the process of change in all schools. The systemic reform movement could be accused of offering a too conceptual framework which does not take into account the specific politics of educational governance and decentralisation, or, as Elmore (1993) put it, a framework based on absolute as opposed to "relative values gained from balancing different interests". However, it is a useful framework to assess how aligned educational centralisation is in specific settings (deClerq, 1997, p.16).

For Elmore (1993), the national level is better placed to define and monitor the knowledge and skills acquired by the students. The local level is better positioned to have the responsibility for creating the environment and the way in which students learn. Assessment and monitoring of students' work and negotiating the relationship between the school and the specific local constituencies are also best done at the local level. Elmore (1993) concludes that the challenge is to develop institutions and policies which emphasize the interests and competencies of each level and also foster interdependent relationships between the different levels (Elmore, 1993, p114).

Thus, in analysing the dynamics of the South African educational governance system examining the specific policy documents is interesting and how they shift power and responsibility to the various governance levels. Understanding the specific configurations of power which exist in South Africa, from the conception of policy

through the implementation and the operational stages of the decentralisation project is important (Samoff, 1989).

Chisholm (1997) postulates three main approaches to the question on the locus of control or decentralisation in South Africa. One approach maintains that they highly centralised education under apartheid in South Africa, and that the process of democratisation must entail a concomitant decentralisation of educational control. She argues that a second model has presented South African education as historically a mixture of both centralised and decentralised tendencies. This mixed model can be contrasted with the third model which identifies decentralised models with the entrenchment of inequality.

In the first instance the state and the exercise of state power, is seen negatively and as hostile to democracy and the free play of market forces which decentralisation ensures. In the second, the state is seen as a neutral instrument. In the last, the central state is seen as capable of being harnessed to national goals to achieve equity and social transformation (Chisholm, 1997, p.63).

Sayed (1992) has also highlighted this. All the policy texts produced after 1994, referred to the need for participation in educational governance (Sayed, 1996, p.4). In South Africa, a consensus and settlement have been built around educational change. The education policy, as developed by the new South African state, has deployed a complex range of discourses. The specificity seems to lie in the linkage of redistributive strategies with policies designed for a context of financial stringency; of an association of desegregation with deregulation. Whether or not the greater play of the market forces will achieve greater equity and quality in education still needs to be seen (Chisholm, 1997, p.65).

In the development of policy in South Africa, while strong emphasis has been on the need for participation and all policy documents are open to public response and feedback, schools have remained marginal to the development of the policy process. The heads, senior managers, classroom teachers or students are not involved in the process of generation of policies. They believe that this is the function of the teacher unions. They are usually busy with the process of implementation of the policy.

The changes in policy and the greater emphasis on participation are a consequence of the wider transition to democracy. Two areas of significance in the evolution of educational policy are the devolution of powers, from the centre to the nine South African provinces, in terms of the new constitution, and the devolution of power to, historically, model-C schools (white) to all public schools.

The national level is in charge of norms and standards to provide uniformity across the nation, while the provinces are in charge of service delivery and policy implementation. Provinces set up a new administrative level, namely, the district or circuit level of educational governance in charge of service delivery and provisioning for most schools across racial and social li. .s. Education is, thus, a provincial competence, but subject to a national policy framework. Through this devolution of power from the national to the provincial to the district levels, conflict is deflected from the centre to local levels.

Weiler's (1989) views on decentralisation have a political perspective in that decentralisation is not driven by effectiveness, but involves power and control over scarce resources. The state has introduced decentralisation in South Africa to satisfy the political expectations of the people. Decentralisation is seen as a powerful means for dis-empowering the alleged beneficiaries of the policy. This has been revealed in the research undertaken. The so-called disadvantaged schools were further disadvantaged due to poor resources and poor capacity. The functions of the head were further complicated at the disadvantaged schools.

Weiler did not consider the social dimensions involved in the decentralisation process. Street(1995) looks at decentralisation in the social perspective. The main focus here is that benefits other than academic, in terms of increased participation, are also valuable. In South Africa, the new democratic approach to management in fact looks upon the benefit of increased participation. Ferris (1992) emphasised the implementation of shared governance, depending on capacities and competencies. This view is clearly illustrated in the research findings. The capacity of the School Governing Body varied from school to school. The effectiveness of the implementation depended much on the capacity of the head to empower the members of the School Governing Body.

While the state has introduced decentralisation essentially because of the political perspective, the social perspective and the implementation phase of decentralisation has impacted on the role of the heads in South Africa.

CHAPTER 4

SOUTH AFRICAN EDUCATION AND DECENTRALISATION

I will attempt to analyse the local, South African policy sources from which decentralisation of power, resulting in school-based governance, financial control and curriculum development, have emerged. The policy sources to be analysed are the two white papers on education, the Hunter Report and the South African Schools Bill which was legislated as an Act in 1996. In respect of curriculum I will review the Discussion Document on Curriculum 2005.

The White papers and the South African Schools Act are the product of a policy making process that predates the 1994, South African, general elections. The *policies draw on, and develop, the ideas first put forward in the Democratic* Movement's National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI, 1992), the African National Congress's Policy Framework and Implementation Plan for Education and Training (IPET) documents (ANC, 1994, a, b), and also the Nationalist Party led Government's Education Renewal Strategy (ERS, 1992)(Tikley, 1997, p.2).

The first White Paper on Education and Training committed the government to reform the educational and school governance system along the lines of a more effective, customer oriented, decentralised, representative system (Department of Education, 1995a). This White Paper had called for the establishment of a National Review Committee to make recommendations on the organisation, governance and finance of schools. In August 1995, The National Review Committee, comprising of representatives across the political and educational spectrum, led by Professor Peter Hunter, submitted a Report.

The mandate of the Hunter Commission (which was the basis of the South African Schools Act) was to recommend "a national framework of school organisation and funding and ownership, and norms, on school governance and funding which are likely to command the widest public support . . ." (Hunter, 1995, p. ix). Regarding

governance the Hunter Report advocated shared responsibility of parents, teachers, students and the community at large. The proposal increased parent representation, proposing two sets of functions of school governing bodies.

White paper 2 (February 1996, WP2: Department of National Education, 1996a) was the government's response to the Hunter commission. It reflected the broad acceptance of recommendations of the Hunter commission. Much emphasis and detail are outlined in the discussions that follow from the Hunter Report, as this report formed the basis to the South African Schools Act, which in fact legislates all aspects of education in South Africa.

White Paper 2 was reformulated and passed through many drafts, after representations from the different stakeholders and led to the South African Schools Bill *(SASB)*.

The *South African Schools Bill* was finally enacted, in November 1996, into the South African Schools Act *(SASA)*. Even in the final stages of the debate, the *South African Schools Bill* was subject to objections. Concerns were raised in relation to some clauses of the Bill, particularly those dealing with financing, powers and composition of governing bodies, language policy and corporal punishment. These objections followed the introduction of some extensive changes to the earlier versions of the Bill by the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on education (Kgobe, 1996, pp.2-3).

Having briefly attempted to outline the policy developments leading to the *South African Schools Act*, let us now look at the various policy documents and trace the development of policies on school organisation, governance, finance and curriculum. It will be argued that through a policy mix of centralised and decentralised tendencies, these will affect school organisation, governance, finance and curriculum. The state may maintain control by analysing which powers are decentralised and which are kept centralised.

CHAPTER 5

SCHOOL BACKGROUND AND ORGANISATION

This chapter looks at school organisation, as proposed by the policy documents and links this to the school organisation at the five schools where I carried out the research. The data collected at the five schools suggest clearly the variation in school organisation brought about by the past historical development of the schools. In this chapter school profiles are presented briefly. The profiles presented are in respect of amenities, learner enrollments, relationships in teacher and management statistics. These background statistics are important in providing a basis for comparison of these factors at the different schools.

Policy

Against the background of significant differences in levels of resources, availability of management skills, willingness to participate in school governance, and access to parent communities, the Hunter Review sought to develop a coherent framework of school categories and ownership that would maintain the positive characteristics of various models but incorporate them in a new structure (Greenstein, 1995, p.3).

Following the recommendations of the Hunter Review Committee, the *White Paper 2* and the *South African Schools Act* made provision for two basic categories of schools, namely, public schools and independent schools. All public schools would function as partnerships between the respective province and the local communities. The new category of the public school incorporates many features of the former "Model-C" schools. This suggests the possibility that such former "white" schools will not change much. Thus, the practical implications for these schools will not be significant. This was revealed in the research. The head at the ex-model C school in Mondeor could adapt easily to the minimal changes brought about by the decentralisation policy.

It is the reorganisation of schools in the other sectors that should receive a great deal of attention. By putting the same structure in place for all schools the *South African Schools Act* has cleared the way for an integrated education system. Schools that previously had varying structures, and answered to different authorities, will be streamlined into coherent, provincial, district and institutional structures. This is seen as a necessary condition for overall planning and is, thus, essential for programmes of redress (Greenstein, 1995, pp.3-4).

Research Findings

With this background on the theoretical basis of school organisation, I will now look at the data obtained from the schools investigated. While most schools in the Gauteng Province are currently responsible to the Gauteng Department of Education, much of their present development and philosophies have been determined by their past, historical, education departments. How decentralisation is driving the reform in each school is evident in the manner in which the schools are being managed. The heads are involved in trying to change the old order. In doing so they do not fully understand and see the decentralisation process as such. The functions that are being passed to the school are seen as structural issues being passed down for staff to implement. The issues of decentralisation are equated to democratic control. Many staff view the issues of decentralisation as synonymous with the introduction of democratic management.

The head of a school influences the manner in which he would implement the policy initiatives. The implementation of the decentralisation policy will definitely influence the role-function of the head at a school. In Belgium, Vandenberghe (1992) explored how the trend towards decentralisation affected the role-function of the principal. Principals were expected to be innovative in monitoring the local implementation process. The principal was largely responsible for how the local school adapts to the new policy. The policy-makers seldom involve themselves with the implementation. The principal is one of the chief implementers of policy (Vandenberghe,1992, p.20).

Large-scale government-initiated improvement policies seem to assume a direct relationship between central inputs, local responses, and programme/policy results.

According to McLaughlin (1990), while a relationship exists between central policy and local reactions, an analysis at the school level demonstrates that local factors, that are beyond the control of any policy maker, shape the nature of change. One of these local factors is the principal. The manner the principal organises the local reaction in a proactive or passive way, in an independent or dependent way would determine the changes in the role of the head (McLaughlin, 1990, p.11). At the five schools where I conducted the research, the factor of the decentralisation of the school organisation has affected the role of the head. I have analysed their perceptions in this chapter.

A related issue is that of school culture. School culture is closely linked to school organisation. The culture of a school is defined as the peculiar and distinctive "way of life of the group or class, the meanings, values and ideas embodied in institutions, in social relations, in systems and beliefs, in mores and customs" in the uses of objects and material life (Clark, et al, in Davidoff & Lazarus, 1997, p 42). The culture of a school relates to the way things are done at a particular school. It comprises the values and norms of the school, the unwritten rules which determine and establish a certain set of behaviours, a particular way of being and relating, working in the context of the school. The culture of a school ensures a certain measure of conformity, so that over time individuals who work there begin to express the culture of the school. It is the ethos or climate of the school affected by its outer context. The culture of the school is the most pervasive aspect of school life and touches and affects every other aspect (Davidoff & Lazarus 1997, pp 42-43). In studying the cultures and organisational structures of the different schools, it becomes apparent that each school relates differently to the issue of decentralisation. This difference in reaction is related to differing capacities and resources. Let me now proceed to examine how each school has implemented decentralisation in school organisation.

At the Soweto A School, an effective, vibrant headteacher was able to get people on board. She is a person's person, driven to make the school one of the best to provide an effective service for the children. In her words:

> I encourage staff to participate in all school activities. I enjoy the enthusiasm and commitment with which the staff work. In decentralising governance, the

> curriculum and finances the staff assist in assuming the responsibility of setting up the school-based management systems.

While there has to be much development in systems and capacity of different stakeholders, the head, with the staff, has built a warm culture of teaching and learning.

At the Soweto B School, the head is concerned with the concept of democracy. She believes that the new policy involves democratic control. While she believes in democratic control she is unable to bring about a responsible culture. She does not see the policy of decentralisation and the shifting of power to the school as a positive policy initiative. She is uncertain of what is expected of her, as a leader, in the new education system. The culture of this school is that of fragmentation. Collaboration among staff is lacking. The elements of the defiance campaign are visibly apparent at this school. The interviewed educator stated: "Why must I have additional responsibilities? The head and management staff must do their work. I get paid to teach." Clearly, here there is no support for additional duties that school-based management is to bring.

At the Lenasia School, the head claimed:

> The decentralisation process results in an increase in work. I had to change my style to working with the staff rather than on my own. I found difficulty in trying to adopt the school-based management system. I looked at the positive aspects of sharing work with the staff. Much time was spent on creating positive attitudes towards the implementation of the new decentralised curriculum. I believe that decentralisation of tasks to schools will be more productive. However, with the decentralisation of power to schools, a culture of sharing tasks has resulted and, thus, we have created a positive culture of ownership here.

The organisation at the school had to change and thus the head had to adopt a change in role function.

At the Ennerdale School, the head is defensive. The policy initiatives of decentralisation are not fully understood. He continually looks for support and directives, from the district offices. He does not want assistance in the management of the school from the school management team or the School Governing Body. Often it was found that they legitimise much of the representation through non-participation of the members. He does not use the resources at school to put systems in place. He stated that he enjoyed the increased administration work. This would mean that he would not have to offer curricular support for the teachers. A culture of insecurity exists, where he has not led staff into a culture of belonging.

At the Mondeor School, the head is an experienced, confident educator. He is well-versed in policy documents. Excellent capacity and adequate human resources exist to implement the decentralisation policy. Decentralisation policy is seen as different from just based on democratic principles. As a senior teacher commented:

> The devolution of power is at different levels. The executive management team members are responsible for wider management and administrative decisions. The staff are given the opportunity to make decisions. These are at the levels where they concern their teaching and operation in the classrooms. This creates a happy school culture, where staff and pupils are happy to assume responsibility to work.

The culture suggests that this is an effective school where the head is in control of different levels and the staff support the hierarchial organisation. The implementation of decentralisation is much easier as there are excellent resources and good capacity, with a head, who is proactive at this school.

School-based management has been implemented at different schools in varying degrees. The degree to which the implementation takes place depends on the level and manner in which the head interprets the policy of decentralisation and facilitates the implementation of this policy. Having briefly looked at the differing degrees of implementation of decentralisation, responses of principals and its influence on the culture of each school, let me now examine the demographic background in relation to the location and availability of resources, both physical and human, of each school.

Table 1: Amenities at Schools A, B, C, D and E.

CRITERIA	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Location	Soweto	Soweto	Ennerdale	Lenasia	Mondeor
Former education dept	DET	DET	HoR	HoD	TED
School building - material	Brick	Brick	Brick	Brick	Brick
School building - storied	Double	Double	Single	Single	Single
Additional amenities	None	None	None	Fair	Good
Playgrounds	Poor	Poor	Poor	Good	V Good
Sports fields	None	Poor	None	Good	V Good

The five schools where I carried out the research are all primary schools from the Central District 1. All are within a radius of approximately 20 kilometres from the Central District 1 offices. *Table1* illustrates that the two Soweto Schools are ex-Department of Education and Training; the Ennerdale School is ex-House of Representatives Education Department; the Lenasia School is ex-House of Delegates Education Department; and the Mondeor School is ex-Transvaal Department of Education (House of Assembly). Noting that each of these schools has a different past is necessary, considering the differences in the departments through which they developed.

The school buildings at all five schools are brick buildings. The maintenance of the buildings varies depending on the support-staff available. The Lenasia School and the Mondeor School had maintenance contracts with outside firms, who were responsible for the general maintenance and upkeep of the buildings and grounds. At the Ennerdale School maintenance-staff had been employed by the Department. Continued vandalism had led to the poor appearance of the school buildings at this school. At the two Soweto Schools, the ex-departments made no provision for maintenance staff. Thus, the cleaning at Soweto A School is done by the learners as well as the staff and voluntary community workers. The voluntary workers are more regular at the Soweto A School than at the Soweto B School. This is because at the Soweto A School there is much greater community participation. The head said:

> This community views the school as part of its own. The culture of ownership of the school has been developed within the community. The school is, thus, the centre of the community. It is well used by church groups and other welfare and community groups. It is also well looked after by the community against vandalism and rebel behaviour. Voluntary assistance from the community is always forthcoming for the proper maintenance of the school.

At the Soweto B School maintenance of the school is poor. The classroom conditions are drastically poor, with broken window panes, desks in states of disrepair and generally dirty walls. No staff members have been allocated the responsibility for maintenance and no one assumes responsibility for the cleanliness of the school. The administration block, including the principal's office, lacked adequate or suitable furniture. The principal's desk seemed cluttered.

At Schools in Soweto and Ennerdale the supply and quality of the resources are generally poor. The stationery and learning materials, for the current school year, were received late, and the supply was limited. At the Soweto A School the materials for the laboratory and libraries were developed through the resourcefulness of the head and the staff. Mini libraries and laboratory corners were developed in the various classes. At the Soweto B School, through the 'read-a-thon' supply of books, the school developed library corners, but there are no other specialised facilities at this school. At the Ennerdale School, the reading materials are limited and thus library facilities are extremely poor. There is no laboratory, nor is there a supply of laboratory materials. These resources are also limited. At the Lenasia School, there is a well-equipped library. A full-time librarian is available who helps the learners in the use of the library resources. The laboratory had been set up in a classroom. Chemicals are purchased from school funds.

At the Mondeor School, the additional amenities are excellent. The library is well-equipped and computerised. The learners have good opportunities to develop skills in research. The laboratory is well set up and effectively used by learners. A computer-room is available for learners to acquire basic skills in the use of computers.

In analysing *Table 1*, the Lenasia School and the Mondeor School, both have well-

maintained, turfed, playgrounds and sports fields. Upon interviewing the heads of these schools it was found that the grounds and sports fields development had been due to the fundraising efforts of the respective parent-teacher associations at these schools. At Schools in Soweto and Ennerdale the playgrounds, which were not developed at all comprised essentially bare sandy grounds. The sports and recreation facilities were inadequate. At these schools the staff show little commitment towards any extra-curricular activities that are to take place outside the normal teaching time. At the Lenasia School, some staff (approximately 10%) are reluctant to help with sports activities as they feel they are the 'older' members of staff. However, there is good participation by staff in drama, arts and music. At least 60% participate in extramural activities outside school hours. The Mondeor School has an extensive extramural programme. All staff participate actively in extramural activities outside school time.

With decentralisation of school organisation to the local level and schools levying user fees all other schools have an opportunity to develop their grounds and buildings according to their learners' needs. This would of necessity impact additionally upon the role that the head would have to play in these developments.

Table 2: Learner Statistics of Schools A, B, C, D and E.

CRITERIA	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Location	Soweto	Soweto	Ennerdale	Lenasia	Mondeor
Former education dept	DET	DET	HoR	HoD	TED
Pupil enrolment	842	925	1192	930	900
Teacher/Learner ratio	40.1	38.5	36.1	32.1	30.0
Learner: Racial composition (%)					
- African	100%	100%	20%	85%	25%
- Coloured	-	-	70%	2%	10%
- Indian	-	-	10%	13%	10%
- White	-	-	-	-	55%

Pupil enrolment at these schools varied from 842 to 1192. The staff allocations at these schools vary depending on the ratios as determined by the ex-departments. The teacher/learner ratio in the Mondeor School is the lowest (30.0 learners per teacher) while this is 40.1 learners per teacher at the Soweto A School, 33.7% more. With all the schools, now being controlled by the same department and the same policy initiatives, the Gauteng Department of Education has equalised the learner-teacher ratio at all schools, as at the beginning of the 1999 school year.

The pupil composition at all the schools, along racial lines, has changed, except the ex-DET schools, where the learner population is 100% African. At the Mondeor School, a varied learner population mix is present, from 55% White, 25% African and 10% each in respect of Coloured and Indian learners. At the Lenasia School, the learner population has changed dramatically in the past three to five years since the development of informal settlements in its close surroundings. The learner population comprises 930 learners, 85% (790) being African, 2% (19) Coloured, and 13% (121) Indian. While the community around the school is essentially Indian most of the Indian children have moved to either other schools in Lenasia or to the previous-Model-C schools. The reason for this, according to the head, is that the standards at the local schools are not as high as they used to be. While all attempts are being made to maintain standards, the quality of the learners requires that work be presented at a slightly lower standard.

At the Ennerdale School, 70% (835) of the learner population is Coloured, 20% (238) is African and 10% (119) is Indian. This allocation of pupils, according to the head, is in keeping with the population distribution in the surrounding areas. This is the pattern that has generally been found in the schools, except the ex-model-C schools, where the learners travel from distant areas.

Table 3: Teacher Statistics of Schools A, B, C, D and E.

CRITERIA	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Location	Soweto	Soweto	Ennerdale	Lenasia	Mondeor
Former education dept	DET	DET	HoR	HoD	TED
Number of teachers - Female	17	19	24	20	28
- Male	4	5	9	9	2
Ratio of teachers - Female (%)	81%	79%	73%	69%	93%
- Male (%)	19%	21%	27%	31%	7%
Total number of teachers	21	24	33	29	30
Qualified teachers	19	24	32	27	30
Unqualified teachers	2	nil	1	2	0
Graduate teachers	10	2	1	7	1
Teachers:Racial composition (%)					
- African	100%	100%	15.2%	10.3%	6.7%
- Coloured	-	-	75.7%	6.9%	3.3%
- Indian	-	-	9.1%	82.8%	3.3%
- White	-	-	-	-	86.7%
Average teaching load (hours)	25	25	25	23,5	25

Overall, 79% (108) members of the teaching staff at these schools are female, while 21% (29) are male.

The teachers at all five schools are qualified, with the exception of 2 teachers at the Soweto A School, 1 at the Ennerdale School, and 2 at the Soweto B School.

The statistics show a marked difference in graduate teachers: 10 at the Soweto A School, 7 at the Lenasia School, 2 at the Soweto B School, and 1 each at the Ennerdale and Mondeor Schools.

The teaching hours of the teachers at all schools average at 25 hours, except the Lenasia School where the average teaching time is 23,5 hours.

The racial composition of the staff at each school is predominantly of the race group in which the school was established. For example, at the Soweto Schools the staff are 100% African; at the Lenasia School the majority (82.8%) of the staff are Indian; at the Ennerdale School majority (75.7%) are coloured; and 86.7% are White at the Mondeor School. The pattern of distribution of staff is essentially similar to the distribution of the population in the area.

Table 4: Management Staff Statistics of Schools A, B, C, D and E.

CRITERIA	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Former education dept	DET	DET	HoR	HoD	TED
Head's gender	F	F	M	M	M
Qualifications of head	p/grad	p/grad	u/grad	p/grad	p/grad
Experience as head (years)	8	15	7	20	15
Head's teaching load (hours)	14	3	nil	2	2,5
Number of deputies	1	1	1	1	1
Deputy teaching load (hours)	16	16	19	10	15
Number of heads of department	1	1	4	4	3
Heads of department: Gender	1F	1F	1M, 3F	3M,1F	2M,1F
HOD: Teaching load (hours)	25	25	22	20	22

Table 4 compares the management staff statistics at the five schools from the different ex-departments. While 79% of the teaching staff are female (see *Table 3*) at these schools, only 40% of the heads are female. All heads, except the head at the Ennerdale School, have postgraduate qualifications. The experiences of the heads at the five schools vary from seven years to twenty years. Thus, this study has ensured that all have adequate experience in administration functions. They have clearly had adequate experience in managing the school, according to what their role functions were with the ex-departments.

In this chapter I have looked at the school organisational data with an emphasis on the heads' perception of and relationship to new policy at a general level. This was linked to school culture. The data collected in the background information on amenities and facilities, the conditions of schools, learner enrolments, staffing and teaching load reflect historical departmental divisions with some differences. I have highlighted these differences in the analysis of the information from the tables.

CHAPTER 6

SCHOOL FINANCING

With the devolution of financial control to schools, financial systems have to be set up. The state widely recognises the need for the redistribution of resources and the elimination of inequalities in provision.

Policy

The *Hunter Committee* considered three strategies for moving towards greater equality in expenditure. First, the minimalist-gradualist approach, which would allow most existing governing bodies to continue to function, including the ex model-C schools. Secondly, the equitable school-based formula approach which is similar to the previous approach but argues for equal per capita expenditure and prohibits schools from raising extra funds. The third strategy, the partnership approach, includes an equal per capita expenditure but where the state's contribution to operating costs is reduced depending on parental contribution (DNE, 1995a in Sayed,1996, p.5).

While the *Hunter Report* does not make a definite commitment to any of the three options, it does argue that the partnership funding approach offers the best advantage. Through this partnership (between parents and state) the state is passing the responsibility of funding onto the School Governing Body. Based on the assumption that the provision of quality education, without a direct financial contribution by parents and communities, is unaffordable, this approach suggests that the burden of funding be divided in unequal parts between the state and the parents, with the former bearing the largest part of it and the latter contributing their share in proportion to their incomes. As a mechanism for closing the gaps between different types of schools the provincial budget will be divided into five components, namely, capital, redress, core, salaries and operating costs. Fees by parents would supplement the operating costs.

Despite controversies over the question of fees or user-charges the Committee felt that there were no alternatives to them. The option chosen was a combination of compulsory and voluntary fees, using a sliding scale based on family income and exempting the lower end from payment. The *Hunter Report* suggested that in well-off communities the state will contribute a minimal portion of the budget, whereas, in poor communities it will pay, up to 100% of the costs.

The *Hunter Committee* realised the problems involved in assessing family income for purposes of fee paying but offered no solution. As with other financial issues, it was concerned with the principles rather than their precise nature of their application.

The recommendations of the *Hunter Report* are consistent with the universally accepted principle of progressive taxation and subsidisation of the poor by the well-endowed. How this will be put into practice is, however, not clear. It is also doubtful whether there can be effective monitoring of the levying of such fees.

There is a key shift in *White Paper 2* concerning school financing. *White Paper 2* rejects all three options proposed by the *Hunter Report* and opts for a 'fourth option'. This option maintains a commitment to a uniform formula-based system of funding, but enables some schools to raise additional monies (Sayed, 1996, p.6).

South African Schools Bill favours this fourth option. All learners in public schools will attract an equal per capita expenditure. To ensure that the middle class does not flee the state sector, school governing bodies can probably raise additional user-fees to subvert the formula following an accepted procedure. To ensure equity, governing bodies probably cannot insist on payment from parents unable to do so. If, after a due process, the governing body agrees on mandatory fees then all parents who can pay are obliged to do so.

In an attempt to avoid the perpetuation of the inequalities in education, the *Portfolio Committee* introduced a change in the *South African Schools Bill*, in respect of finances. According to the *South African Schools Act*, there was an attempt to ease the burden of the user-fee option through a clause providing for the Minister to set national policy guidelines about fees and exemptions, after consultation with the

Council of Education Ministers, the Fiscal and Financial commission, and the Minister of Finance.

In attempting to address the situation, in which huge gaps in accumulated resources and ongoing provision between the wealthy and the poor, urban and rural, and inequalities of the former department schools exist, the implementation of national directives had little effect. The direction of funds to those less-advantaged parts of the system that needs better quality education most is seen as endangering quality in the "better-off" schools. Whether this new commitment to redress will succeed in reducing the existing gaps is uncertain (Kgobe, 1996, p.3).

The *Act* allows parental contributions and fees to be used by schools to address their own priorities and needs. Section 36 of the *Act* makes provision for a governing body to "take all reasonable measures within its means to supplement the resources supplied by the state" to improve the quality of education. While this may be positive under the condition of already-existing disparities it may mean that the gaps in provision will remain and might even increase as state resources cannot equal those committed by private individuals for the education of their children(Kgobe, 1996, p.3)

There is a lack of clear quantifiable commitment in funding. Presently, a differential education system continues to exist where differently-endowed communities still enjoy widely varying levels of provision, and only some can meaningfully supplement state resources (Vally & Spreen, 1998, p.7). The new national norms and standards for the funding of schools attempt to address the huge imbalances between rich and poor schools and give schools more scope to manage their own affairs. The norms are only guidelines for how provinces should divide up their budgets.

Some of the main features of the new funding norms include the ranking of state schools by provinces from the poorest to the richest. The poorest 20% will get 35% of the resources and the richest 20% will get 5% of the resources. Parents can now apply for full or partial exemption from paying fees. If parents' combined, yearly, gross, income is less than 10 times the annual school fees per learner, they qualify for full exemption. If this is less than 30 times, but more than 10 times the annual school fees, they qualify for partial exemption. All schools will be responsible for

maintaining and cleaning their schools, and for small paint and maintenance repairs. Independent schools will be funded according to the fees they charge, the wealthiest will lose their subsidy altogether but the poorer independent schools will be subsidised. All pupils should get a minimum package of learning materials (costing R100), with preference given to poorer children (Garson, 1998, p.3).

Table 6: Criteria for payment of school fees

Parents' Gross Income (combined; annual)	Annual School Fees (per learner)	Exemption
Less than ...	x 10	Full
More than ... but, less than ...	x 10 x 30	Partial
More than ...	x 30	None

While these norms aim at improving the allocation of resources to the more disadvantaged schools, Vally (1998) points out that the new funding norms are unlikely to lead to much redress on the ground and require further research. One reason is the backlogs as described in the *School Register of Needs Survey* are huge. The *Survey* has shown that 67% of schools have an absence of learning materials; 73% of equipment and media collections. In 49% and 35% of all schools the textbook and stationery supply was deemed inadequate. Even if provinces manage to provide the R100 per pupil, it is unlikely that this will cover the massive backlog. Another factor is that budgets will in real terms decline given factors like high inflation rates, thus giving them less money to spend on school expenditure, once teachers' salaries have been paid. He also points out that pupil enrolment figures are on the increase, which places even more financial pressures on the provinces(Garson, 1998, p.3).

Hofmeyr (1998) points out that "implementation will pose the most difficult challenges. Provincial education departments will need to strengthen their

management capacity and information systems to grade schools correctly and to hold schools accountable for the funds allocated to them." She adds that many heads are concerned about the fee exemption provision. The fee base of school could possibly be eroded, thus resulting in higher fees for paying parents (Garson, 1998, p.3).

Of greater importance is that the "poorest 20%" differ from province to province and within provinces and even localities. Unevenness of provision and inequalities between provinces is an important feature in South Africa, particularly in provinces with a large rural sector, or, in those which have incorporated previous homelands. One can suppose that the state might equate the 20% of the poorest population in a comparatively wealthier province in terms of much higher poverty levels in an impoverished province, thus perpetuating unequal resource allocations between the provinces.

These new funding norms are complex. The schools are to become their own budget centres. So, the burden of establishing, exempting and retrieving fees becomes a time-consuming task especially in cases where parents can afford to pay the fees but do not have a culture of paying. Budget formulation and financial arrangements with the district and provincial levels will require considerable expertise and competence, which is currently lacking in both the provincial departments and School Governing Bodies.

The need to afford governing bodies extensive training in financial management is, therefore, crucial. This would also impact on the role of the headteacher, in that the additional financial responsibilities would have to be shared between the headteacher and the school governing body treasurer. The lack of capacity and commitment are a greater problem than a lack of funds. However, most aspects of the new policy will only come into effect in the year 2000, thereby giving all involved time to become empowered.

At many schools, research will need to establish whether the norms redress accumulated gaps in education facilities, and equalise total expenditure of the school. This requires additional state allocation of specific funds. These funds should target infra-structural backlogs, the dearth of learning materials, the training of teachers and

governing bodies, as well as administrative development. The earmarked R200-million from policy reserves for spending in specific areas, quality improvements in the delivery of education, and to address the problems of financial and administrative management seems a step in the right direction (Vally & Spreen, 1998, p.8)

The new funding norms require the setting up of adequate and effective financial systems. Staff and School Governing Body members have to be trained in basic financial skills. The head's role will be changed with the devolution of financial control to the schools. In Levačić's study (1995) the evidence revealed the changed nature of the role of the head and the different ways in which the head responds to the need to find a balance between the now-expanded requirements of their post.

Delegating the budget-manager role to a deputy head, while retaining a central interest in resources management and making decisions collectively within the senior management team, is probably the most effective response. However, Maychell (1994) found that primary headteachers were not in a position to delegate budget management, and that very few primary deputies had financial responsibilities. Thus, primary heads, if they are to manage effectively, must have a capable finance officer (preferably professional) to undertake financial control, and who can advise on expenditure decisions (Levačić, 995, p.119).

Research Findings

In the research data collected, some schools have evidently not fully understood the devolution of financial control and the responsibility and accountability that the state has passed onto the schools. The full implementation of financial control would take place in the year 2000, by which time the head and School Governing Body members, and the staff, need to become empowered.

At the Mondeor School, the School Governing Body fully manages all financial matters. The provision of funds for the daily running of the school is the responsibility of the School Governing Body. The School earmarks the fund-raising events for projects that the school decides upon. Fee-collection is the responsibility of the treasurer.

Each standard's budget is prepared by the standard leader, with the assistance of teachers from the standard. The school's management team then looks at these and they are finally presented to the School Governing Body, where decisions are made as to the amounts to be spent.

This is an effective manner of spending. Staff become cautious of the funds available. Money is spent on essentials needed at the school. While this type of financial control does not add considerably to the role of the head (as was found at the other schools) the head, the treasurer (a parent) and the secretary are finally accountable for all funds received and spent at the school. The school's (effective) system of financial control had been in place since 1990.

The Lenasia School head explains:

> The shift of finances to school-control has impacted on my role. The drawing up of budgets is time-consuming. This is done, jointly, between teachers in the different departments, the school management team, the school fund committee and the School Governing Body. The responsibility for the collection of school fees rests with me. I have to explain, time and again, to parents, what the money is going to be used for. All this increases the administrative functions that I have to undertake.

This school already has a financial policy in place. All monies received are receipted, and all payments are made by cheque only, except amounts of less than R100. Any expense greater than R500, has to be approved by the School Governing Body and the school fund committee. According to the head, as 80% of the fees had already been collected, there was no reason for any fund-raising projects. A teacher interviewed stated that the staff were de-motivated from carrying out any fund-raising projects, because of the exceptionally high number of times that burglaries had taken place at the school.

The Soweto and Ennerdale schools do not have proper financial systems in place. All three heads do not handle the finances at their respective schools directly. At the schools in Soweto, teachers serving on the School Governing Body are responsible

for collecting the funds, in Ennerdale the deputy head and a secretary are responsible for the handling of funds. They are, however, accountable for the financial management at their respective schools. At all three schools the respective budgets were not prepared timeously. Priorities were listed in March/April and purchase effected according to priorities.

At the Soweto A School all purchases were made through cash payments: while at Soweto B School and at the Ennerdale School purchases were, in fact, paid by cheque. At all three schools the treasurer is a teacher. This is actually an intensification in the teacher's work. It makes the handling of finances very difficult. Receipting is done once a week only! Often the cash is not receipted and used directly for school expenses. Subcommittees collect money and decide how the school should expend such money. There is no strict reconciliation between the money collected and what is spent on projects. This is a clear instance of a situation where hopelessly inadequate systems exist where the staff, particularly management, needs to be made more accountable for the finances.

While the School Governing Body helps with finances minimally, they approve all major purchases to be made at the schools. The School Governing Body takes no responsibility for the collection of school fees or even undertaking fund-raising projects, except Soweto B School where the School Governing Body has been quite active in raising funds for the school.

At the Soweto A and the Ennerdale Schools the staff carry out all fund-raising efforts. The School Governing Bodies at these schools need to debate and adopt an official financial policy. In addition, if an additional staff is appointed at the school to handle only financial matters, such as the bursar at the Mondeor School, the finances could become much more streamlined.

Each head feels accountable and responsible for the finances at their schools. Yet the lack of personnel, and expertise, does not enable them to effect a stricter financial control.

The devolution of the finance function and the power of the School Governing Body

to collect user fees is, contrary to the expectations of the communities, going to increase the inequity of education in South Africa. Where learners can pay the higher fees the school would give better services as opposed to schools where learners are unable to pay the fees.

According to Vally (1998), school funding policies are seen to contradict the new government's previous commitments to free pre-primary, primary and secondary education. As for school governing bodies, while decentralisation allows local communities a greater role in schooling, it paradoxically also forces them to carry the (greater) financial burden of education costs. While the argument is made that the payment of school fees by some communities will free up resources for poor schools, others feel that, in conditions of already existing disparities, it will perpetuate inequality in education (Garson,1998, p.3).

The evidence gathered about the financial control and policies that are prevailing at three of the five schools investigated illustrates that much training of staff is required and new systems have to be put into place. Additional support staff to handle the financial function are also necessary but unaffordable. Moreover with the decentralisation policy, heads complain that their roles are further complicated. They feel that through decentralisation there is an attempt to mobilise more resources for education. However, the state's financial burden is transferred to schools to involve them more in the sharing of educational expenditure. While the funding policy is to create equality at all schools, heads are feeling more pressured to provide adequate resources in the light of poor funding from the education departments.

The heads have the additional function of collecting user-fees. They feel more accountable for the financial controls at their schools. Right now because of the lack of effective support staff for the handling of funds heads believe that the roles have been intensified. Heads reported that while the School Governing Body was to execute the financial function most of the work is in effect done by the head and the staff. With time and adequate training heads would feel more confident . determining and executing their budgets and all financial functions at their schools.

While the redistribution of resources is supposed to eliminate inequalities in

provisions, with the new funding formulas, the schools that have the resources can charge higher user fees. With these higher fees, for example the annual school fee at the Mondeor School is R3 000 as compared to R250 at the Lenasia School and R50 at the Soweto and Ennerdale Schools, the so-called advantaged schools will continue to provide better facilities. This disparity will therefore further disadvantage the so-called disadvantaged schools in providing quality education with all the adequate facilities. We can also attribute the difference in user fees to the location of the various schools according to the historical racial divisions.

CHAPTER 7

SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

Policy

In this chapter I will attempt to trace the policy initiatives (namely the *Hunter Report*, the *White Paper 2* and the *South African Schools Act*) that determine the system of governance at schools. The Hunter Report formed the basis for the South African Schools Act. It is for this reason that I will be discussing the *Hunter Report's* influence on the decentralisation of governance in great detail. The devolution of governance has essentially been through the establishment of school governing bodies. The impact of the establishment of the school governing bodies on the changing role of the head at the schools where I conducted the research will also be discussed. Much of the research illustrates that while parents are supposedly given more power through decentralisation and the establishment of School Governing Bodies, the work of the head is intensified. Most members of the School Governing Bodies prefer a passive and submissive role. Moreover, the differential histories and capacities of the different schools and subsequently their School Governing Bodies have further impacted on the role of the headteacher.

The premise of the *Hunter Committee's* recommendations in this sphere is that the governance of education is a shared responsibility of parents, teachers, students, and community members at large (Greenstein,1995,p.4). It is important that the community members be those with the expertise to contribute instrumentally to schools. Representatives from community-based organisations are usually persons who can reflect the views and sentiments of the community. The model of shared governance with multiple school-based constituencies gives more weight to parent representatives who have the absolute majority. The parents also have the power to select community representatives. This proposal is problematic as it increases the parent representation, and in so doing, undermines teacher and student representation, two key constituencies that have strongly influenced the struggle for

democratic governance structures. Turning the school to the parents may have the potential of undermining equal participatory democracy, and the interest of the staff would not be taken into account. Moreover, parents may not even have the expertise to comprehend and execute the policy initiatives.

The commission proposed two categories of powers and functions of school governing bodies. Basic powers were those that all governing bodies possessed and were entitled to. Negotiable powers were those which "provinces can provide on contract to schools or where schools can contract privately" such as with the maintenance of buildings. All these constituencies should assume an active role in determining and adopting school policies; in particular, regarding school missions and objectives, the control of finance, relations and communication with the parents and the community, use of facilities and the appointment of administrative staff. The governing body can also make recommendations on issues of school level curriculum and selection of temporary teachers. Decisions in these areas should be made within the national and provincial visions of education. It is expected that it would take some time before any meaningful structures could be put into place in most schools. In practice the specific circumstances of each institution might determine the balance of power between the different stakeholders, rather than follow the universal design laid out in the Report.

A critical issue on the framework of governance is that the *Hunter Report* avoids dealing with problems such as the extent to which stakeholders are genuinely interested in assuming the powers allocated to them, gender representation among the stake holders, problems experienced by parents regarding methods of selection and functioning of their representatives, the domination by teachers at meetings, the relation of parents and principal to the role of teachers and students. These problems have in the past been experienced in South Africa. If this information, vital to the functioning of governing bodies was examined by the Committee the *Hunter Report* did not reflect these issues (Greenstein, 1995, p4).

The concept of negotiable powers is also problematic, because the method of implementation would be extremely cumbersome. Moreover, for each school to negotiate separately the powers and for the capacity to be monitored effectively a

large bureaucracy would have to be established. Issues of control of the mechanism, the expense involved and the training of the human resources have not been addressed in the Report (Greenstein, 1995, p.4).

This is a major weakness in the *Hunter Report*, in that policy options, not properly informed by facts and figures and not accompanied by a careful evaluation of the administrative and political difficulties run the risk of being modified or even subverted when they reach the stage of implementation.

White Paper 2 suggests a similar composition of the governing bodies as the *Hunter Report*. The main difference is that the governing body elects the community representatives and not the community. The Ministry felt that it was important to ensure that community representatives are acceptable to all school-based constituencies (Department of National Education,1995b). Another important aspect of this document is that parents have to be in the numerical majority in school governing bodies, since they have the greatest stake in schooling. Parental majority was justified on the grounds that governing bodies are expected to make serious legal and financial decisions.

In contrast to the *Hunter Commission's* concept of basic and negotiated powers *White Paper 2* proposes the notion of menu powers specifying twenty such functions. According to *White Paper 2* governing bodies can choose and the provincial education departments can decide which of the twenty functions governing bodies can assume control of based on considerations such as capacity. A key change between the *Hunter Report* and the *White Paper 2* is that teacher employment is no longer at the discretion of governing bodies. Instead it is the function of provincial education authorities, with governing bodies making recommendations. This was a direct response to the fears of teacher unions who felt that the control by governing bodies could not only undermine teachers' rights but also cause differentiation between state and privately-employed staff (Sayed, 1996, p.6). The provincial department thus has control over staff appointments. While the School Governing Body has to be responsible for making the recommendations, the provincial department still maintains control. Moreover as Weiler (1989) would argue, the conflict over appointments now being shifted to the school, while the provincial department still maintains control.

There are three major shifts in the *South African Schools Bill*. First, the bill explicitly outlines limitation clauses on governance structures that are not directly addressed in previous policy texts. Secondly, the bill directly codes the function and powers of governing bodies. Thus, the bill specifies the modus operandi of governing bodies, and inter alia, the need for public financial accountability. Thirdly, the bill tightens up the definition of public schools making it impossible for governing bodies to determine the ethos and missions of schools. Through the policy, the central state is still retaining powers, passing on limited powers and legitimising the School Governing Body powers for much more work.

The *South African Schools Bill* does not make any distinction between a *PTSA* (parents, teachers and students' association) and the school governing body. This association was previously the body that ensured parent representation in school matters. Their functions varied depending on the various ex-departments. Overall they saw their function as fundraising and the organisation of school functions. Little power was passed onto the *parents, teachers and students' association*. The *parents, teachers and students' association* had no statutory power, which the School Governing Bodies do now have. The *parents, teachers and students' association* assumed little responsibility for the running of the school. Most aspects were left to the school management team (Sayed, 1996, p.6).

The proposals suggest a governing body which represents all three sectors of the *parent teacher and student association*, including others, namely the school principal, non-teaching members of staff and co-opted community representatives. While it does not directly address the issues of day to day functioning, it was assumed that these duties would be performed by the principal and his or her management team.

A significant shift in *South African Schools Bill* concerns the role of the principal and the community. The previous policy texts had suggested that the principal's seat on the governing body was in an *ex-officio* capacity. *South African Schools Bill* makes no such distinction, nor does it make it clear about whether the principal has voting powers on the body.

Community representation has always been problematic on governing bodies. We

may attribute this to the varied levels of commitment and comprehension of the members of the community. While the members representing the community may have good intentions, they may not have the means to fully participate in activities.

We can trace three forms of community representation through the policy texts:

- community representatives nominated by parents and elected by governing bodies *(Hunter Report)*
- community representatives elected only by governing bodies *(White Paper 2)*
- community representatives coopted by governing bodies *(South African Schools Bill)*.

The weakest area of the *South African Schools Bill* is that it leaves open, without any guidance, the way in which decisions can be made by governing bodies. The document needs to explicitly state the mechanics of voting and the powers and functions of the different representatives. The *South African Schools Bill* proposes that governing bodies will be juristic persons. This implies that their powers and functions are guaranteed and statutorily recognised, and that they may make decisions as a corporate body.

The legislation of the status of the governing bodies has grave implications for their functioning. First, this implies that such bodies can be sued and that they are legally responsible for the decisions they make based upon the powers and functions devolved. Whether the governing body is equipped to take on such responsibilities is unclear. Secondly: are governing bodies, as legal entities, obligated to implement state policy even when they are in disagreement with it? Third, the governing bodies may find themselves entrapped in bureaucratic legal battles that may undermine their effectiveness as vehicles of participation and representation (Sayed, 1996, p.7).

Research Findings

The devolution of governance to schools through the establishment of School Governing Bodies at all schools, required by the *South African Schools Act,* has changed the role of headteachers. There may be more power distributed to the parents than the head. However, parents do not cope with the additional functions

expected of them, and thus the head has more overall responsibilities in managing the school.

The capacities of School Governing Bodies at the different schools vary considerably in being able to handle these functions. At the Mondeor School, the School Governing Body (or equivalent body) has been functional since 1990, having some nine years' experience in such form of school governance. The members of the School Governing Body had formed a partnership with the staff. The School Governing Body members understand their powers and functions. They carry these out effectively. The School Governing Body impacts positively on the functioning of the school. There is a clear demarcation between functions performed by the head and staff and those performed by the School Governing Body. This is because the head feels that certain aspects of school governance are not the domain of the School Governing Body.

All academic, curricular and professional aspects of teaching and learning, and school management are left to the head and the teaching staff; while decision-making in respect of all other aspects, including maintenance of buildings and grounds, is ably managed by the School Governing Body members with the head and staff. All financial aspects, from the determining of school fees, collection of fees, follow-up to fee collection, determination of fund-raising events (with the staff), financial control of all fund-raising events, are handled by the treasurer of the School Governing Body and the school secretary.

In the words of a senior teacher:

> The School Governing Body members are highly supportive in all avenues of the school life. They are well-empowered and guided by the school management. They handle finances effectively and assume responsibility to ensure that school fees are paid. In general, it appears that the establishment of the School Governing Body has eased the complex role of the head. The headteacher has more time to devote to the curricular and academic function of the school. Much more cannot be expected from these members as they are exerting themselves to the full benefit of the school.

Even at such a highly organised school, where decentralisation seems to be working effectively, it is essential to consider what tasks are expected to be performed by the School Governing Body members. The issue of empowerment, and the reasons for the empowerment in the particular areas must be investigated. It is also important to consider the qualifications of members of the School Governing Body. Many of them are professionals, unlike the members of the School Governing Bodies in the Soweto or Ennerdale schools.

In contrast, at the Soweto and Ennerdale Schools, the respective School Governing Bodies have not been as effective. The institution of the School Governing Body has not impacted immensely on the functioning of the school, but it has impacted on the role of the head in ways similar to those examined elsewhere. Hallinger and Hausman (1993) maintain that such "direct participation of parents (has) made parental beliefs, values and perceptions more central in the lives of professional educators". However, in these instances, many members are not empowered to handle the powers and functions of the School Governing Body. Many do not even understand, or know, what their powers and functions mean. As one school administrator in Chicago remarked: "(it) is another full-time job educating the Council" (Ford 1991). This education includes keeping the board "abreast of its duties" (Ford, 1992), informing board members about school activities, providing resources, maintaining ongoing communication, consulting with board members before important decisions are made and fostering a sense of cohesion among board members (Murphy & Louis, 1994, p.37).

The head of Soweto A School had similar experiences and commented:

> The School Governing Body members are not enlightened in their responsibilities and duties. When the district office presents workshops for empowerment, there is a tendency among members not to attend. The reluctance to attend is because they do not find it useful to attend, or they do not understand the workshop because of the level of presentation and the understanding of the language in which the workshops are presented. In addition, at these workshops usually task lists are presented for the School Governing Body members in the name of empowerment. With persuasion,

> they attend, but the feeling is that they do not understand much as the workshops are presented in English and the level of comprehension of the members attending the workshops has not been considered. The members who attend are not able to plough back into the school.

This aptly describes what is happening at schools. The headteacher and the staff are shouldering much of the responsibility of governance. Thus, management can manipulate governance. Parents figured significantly in the head's comments and that they were now taking more of the head's time. One reason was that parents had become more aware of their rights. Many heads felt that parents were entitled to an explanation and even a justification of decisions that the head and school had taken.

At the Soweto B School the head and staff feel that the members of the School Governing Body need to become more positively involved. There must be greater communication and working together of the staff and School Governing Body members. This is not happening as there is much conflict between the School Governing Body members and the management staff of the school. This is because the management staff and the members of the School Governing Body do not have a common vision or mission for the school. Thus, the institution of the School Governing Body affects the school. The members use their powers adversely, creating problems for the management staff. The level of understanding of the powers and functions is quite low.

At the Ennerdale School the School Governing Body was responsible for the maintenance of the school grounds. The head stated: "I am quite happy with the present functioning of the School Governing Body (things are going well) the members could possibly assist with more active fund-raising." This head sees the role of the School Governing Body as, essentially, fund-raising and not other decision-making and governance functions.

The teacher that I interviewed at this Ennerdale School stated:

> The School Governing Body seems to be doing nothing. There have been no

> improvements at the school since its inception. They are not functioning in the way they are supposed to. They are too much in the background. The members are not, at all, involved in school functions. Sharing the responsibilities would bring about a better understanding and commitment in the work. Fund-raising should be done jointly and not by staff alone.

This comment suggests that the School Governing Body was not functioning impressively and was operational in name only.

When I probed the differences in opinions between the teacher and the head, I found that the head felt that apart from the fund-raising, he did not want interference from the School Governing Body, and therefore he stated that he was happy with the functioning. The staff, on the other hand, felt that they would appreciate a more active participation from the School Governing Body. It appears, then, to also be a matter of perceptions and expectations of different persons. There is not yet a clear and well-defined delineation of roles and responsibilities.

At the Lenasia School, the institution of the School Governing Body impacted positively, initially, on the functioning of the school. The members are familiar with the new legislation and helped the school in the drafting of the new school policy, mission statement and vision. The appointment of staff was also quite successfully completed. The head reported that the School Governing Body had been effective in decision-making, promoting the school's marketing, budgets, admission and religious policy. They stood distant (but alert) regarding the professional and academic matters of teaching and learning. The School Governing Body and the school fund committee control school finance.

Recently, however, there has been a considerable loss of interest by the School Governing Body members. A remark by a teacher interviewed revealed:

> The School Governing Body, at present, is not as effective as it was at its inception. Some parents are not as highly motivated as in the past. This is because their children have moved from the school, though, as previously elected parents, they continue to serve on the School Governing Body. It has

weakened, but it still appears to be running smoothly. The head now looks towards the few dedicated members for support. There should be a full complement of working members who can work in partnership with the head and staff.

With the decreased participation of some members, much of the decision-making and control (effectively transferred to the head in the absence of a strong Governing Body) may be legitimised. The head makes the suggestions and the members of the School Governing Body agree to the decisions. The governance of the school can be manipulated between the head and the School Governing Body members. Particular persons may drive the governance (having special agendas). With this legitimisation it is essentially the head and the few School Governing Body members that are manipulating decisions, ostensibly according to the needs of the school.

At all five schools much legitimation of decision-making occurs.

Headteachers tend to favour the supportive school governing body since it brings in resources to the school at no threat to the positional power. Headteachers have many more resources at their disposal to retain the power to control what goes on at the school. They possess professional expertise, administrative authority, full-time commitment, access to (and control of) information flows, and relationships with key individuals. It is, therefore, easier for members of the School Governing Body, who are unsure of their expertise, lack time, are unwilling to resist the denial by professionals of the legitimacy of their accountability role and reluctant to create unproductive conflict, to acquiesce to the supportive role.

While school governing bodies are, officially, expected to operate as accountable bodies and have more formal power through legislation, there are many obstacles present. In South Africa, Mokgalane & Vally (1996) point out that given the pivotal role placed upon parents in school governance, factors which militate against parental involvement (such as transport and work commitments) must be considered. The socio-economic levels of people would also possibly affect the levels of involvement. Parents are seen as volunteers expected to take on significant, administrative, tasks without any pay (Mokgalane & Vally, 1996, p.7).

While the devolution of power allows stakeholders to participate at a level in which they can have a direct impact on matters that concern them, it also allows different capacities and inequalities of power and influence at that level to be expressed more strongly. In the absence of any outside monitoring mechanisms that would balance local relations, the disempowered will continue to be marginalised by more powerful local interests.

The major difference in governance between the various schools lies in the capacity of the schools. The difference in capacity has resulted from the historical racial divisions manifested at the schools. The historical past has led to schools being established for particular communities. While this pattern is changing in the so-called advantaged schools, where learners of all race groups are attending, this is not so in the so-called disadvantaged schools. Thus, the parent population of schools in Soweto and Ennerdale differ markedly from the parent population of the Mondeor School. Most of the parents at the Soweto and Ennerdale Schools are not adequately empowered, are not professionally qualified and may have poor comprehension levels. As was found in the Lenasia School learners whose parents could provide better quality education are already at the so-called advantaged schools. The schools in Soweto and Ennerdale have most of the parents who have other additional problems such as availability of transport and keeping a regular job. While it is not that these problems do not occur in the Mondeor or Lenasia Schools, but it is the exception than the rule as it is in the Soweto and Ennerdale Schools. Moreover, at the Mondeor and Lenasia Schools such problems can be more easily sorted out.

An important conclusion is thus the differential impact on schools with the different organisational histories. The impact on the role of head is that of more liaising, consultation and empowerment of School Governing Body members.

CHAPTER 8

SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Policy

The implementation of the *Curriculum 2005* programme has become the central arena for the transformation of teaching and learning in South Africa. As with many policy initiatives in South Africa, in education, the notion of consultation with stakeholders has provided legitimation to the adoption of the new curriculum.

The participation of representatives from teachers' organisations and of the provinces on some curriculum planning committees are presented by official sources as proof of the involvement of the relevant actors in policy formulation. Political representation and meaningful involvement in policy are two completely different things. It is the meaningful involvement that is important, as the vast majority of teachers, who are supposed to carry out the policy at school level and the provincial departments which are in charge of implementing and administering the policy had been kept in the dark regarding the new policy until after the state had finalised it.

The South African Schools Act and the Hunter Report have not detailed policies regarding curriculum development. *Curriculum 2005 (C 2005)* was officially gazetted, in June 1996, as a discussion document on the development of the curriculum. The discussion document is an attempt to realign the South African curriculum in ways that are consistent with the new Constitution of the Republic of South Africa and to link it to the needs of South Africa as a democratic-society-in-transition. It is the outcome of processes of curriculum development within the context of systemic educational change and wider societal transformation (Carrim, 1998, p.5).

The 1994 *African National Congress Education and Training Policy Framework Document* were the expression of the official policy position of the African National

Congress on matters related to the educational sector. It clearly draws on the work done by the *National Education Policy Investigation* and the *National Education and Training Forum*, inter alia. This framework document articulates, explicitly, what is considered important values that ought to inform education and training in South Africa. It finds the historical context within which such an initiative occurs, and, hence, what the rationale for education and training change is in South Africa. It also highlights the ways in which education and training are viewed, notions of the curriculum, issues around pedagogy and assessment, and the role of education in contemporary South Africa.

According to the *African National Congress* document, the state expects that the role of education was to provide a curriculum that promotes unity and the common citizenship and destiny of all South Africans, irrespective of race, class, gender, and ethnic background. It must be relevant to the needs of the individual and the social and economic needs of society. The curriculum must promote independent and self-critical learning and respect the equality of all forms of knowledge. The process of curriculum development was to be democratised through the participation of all stakeholders (African National Congress,1994, p.72).

In summary, the *African National Congress Policy Framework Document* emphasises the idea that knowledge is constructed socially. The role of education as both that of developing democratic citizenship and an appropriately skilled workforce (within a globally, competitive, capitalist market); a de-emphasis on the formal curriculum and emphasis on the lived curriculum which is outcomes- and skills-based, as opposed to being content based; a critical pedagogy; learner-centredness; and flexibility of and articulation across the education and training system (Carrim, 1998, p.10).

Curriculum 2005 officially formalised the *African National Congress Policy Framework Document* and is now a government-endorsed approach to educational change in South Africa. With this government sanctioning, the *South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA)* has been put into place. Various learning area committees have been established on national, provincial and regional levels and the implementation of *Curriculum 2005* is underway in Grade one.

South African Qualifications Authority was statutorily established in 1997 and its purpose is to decide the outcomes or skills that ought to be achieved at each of the education and training bands. *The South African Qualifications Authority* is, essentially, composed of three levels of structures, namely, *National Standards Bodies*, *Standard Generating Bodies* and the *National Executive Structure of SAQA* itself. These only operate from the further education and training band upwards. They do not cover the basic education and training band. *Curriculum 2005* articulates the outcomes, norms and standards for the basic education and training band. It is the *South African Qualifications Authority* that legitimates what is acceptable knowledge in the education and training system in South Africa.

The adoption of *Curriculum 2005* enabled education departments throughout the country to establish curriculum development structures. These are known as *Learning Area Committees (LACs)*. There are eight such learning areas stipulated in *Curriculum 2005*. These are:

- communications
- mathematical literacy
- human and social sciences
- technology
- arts and culture
- literacy and language learning
- mathematics and mathematical sciences
- physical and natural sciences
- economic and management sciences
- and life orientation

Learning Area Committee's exist on national, provincial and regional/district school levels. Each *Learning Area Committee* determines what they consider to be appropriate skills and outcomes in each learning area and at which level and devise guidelines for learning programmes in these areas. The *Learning Area Committee's* are composed of individuals who are practitioners and experts in their particular fields, as well as representatives from the educational bureaucracies. These stipulations of the *Learning Area Committee's* are eventually taken right through to national levels and the *National Education Department* and *South African Qualifications Authority* then sanction such recommendations, which eventually become legislated (Carrim, 1998, p.11).

South African Qualifications Authority has also stipulated what are called "critical outcomes". These outcomes are to be achieved on all levels of education and

training and across all learning areas. The *Curriculum 2005* gazetted *Discussion Document* contains the outcomes in each of the eight learning areas. The outcomes have been specified for the general and basic education and training band only. Learning programmes for Grade 1 have been developed and implemented since the beginning of 1998. It is this implementation of the new curriculum and how it is influencing the role of the principal that I am investigating. Examining what schools are doing with the curriculum being adequately decentralised to the effectiveness of teaching and learning would be interesting.

Major concerns have been expressed concerning the absence of appropriate learning materials, textbooks, poor preparation of teachers, unclear and untested assessment methods, and the undermining of content for the sake of vague and difficult to measure outcomes.

The National Department of Education set up the broad curriculum policy framework. Intentionally the National Department is not prescriptive in the process of implementation. The provinces are to implement this curriculum and provide adequate resources. The provinces in turn have devolved the responsibility of implementation to the districts and the schools. Thus it is quite interesting that the central state evolved the *Curriculum 2005* policy, yet this is the means that this Central state is using to decentralise education in South Africa. There is still the top down approach in the implementation. The research evidence showed that heads did not have much leeway in the implementation programme. The District offices prescribed all aspects of the curriculum in a limited fashion. The heads each in his own way implemented the curriculum in the Grade1 classes.

Research Findings

The impact of the implementation on the role of the head differs from school to school. Looking at the overseas literature, Webb and Vulliamy (1996) state that research on the role of the primary school headteacher revealed that the increasing pressures from management and administration would dilute the curriculum leadership role of the headteacher (Webb and Vulliamy,1996, p.303). In New Zealand, the heightened responsibility to manage change came at the expense of the principal's

instructional role. Mc Connell & Jeffries (1991) found that principals felt that a management emphasis had taken over from instructional leadership. In Chicago, studies by Bennet, et al (1992), Ford (1992), Mc Pherson & Crovson (1992), reached a similar conclusion (Murphy & Louis, 1994, p.34).

In my research what is evident from the responses is that the application of *Curriculum 2005* has been challenging for all the headteachers. The difference lies in whether the head viewed the challenge as a positive or a negative challenge. The delegation of responsibility of the implementation process differed from school to school. The heads at the Ennerdale and the Soweto B Schools delegated much of this responsibility, as they felt uncomfortable with the implementation of the curriculum. They stated that they lacked sufficient expertise in executing the implementation. The heads could also alleviate the increased administration pressures through delegation. The head at Soweto A School plays an greater instructional role as compared to the heads at the other schools who are playing an administrative role in respect of curriculum implementation.

The head of the Mondeor School stated:

> It is extremely exciting to see how *Outcomes Based Education (OBE)* is unfolding the potential of the learners. I attended many interesting and informative workshops. This has helped me to understand the dynamics of *Outcomes Based Education*. I am confident about *Outcomes Based Education* and I enjoy offering support to teachers.

This is again a management and administrative role that the head is performing.

The head of the Lenasia School also views *Outcomes Based Education* positively. In his words:

> *Outcomes Based Education* is extremely successful with the present learners. With the staff geared-up and in full comprehension of *Outcomes Based Education* the task of the head is easier. Rather than a supervisory role, the head is now part of the team, while assisting, supporting and learning.

Rather than an instructional role the head is performing an administrative, supportive, coordinating and a guidance role in implementing the curriculum Here the head had allocated time for staff to meet and discuss *Outcomes Based Education* and associated problems. This displays a certain degree of commitment from the head and an acceptance that staff do need support in implementing the new curriculum. It also builds reassurance in the staff that the head is sensitive to their needs.

The headteacher at the Soweto A School describes:

> Initially, teachers had to be motivated in viewing the adoption of *Outcomes Based Education* positively. Definitely, they needed more support from me. Besides encouraging the staff I had to identify with the problems, assist in sorting these out or obtain assistance from other avenues. Essentially, I play a coordinating function, with other senior management and curriculum committee members. I am part of the team. Together, we find that *Outcomes Based Education* is working for our children.

The head displays an adequate understanding of the policy in this instance. The head works as facilitator of the process.

The head at the Soweto B School felt that she needed a lot more time in familiarizing herself with the *Outcomes Based Education*. Because of the load of administration work, she was unable to attend the workshops held. Many new resources have to be obtained. The heads experience much insecurity, as she does not feel confident in guiding her staff or monitoring their work. The head here is not performing a coordinating function. She concentrates on administration functions, as opposed to curricular coordination and support functions which she has delegated to subject heads.

The Ennerdale School head felt that with the implementation of the new curriculum much coordination of the various learning areas had to be effected to keep the curricular implementation together. This was time consuming and needed the development of expertise in monitoring. The head was having trouble in adapting to this new role.

Upon further investigation, it was found that the head was spending much time on administration, at the expense of being involved in curricular matters.

In general, we may conclude that the Mondeor School, the Lenasia School, and Soweto A School, who have high degrees of commitment from the heads, senior management teams and curriculum committees, are managing the implementation process. It is the head's role to create the positive culture and attitude that are helping in the easier implementation of *Outcomes Based Education*. Structures are set up by which teachers support each other through informal discussions, buddy systems, team teaching, standard leaders coordinating discussions on common problems and trying to find solutions, with subject head and management staff helping and advising wherever possible. Times are set out for curriculum discussion. This key time for development is considered extremely important for staff motivation.

At the Mondeor School the joint preparation adds to the resourcefulness of teachers. The staff experience a sense of security working at these schools. As many staff members as possible attended district workshops and the information was relayed to the remaining staff. The new learning materials from the education department arrived late, but the resources required to implement *Outcomes Based Education* at the Mondeor School and the Lenasia School were adequately provided through purchases from the school fund. The purchase of the new learning materials emphasised the managerial and administrative role of the head in implementing the curriculum. The evidence above clearly illustrates the new managerial and administrative roles for heads.

At the Soweto A School, while inadequate funds limited the purchase of the learning materials, teachers were innovative in obtaining learning materials through parents or making the necessary aids from materials that were available. The lack of resources did not hinder the effective implementation of *Outcomes Based Education* because the head motivated the staff positively. The head is therefore preeminently adopting the role of motivator and coordinator. Much emphasis is being placed on the more managerial and administrative functions of the head. What has changed is that Curriculum 2005 has emphasised the head's managerial rather than an instructional role. Heads seem to spend more time in workshops, facilitating and coordinating

teacher learning rather than being active in the classrooms.

At the Ennerdale and the Soweto B Schools, teachers are finding *Outcomes Based Education* too complicated. The essential support at these two schools is lacking. Teachers support each other through informal discussions. Little follow-up and interaction exist from one class to the next. The head is not coordinating the implementation of the new curriculum. He is not even performing a monitoring function. The head is unsure of his role in the implementation of the curriculum. He does not have the necessary knowledge to feel confident in this managerial function. Each teacher is trying to carry out the curriculum as best as he or she understands it. In a school such as this one wonders whether that which they are teaching has changed or whether the manner of instruction has changed. The teachers in the foundation phase do get together at the Ennerdale School, and the head is not part of the group decisions. He isolates himself and is not comfortable with the new curriculum. While staff attended the District workshops, the teachers did not fully understand, and by cascading that to other staff therefore became quite difficult. The head believes that by directing the teachers to attend the district workshops, he has done his duty of empowering them. He feels they should, thus, assume responsibility for delivering the curriculum to the learners. The teachers are not happy in being given this responsibility. The head does not perform a managerial role in respect of *Curriculum 2005*. He prefers to control the administrative functions at the school.

Teachers at the Soweto A School, the Lenasia School and the Mondeor Schools experience a high level of commitment towards the implementation of *Outcomes Based Education*. The heads at these schools have positively influenced the culture for the effective implementation of *Outcomes Based Education*. The head facilitates curriculum implementation. These heads understand the policy of decentralisation of the curriculum to the local level and can interpret the current policy and transfer the information to the staff. The staff are happy to try out the new options offered by *Outcomes Based Education*.

The heads at the Ennerdale and the Soweto B Schools have not studied the current policy documents and are always looking for an external source for guidance. The

guidance given by the district, in respect of *Outcomes Based Education*, is not regarded as adequate. Yet, the Lenasia School and the Mondeor School staff are able to help the district in providing the courses.

The Soweto A School, on the other hand, although they do find the district support inadequate, the staff are, collectively, trying to unwind the dynamics of *Outcomes Based Education*. They are not waiting for someone from the outside to give them solutions. The district has set up no other inset training for teachers.

At the Lenasia and Mondeor Schools, the heads have created the climate where staff can express their needs for inset training. The school management sets up these insets for staff by soliciting opinions. At these schools there is a programme set for staff development, which was devised based on needs of the staff. These needs are expressed at meetings and then through a needs-analysis circular. At the other schools a staff-support programme is not in place.

Concerning curriculum implementation and the inset training the success of this is dependent on the attitude and capabilities of the head. If the head has a positive attitude and is supportive to the teachers then the achievement is successful as staff takes it positively. The staff are happy to work in a secure comfortable atmosphere. Teaching and learning would then take place optimally.

None of the School Governing Bodies have contributed to the implementation of *Outcomes Based Education*, except the sanctioning of the purchase of learning materials on the request of the academic staff. The members of the School Governing Bodies feel that they are not able to advise the staff on academic matters, be it on curriculum or other aspects of inset training. Andrew Sturman (1989) found little evidence from case study visits in Australia, that parents and the community had made any direct contributions to the organisation of the school's curriculum. Even in those states where such contribution was actively encouraged, school councils would appear in the curriculum area to be proactive, and even in reactive roles. Discussion, followed by legitimation of school-developed policies, appeared to be the norm (Andrew Sturman, 1989, p.24)

This has also been true in the five schools selected for this case study. All heads suggested that they with the staff were the professionals who would handle the application of the curriculum. They preferred that the School Governing Body members did not interfere with curriculum matters.

An important aspect that still needs to be considered with *Outcomes Based Education* success is the class size. All schools, except the Mondeor School, (which has small classes) expressed that the implementation of *Outcomes Based Education* would be more successful if the classes were smaller. At these schools the School Governing Bodies have not exercised their powers of employing additional teachers. This is possibly because of the lack of funds, or the knowhow and fear of the administrative burdens of becoming employers. With the employment of additional teachers, the administration functions of the heads would be increased, especially at schools where the School Governing Body is not adequately empowered.

In the decentralisation of curriculum to the local school level, it has been found from the responses of the teachers interviewed that *Curriculum 2005* requires heads to assume managerial roles. They need to be supportive, need to ensure that adequate learning materials are available to the teachers, and to create a culture where the staff feel secure and support each other in effecting the changes to the curriculum. Where possible, heads should encourage School Governing Bodies to employ additional teachers so that class sizes may be reduced and *Outcomes Based Education* may be implemented more effectively. In addition, the activation of *Outcomes Based Education* is successful where the head acts as facilitator and mentor and is available for questions. The head becomes the support mechanism for the teachers.

I have done an analysis of the teaching time of the management staff and show this in *Table 5*.

Table 5: Management Teaching Load Statistics of Schools A, B, C, D and E.

CRITERIA	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Former education dept	DET	DET	HoR	HoD	TED
Number of deputies	1	1	1	1	1
Head's teaching load (hours)	14	3	nil	2	2,5
Deputy teaching load (hours)	16	16	19	10	15
Total teaching load(hours)	*30*	*19*	*19*	*12*	*17.5*
Head (hours) %	47%	16%	0%	17%	14%
Deputy (hours) %	53%	84%	100%	83%	86%

While the senior management team consists of heads, deputy heads and heads of department, presenting a comparative analysis of the teaching time of all management staff at schools is not possible because of the unequal distribution of the heads of department. There is an equal distribution of heads and deputy heads at all five schools.

As is apparent there is a wide difference in the hours spent by the heads and more so between heads and deputy heads teaching in the classrooms. The head at the Soweto A School teaches for 16 hours a week. She is heavily involved in the instructional role, as compared to all the other heads. She works on her managerial and administrative tasks after the official school hours. The head at the Ennerdale School, is not at all involved in instruction in the classroom. At the Soweto B, the Lenasia, and the Mondeor Schools, the heads teach 3, 2 and 2.5 hours, respectively. The head at the Soweto A School, besides the administration role in curriculum implementation, plays a major role in instructional duties.

The teaching loads of the deputies, one at each school, average from 10 hours at the Lenasia School, to 15 hours at the Mondeor School; 16 hours, each, at the Soweto Schools, and 19 hours at the Ennerdale School. The distribution of the heads of department varies from 1 each at the Soweto Schools, to 3 at the Mondeor School, and 4 each at Ennerdale and Lenasia Schools. This unequal allocation of heads of

department has impacted on the role of the head and the senior management teams at the schools.

Moreover, the teaching loads of the heads of department at the Soweto Schools are the full 25 hours a week, while at the Mondeor and the Ennerdale Schools the heads of departments' teaching time is 22 hours, and 20 hours a week at the Lenasia School. The differences in the teaching time of the heads of department also affect the role of the head, as those heads of department who are teaching longer hours would be unable to assist with administration and management tasks or they may have to carry double administration and instructional loads. The heads of departments are not willing to assume these double loads.

The loads of the deputy principals and the heads of department, and the unequal allocation in posts, affect the manner in which the head would deal with the changing role especially in respect of the increased administration and managerial roles which can be shared by the senior management team.

At the Soweto A School the head shares 47% of the teaching load, while the deputy covers 53% of the total 30 teaching hours. At the remaining four schools the deputy heads are doing most of the teaching ranging from 83% at the Lenasia School and 100% at the Ennerdale School. Upon investigation on the difference in teaching times the head at the Soweto A School stated that she did not do any planning and administration work while learners were at school. She preferred to be part of the teaching/instructional team. The head at the Ennerdale School did not teach at all. He explained that there were too many administrative duties with the new system of education. He expressed difficulty in finding time to go to the classes. The heads at Soweto B, the Lenasia and the Mondeor Schools expressed that they only taught to fill in the gaps where there were no other staff available. They believed their function was to monitor and oversee instructions rather than being in the classes themselves.

From the research evidence the process of implementation of the *Outcomes Based Curriculum* has clearly been haphazard. Learning materials did not reach the schools on time. All the teachers did not understand the district workshops, especially where there has been little or no internal support from the head or a curriculum committee.

Where heads and management staff have been supportive, the staff have been successful in the implementation process. The availability of funds for the extensive learning materials required is another aspect to be considered in successful implementation.

With the devolution of the implementation of the curriculum to the local level, it is quite evident from the research, that the heads with the management staff and the curriculum committee are driving the process forward. Where the heads view the curriculum positively and have a clear understanding of the outcomes based policy, they have a positive motivating influence on their teachers. It is the head's initiative in creating a warm secure culture with structures of support for teachers that has resulted in the easier implementation of *Outcomes Based Education*. It has also been found that essentially the head's role in curriculum implementation is one of a managerial, coordinating and administration function rather than an instructional function. In addition, the role of heads in respect of the curriculum has changed from one of a supervisory nature to that of a supportive nature. The devolution of the curriculum implementation was an important aspect of decentralisation, which could, possibly, also be seen as a political move, as the introduction of *Curriculum 2005* was the only visible change in education.

CHAPTER 9

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Increased Administration Loads

The success of decentralisation and the shift of power to the local level is dependent on the type of administration and management. Schools can develop excellent aims, goals and developmental plans through strategic planning. Without the resources, both material and human, these will not materialise. The head needs to develop the school's capacity to manage its resources. This entails ensuring that staff, including the administration staff, are given the necessary training and support so that they may fulfill their tasks optimally. The increased administration loads influence the role of the head profoundly.

With school-based management the increasing administrative load influences the role profoundly. Webb & Vulliamy (1996) found that in successfully managing the schools, budget was viewed as a central part of the role function. Besides repairs and maintenance of schools, time was taken up in overseeing catering services, maintenance of the grounds and cleaning arrangements. Blease & Lever (1992) had similar results (Webb & Vulliamy,1996, p.304).

Two aspects would determine how the head would have to change his style of management to accommodate increased administration function. These are the number of staff appointed, their capacity to support the head to perform the administration function, and the physical resources available to conduct the administration function. It would also depend upon the capacity of the school governing body. It therefore becomes essential to trace the evolving role of headteachers in relation to ability and readiness of auxiliary staff to adopt new managerial roles as the process of decentralisation unfolds. The supporting role played by various auxiliary staff proved to be vital in saving costs and promoting efficiency and allowing heads to devote their time managing learning.

The increased administration duties have changed the style of management at the Mondeor School. The performance of the head is not affected because there are adequate administration staff to carry out various functions. For example, the administration personnel with the treasurer of the School Governing Body handles the control of finances. There is excellent access to the physical resources, in that computers are stationed in each office. Administration procedures are running on well-oiled wheels. Administration systems are in place, as the school has been functioning in this mode since 1990. The head, with the School Governing Body and staff, have been responsible for setting up these systems. A system of voluntary personnel from the community to help with administration functions exists. Much of the head's time is spent on planning and effective delegation of tasks and monitoring. In this way the style of management has changed.

In contrast, at the Soweto B School, the head feels overpowered by the increased administration duties. The main reason for this is the lack of resources, both physical and human. There is only one computer in the school. Expertise in using this computer is lacking. One administration clerk is responsible for the telephone and receptionist work, and the typing. The issue and control of stock are also part of her responsibilities. There are limited administration systems in place. Management is experiencing difficulty in controlling finances, and reconciling receipts and payments of funds. Besides the increased administration load the head has a teaching load of three hours, which is not much. The head receives little support from, or enjoys very little confidence of, either the staff, the community or the parents. This may be the result of a serious conflict in what the different stakeholders perceive their respective roles to be. When meetings are held in the afternoons, then staff do not avail themselves. They would say, according to the principal: "Why don't you use your discretion if you are the head." She continues: "... so are they saying that I must be autocratic? Even to draw up the code of conduct, the teachers refuse to do it after school." The staff appear to have mixed conceptions of what they want to do.

The Soweto A School is less than five kilometres away from the Soweto B School. Though both are in close proximity of each other, vast differences occur in the functioning of these schools. At the Soweto A School, the head's role was changed with the increased administration functions. She managed the increased

administration work, despite the large teaching load (14 hours per week) and a School Governing Body that still needs much empowering. In her words:

> I spend my afternoons at school. I leave school daily at between four and five o' clock. I even come in on a Saturday morning to complete the paper work. I plan my work and I am always looking forward according to the needs of the children. The development of administration systems is slow because of the lack of resources. However, the staff are also willing to assist with administration duties in their non- teaching time.

At the Ennerdale School the head believes that the department has not given direction in the establishment of systems to manage the increased administration load. This displays a lack of understanding of the policy of decentralisation. There are only one clerk and one computer. However, the head appears to be enjoying the additional administration duties. He does not have any teaching load and thus he sees his role function to be one of completing the administration duties. The head has delegated the control of finances to the deputy head and the clerk. The head merely supervises the handling of the finances. The increased administration duties give the head an opportunity to keep himself occupied and be office bound.

The head at the Lenasia School stated that the increased administration functions had caused a change in the role function of the head. The good capacities of the two administration clerks have assisted the head. In the words of the head: "the administration systems are set and everyone knows what they are supposed to do. I have to only monitor that things are going well."

The school fund committee handles the finances - here too the head receives assistance from the administration clerk and the treasurer of the School Governing Body. Committees handle all aspects of the administration, the chairperson reports to the headteacher and thus the administrative tasks are being handled effectively, through the process of delegation. Thus there is clearly a change in role function from one where the head does everything himself to one where he has to monitor and check the work of other staff.

Co-ordination, Decision-Making, Delegation and Empowerment

Organisational changes have occurred due to the devolution of power to schools. With the establishment of local level governance, principals have had to work with a group of people, as opposed to working alone, in determining policies for the school. With the devolution of power, the culture of schools has changed. Chapman (1990), writing in the Australian context, states that the principal must become a coordinator of a number of people representing different interest groups among the whole school community, who together will determine the direction the school will follow. Earley, et al, (1990), reported that approximately two thirds of the principals in their study believed that they had become more consultative, more open and more democratic. Heads spoke of the need for more participative management and for staff ownership with school-based management. However, Leithwood, Jantzi & Fernandez (1990) concluded that the foundation of redesigned power relationships lie in delegating authentic leadership responsibilities and developing collaborative decision-making processes in the school. Prestine (1991) found that empowering others represented the biggest change and poses the greatest difficulties and problems for headteachers. Christensen (1992) maintained that principals found it easy to set up a process to delegate but giving up control was extremely difficult. (Murphy & Louis, 1994, p.26).

Each headteacher had individual approaches to leadership. The head of the Soweto A School was, in her own words:

> . . . leading from within, from the centre. It is as if I have to be everywhere and oversee everything. I have to push people from the back; I have to be part of the teams, the guiding force. It will still take time for staff to be empowered adequately to take total responsibility for tasks.

When the head stated that she had to be "everywhere and oversee everything," it gives one the notion that despite her open collaborative approach she is retaining control over the processes.

One teacher at the Soweto A School commented: "The head at this school is the driving force in keeping staff motivated in carrying out their duties." In leading this

head tries to bring all her staff on board, providing frequent opportunities for staff to improve their own abilities. She evaluates the progress at the school to see where more could be done, constantly trying to develop the staff and the School Governing Body members.

Teachers are prepared for the process of decision-making through the manner in which meetings are run and the manner in which the management of the school functions. Decisions on different issues are made at committee level, and staff are expected to assume responsibility for the decisions made. The comment of one teacher interviewed reflected: "The staff feel confident that they are capable of coping with the responsibilities afforded them." The head empowers teachers with different responsibilities and duties within the school, thus allowing them to grow. Another teacher, in her interview, commented: "The cordial and supportive role played by the headteacher, in coordinating the various aspects of the school, with the staff, make staff feel jointly responsible and has developed an ownership of the school."

At the Soweto A School the head has interpreted the new policy initiatives, and is using the positive potential of the different staff members to make the Soweto A School a vibrant, active and effective organisation. While the staff appear to be empowered, the School Governing Body, consisting of six parents, is not really deciding. They simply ratify the decisions put forth by the head. Therefore, the School Governing Body legitimises the decision-making process. The assumption that the decentralisation policy would create effective community participation is not being achieved.

The head at Soweto B School says that the democratic style of management is good. There is no real preparation for decision-making. Joint decision-making is time consuming. Staff are not willing to sacrifice time after school for decision-making. If time after school is involved, then they feel that it is better that the head assumes the responsibility for what has to be done. In addition, the decision-makers do not assume responsibility for ensuring the success of the decisions made. Even when the staff decide, they take no initiative to ensure that the decisions are carried out. There is little enthusiasm about the fact that they have been part of the decision-making

process. The head felt that there should be some indications from the department, or higher authorities, to motivate staff and improve the morale of the staff. Some form of external control was necessary to keep staff working. The head, clearly, does not fully appreciate the process of decentralisation.

An interviewed teacher stated that:

> Staff are not excited about the decision-making process. There is little commitment and, thus, the process is moving slowly. Teachers are losing respect and accountability to the head. Somehow these should be included into the democratic style of management.

Through the implementation of the decentralisation process, staff must be encouraged to assume the responsibilities and obligations to the respective authority levels. An issue to be considered at this school is whether or not the staff want the additional responsibilities brought about by the devolution of functions to the schools.

The impression created is one where staff are happy to do their teaching in the classes without any additional responsibilities.

At the Ennerdale School while the headteacher manages the school democratically, he does not have the staff, nor the management staff on board. He emerges very defensively in his responses, while simultaneously there is a feeling of isolation between him and the rest of the staff. There is some degree of uncertainty that the head is experiencing about his role and functions. The head is constantly looking for support from centralised sources. One of the management staff commented:

> A good head is one who can lead his staff, motivate them by making things more interesting. He should have a clear vision and not someone who waits for the department to give direction. There is no initiative from the office to inspire innovative work.

This head is unable to handle the changes in management. He is not meeting the expectations of the staff. This is because the head appears to lack confidence in his

own capacity and skills.

Decision-making at this school is done by trial and error, essentially at staff meetings and committee meetings. One teacher stated:

> While decisions are made at committee or even staff meeting levels, they often attack individuals rather than the problem. At times decisions made at the meetings are rescinded by the office, without any consultation. At other times decisions come up as ideas and these are, then, manipulated and pushed upon the staff. These are some of the main problems at this school.

In response, the head stated that: "Everyone seems to want increased say. Nevertheless, whether they are prepared to assume the democratic responsibility is questionable. Finally, all responsibility for decisions shifts back to the head". An important issue to be considered at this school is whether decisions are truly participatory and democratic or just manipulations of the decisions by the head and some management staff.

A sense of belonging or ownership may be painfully lacking at this school. Little collaboration takes place between staff members from the different departments, each teacher appears to be working independently. While the main emphasis is on democracy, they have not effected the sharing of duties and responsibilities.

In stark contrast, at the Mondeor School, while there is a democratic mode of operation, there is much respect for authority. A hierarchal authority system is set up and staff understand how the hierarchy works. Decisions are made at the executive team level, standard level, and at the staff meeting level. Teachers are accustomed to planning meetings held once a week. Decisions are made in relation to their classes and standard-wise. The staff feel important, in that they are sharing power, they have control over their work and the decisions they make. Staff representatives on the School Governing Body also have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. At these various levels staff are being given opportunities to assist in the decision-making process. With the constant exposure to decision-making, staff are indirectly being groomed into decision-making skills. Decision-making is achieved

through practice. Many school-based decisions are made in respect of curriculum, fees. and fundraising. Full responsibility is assumed for the allocated duties by the staff.

Staff are encouraged to attend workshops and to participate in further education, so that they can become empowered. The head is in control, while serving as an effective coordinator and manager of staff. One staff commented: "Our head knows the direction he is taking the school in. He is dynamic. In guiding us, he truly understands the staff, he empowers us in different ways depending on our strengths. He is really capable as a leader."

The Lenasia School head reflected:

> The hierarchy exists only on paper, but actually the playing fields are levelled. All decisions taken, even at management meetings need to be ratified at staff meetings. Educators need to be part and parcel of the decision-making process. All staff feel that they should allow them an equal participation, and they have equal rights as employees of the department. They do not see the head as being superior.

In reality this is not true, as power relations exist at schools. There are clear, hierarchial authority levels.

The teacher interviewed commented:

> While staff want these opportunities, when they effectively give them these opportunities they do not take advantage. Decision-making is a skill that teachers have to develop. There are no support structures to assist staff in developing in the processes. Decision-making is being learnt through practice. Teachers need to have greater commitment to the process. The success of the implementation of the decisions made are monitored by their colleagues rather than by the head. This consultative, participative, approach promotes growth. The head can contribute positively to the initiatives of coordinating, and empowering through informal monitoring of all departments and encouraging staff to develop.

However, while the head stated that they were empowering staff there appeared to be no support structures for staff to use for their development.

The head, here, tries to use the many ideas that come to the fore, in a positive manner. While assuming a democratic style the head has to coordinate the various functions that have to be carried out. Delegation of responsibilities in the subject areas is, effectively, being handled by the senior staff. The head finds coordinating and harmonising the multifaceted functions challenging.

Decentralisation of powers to the local level demands a major change in the role of heads. This change appears in their management styles. In the process of empowerment and decision-making at the lower levels, heads have had to change their management styles from a top down to a more consultative, empowering and democratic style of management. Heads are becoming more active as participants of teams. At the Soweto A School, while the head is at the apex of the hierarchy, much is being done to empower staff to share in the decentralisation process. At the Lenasia and Mondeor Schools, the process of decentralisation is unfolding at various levels according to the abilities and needs of the staff. At the Ennerdale and the Soweto B Schools, the process of decentralisation is not unfolding as heads have a limited understanding of how the process is going to work. Limited development and empowering of staff are executed. In essence nothing seems to have changed at these two schools. It is the head and his capacity to drive the process of decentralisation that will eventually result in the changes at the schools. Moreover, the so-called advantaged schools evidently have the capacity to implement the processes of decentralisation, while the historically disadvantaged schools are still grappling with comprehension and implementation of policy.

CHAPTER 10

ACCOUNTABILITY AND POWER SHARING

Accountability

With the decentralisation policy, accountability has increased. In South Africa the national level has lots more power and control than responsibility and accountability. For instance, it formulates curriculum policies *(Curriculum 2005);* it sets norms standards and outcomes for school and teacher education; and has quality assurance and monitoring powers. It sets the model of school governance, ownership and finance and is the key in deciding the teacher utilisation and supply policy. However, it is not responsible nor accountable for implementation, delivery evaluation and educational performance.

Provinces have the power to select strategic priorities, development planning and are responsible for policy implementation, allocation of resources and employment of educators. Districts have little power and resources but are responsible for information gathering, provisioning, support, monitoring and service delivery. Schools, in turn, have little power over curriculum, instructional guidance and teacher development, but are accountable for raising school fees, using national resources effectively and for achieving high educational performance and student outcomes. (de Clercq, F, 1997, pp.14-15).

All five heads (of the respective schools that form my sample) stated that they are accountable at various levels. Four (except the head of the Ennerdale School) felt that their most important accountability lies with the children. The Soweto A School head responded: "... to the children, for their growth, and their participation in the future development of the country." They wanted to ensure that the children received a good, quality, education.

To the parents, heads felt a high degree of accountability for the manner in which

fees are used to provide a good education for their children. The head of Mondeor School stated: "constant communications as newsletters are sent to parents on a two weekly basis reporting on the important aspects of activities, taking place at the school." Parents need to know the quality service that their children were receiving.

The head of the Ennerdale School stated: "... accountable for the finances to the School Governing Body for accurate administration; accountable to the teachers for adopting a democratic approach to education."

While the staff assume responsibility for decisions made by them, the heads act as support-mechanisms for the staff. The heads consider themselves accountable for all decisions mad

All heads claim a strong sense of accountability in financial matters. Here it is the treasurer and the head that assume joint responsibility for the finances. Finally, the head assumes accountability for all aspects of the schools' management.

This increase in accountability, with the decrease in management staff through rationalisation, would further intensify the head's role. Grace (1995, p.203) has shown that, even with the support of school governors, senior management teams and professional support groups, contemporary headteachers have experienced work intensification, through the devolution of power to schools. This work intensification has had deleterious effects upon both their professional and their personal lives. The study has also shown the range and complexity of the moral, ethical and professional dilemmas which headteachers encounter in their work. Headteachers might continue to take the initiative in the resolution of difficult policy issues in schooling, but the responsibility of final decision-making could be located in the wider democratic structures. Thus, in schools where the democratic structures have been set up, all staff must assume power with responsibility. It would not be the headteacher alone who would be held responsible for the consequences of such decisions. The headteachers however feel responsible for all decisions taken at the schools.

Power Sharing

Decentralisation and the devolution of power to the local level mean the participation and involvement of stakeholders in the management of the school. With increased participation the objective is increased efficiency in the use of resources. The norms and fixed rules by the central state have limited the power of the decisions. However, at schools many staff look upon decentralisation as equal to democratisation. It is only if decentralisation is accompanied by a real change in the decision-making process, involving a larger and more effective popular participation, that there will be a true modification in the distribution of power. At present such participation is difficult to achieve since it depends largely on the motivation, interest and time of the people concerned.

For successful decentralisation, a great deal depends on the calibre of people making the decisions. Each school has a hierarchy. The head is at the apex of each school. The manner in which the head manages the school and establishes the authority systems in the school determines the hierarchy at each school.

It is often assumed that the staff are all equally willing (and able) to participate in decision-making, yet research (Alutto and Belasco 1972) shows that this is not so (Lauglo & Mc Lean,1985, p.82). Only a small proportion have such ambitions and desires. Many staff wish to teach and leave the administration and the power sharing to others. This is evident at Soweto B School where staff are not at all keen to share the increased functions that decentralisation brought with it. The head has established a hierarchy of head, deputy, and heads of departments. While some teachers are happy to assist with the decision-making others felt that it was time-consuming, and really it was not part of their work. There is little respect for authority. They view democracy as "do as you please." The teachers are not interested in gaining skills. The teachers at the Soweto B School are not accepting the full impact of joint decision-making and sharing of power and responsibility. Their feelings reflect that too much time of the staff go into school-based management and, if this was going to impact upon their own time, they did not really want these additional duties. They were not keen to share the power with the head.

At the Soweto A and the Lenasia Schools, the heads reported that the hierarchy was on paper. All teachers had an equal say. All teachers are managers and such they assume responsibility for the authority patterns in their classrooms. Both heads, clearly, illustrated that while a democratic approach is adopted there is still control, respect for authority, and staff have to work within the parameters of the set school policies. These heads are using the new policy positively.

At the Mondeor School, a hierarchy has been set. The channels of communication are in place. The staff understand how the hierarchy works. The head and the management team allocate power and decision-making at various levels. The staff assume responsibility for the allocated duties. The staff are aware of how much power they have and accept the authority at different levels. The staff are keen to participate in decisions that affect their classrooms. They do not want to be involved in, or have power over, the administrative functions.

Schools are generally sites for power relationships. This did not come out explicitly in the data collected, except at the Ennerdale School, where the teachers interviewed reported conflicts of power between the members of management and between staff members.

At the Soweto B School, the head reported the conflict in power relations between members of the School Governing Body and the management staff.

Sharing power and relinquishing control are challenging aspects of change that face heads. While heads are, in essence, required to devolve power to the lower levels many heads manipulate the decisions that are made. At times the decisions are legitimised through non participation. Often no power really moves down to the lower levels. The staff are becoming empowered to make decisions, and they are becoming, increasingly, more involved in school-based management. Power is ultimately controlled and the heads have experienced little loss of power.

CHAPTER 11

CONCLUSION

This chapter embraces many important issues that are essential to address to bring this investigation to a close. We must examine and specify the conclusions and recommendations according to the different aspects that were investigated.

The devolution of the different functions to the school level has affected the role of the heads. The manner in which each head experiences and handles the change depends upon his or her individual skills and abilities and the departmental histories. I outline below the different aspects in which the heads' roles have changed.

Increased Administration Duties

The increase in administration loads has created a change in the role of the head. While previously the head carried most of the administration duties out, with the increased administration work the head now has to delegate and monitor the work. The head has to perform more of a managerial role. The level to which delegation takes place depends upon the number and capacity of the support staff. In three of the five schools the administration loads are shared and thus delegation has become an important, new role function of the head. At the other two schools, the heads, have effectively increased administration duties, and they are experiencing a change in their role functions. They appear confused about how to effect the change in their roles.

Co-ordination, Decision-Making, Delegation and Empowerment

These various skills have impacted on the management role of the head. While previously the head was in control, though under the superintendents from the ex-education departments (under centralised control), with decentralisation the head has

a more collaborative and consultative role function. The heads role function has in some cases changed from a top-down management style to a more consultative, open and collaborative style of management. The change in skills in the role function is difficult to acquire, as heads are required to change their management styles without undergoing any formal training in this respect. With decentralisation, according to the head, all accountability and responsibility stops with the head. With the devolution of power, the head has to ensure that the respect for authority is not lost. Decisions are made at various levels and staff have control over their own work.

The head has a major role of managing the physical resources and the personnel. The role of the head has changed to one of dynamism, guidance, delegation and developing the strengths and empowering the staff and School Governing Body members. The management styles of heads have changed. While from the interviews, this was evident in four out of five schools, at Soweto B School staff did not want the additional responsibility caused by the devolution of power. Teachers at this school did not want to spend their extra time taking on extra responsibilities.

Accountability

Accountability needs to become a way of life at schools. With the implementation of decentralisation, there has been increased accountability. In South Africa, while the *National Department* sets out policies, the implementation of policy and the accountability of education is left to districts and schools. All heads assume accountability for what happens at their schools. Heads feel accountability in respect of school finances and towards the learners, their parents, and the teachers.

The increase in accountability will further intensify the role of the head. The responsibility of collecting the school fees, monitoring the use of these funds (and the adequate control over them) intensifies the role.

Power Sharing

Schools are generally sites for power relationships. This did not come out effectively in the data collected. While most of the persons interviewed revealed that they had no problems with handling the power relationships at their schools, at the Ennerdale and the Soweto B Schools the teachers believed that the management staff were not adequately handling the conflicts, resulting from a power struggle. With decentralisation, heads stated that there was a loss of control of power over the staff, except at the Mondeor School, where power has been shifted to different levels, and staff can, effectively, cope with the decisions that affect them directly. However, at all schools a certain amount of power is still vested in the head, despite the comments by heads, such as "The playing fields have been levelled." This, so-called, shifts in power, has resulted in a big adjustment in the role of the heads.

Finance

The devolution of financial control to schools is the single-most important aspect of devolution. This has directly affected the role of the head, with increased administration loads, accounting systems that need to be set up, and school budgets having to be drawn up. It is, finally, the head who has to ensure that these functions are timeously completed.

Increased accountability for the finances creates additional stress for the heads. All heads, however, accept accountability, although they directly are not handling the finances. Stricter financial accountability needs to be enforced at three of the five schools. At the Lenasia and Mondeor Schools, the systems for the collection of fees, receipting and purchasing are in place. The School Governing Body does the approval for purchases. The essential function of the School Governing Body is seen as to raise-funds and deploy funds.

The appointment of a financial officer (bursar) would ease much of the burden of the head. Proper accounting systems, guidelines and financial training for heads are essential.

Governance

The *South African Schools Act* required the implementation of the School Governing Body at all schools to improve community participation. However, it is questionable, whether the representation of six to eight members on the School Governing Body really increases community participation. Moreover, the members' capacity, in terms of time, transport and abilities, needs to be considered when expecting them to execute their functions and powers. In considering these factors the establishment of governing bodies have evidently also impacted on the role of heads.

The School Governing Body members, in the advantaged communities, can assist the head in executing his duties more effectively, while the School Governing Body members, in the less advantaged communities, needed to be empowered and trained in the different functions that have to be carried out. The members of the School Governing Bodies at the advantaged schools have better access to amenities such as transport. They are in better jobs and thus they are in a better position to help the head with various duties as is evident from the research findings at the Mondeor School. At the so-called disadvantaged schools the head has to assist in the development of the School Governing Body members. There has to be a continuous training and retraining of members as the composition of the School Governing Body changes on a regular basis. This also affects the work of the head.

At all schools, the head with the staff makes the decisions at the school. These decisions are then, presented to the School Governing Body for approval. Often the School Governing Body members merely legitimise such decisions. Thus, the head and the staff can manipulate and control decisions, and particular persons may drive governance, possibly having special agendas.

Regarding the participation and functioning of the School Governing Body, all principals saw their function as fund-raising and general administration decisions (most of which may be legitimised). All academic, professional and curricular matters would remain the domain of the head and the staff.

A general change in the parents' role occurred, from one where parents were,

previously, merely informed about the happenings at the school (in the times of the *Parent Teacher Association* and the *Parent Teacher and Student Association)*, to that of liaising, consulting, empowering, legitimising and working with the school.

Curriculum

In all five schools heads are spending much time in a managerial and administrative role for the implementation of *Curriculum 2005*. Concerning the instructional role, four out of the five heads spend two to three hours teaching non-examination subjects, which does not give them sufficient experience in performing the instructional role. One head spent fourteen hours in the classroom teaching. She believed that being part of the instructional team, would best benefit her from the first hand experience at instruction in the class with the learners. She is playing a significant instructional role, and an administrative role in the curriculum implementation. In general, heads are serving a more managerial, administrative function as apposed to an instructional function.

Regarding curriculum control, heads' roles were, previously, regarded as supervisory. Now, with the school-based implementation of the curriculum, the monitoring function has become extremely important. The heads stated that their role has become more supportive, trying to help and advise teachers, where possible, instead of being on a fault-finding mission, as most heads did in the past. Team building, as well as, being members of teams, have also become part of the heads' role function.

Another interesting aspect of the role function of heads is that they need to constantly be in touch with the latest developments in policy and management. In the past policy had been set out with little changes over the years. Heads became complacent with the existing policies. With the devolution of power and the introduction of school-based management, heads had to assume the role of interpreters of policy to, effectively, manage their schools. From the research data, three of the five schools are evidently confident in the change of their role functions in respect of curriculum implementation. The remaining two heads are not confident, due to the lack of knowledge and understanding of the new curriculum.

The heads have not been part of the process of the policy development. The state politically drove the implementation of the curriculum. It is the only visible aspect of education that the new government has put in place rapidly. The schools and heads were not adequately prepared for the change. Schools were not properly resourced and staff were not adequately trained. The schools are now in a state of quandary between the old and the new. The decentralisation of the curriculum to schools must be a gradual process with sufficient resources and adequate training of staff.

General

While existing literature suggests that with decentralisation much flexibility is experienced, the heads did not express this flexibility. They did not have the experience of flexibility as the devolution is still in the early stages. Heads are still grappling between the old and the new. For effective implementation pilot programmes (lasting, usually, between one and four years) should have been introduced. At the schools the extensive preparations required for the implementation of the programmes was lacking. Moreover, the early retirement of key personnel could also have affected the effective implementation. The reduction of staff and high teacher-learner ratios, in addition to the varied levels of training and the resultant competencies of staff make the change much more difficult. The devolution of power to schools has, unequivocally, resulted in a change in the role of the heads. The degree of the change varies from head to head. Much of the degree of change depends on the effect of the historical racial divisions in the education as presented by the ex- education departments. It is interesting to note that while similar results have been found in other countries, in South Africa these are mediated and expressed in very different ways in schools with different histories.

REFERENCES

Act No. 84 of 1996. 'South African Schools Act.' *Government Gazette*. No. 17579, November 1996.

ANC Education Department (1994) *Policy Framework for Education and Training: Draft Discussion Document.* (Johannesburg, ANC)

BELL, J. (1987) *Doing Your Research Project. A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education and Social Science*. (Philadelphia, Open University Press).

BROWN, D.J. (1990) *Decentralisation and School-Based Management*. (United Kingdom, The Falmer Press).

CARRIM, N. (1998) 'An Analysis of Curriculum Development and Curriculum Materials in Regard to Human Rights, Democracy and Citizenship Education in Contemporary South Africa.' (Paper presented at the WCIES World Congress, Cape Town, South Africa).

CHISHOLM, L. (1997) 'The Restructuring of South African Education and Training in Comparative Context.' In KALLAWAY, et al. *Education after Apartheid*. (Cape Town, University of Cape Town Press).

COHEN, D.K. & SPILLANE, J.P. (1992) 'Policy and Practice: The Relations Between Governance and Instruction.' In *Review of Research in Education*. (American Educational Research Association).

COHEN, L. & MANUEL, L. (1987) *Research Methods in Education*. (New York, Croom Helm).

DAVIDOFF, S. & LAZARUS, S. (1997) *The Learning School: An Organisation Development Approach*. (Kenwyn, South Africa, Juta and Co. Ltd.).

DE CLERCQ, F. (1997) 'Contested Educational Governance: In Whose Interests?' (Paper presented at the Kenton-at-the-gap conference, South Africa).

Department of Education (DNE)(1995) *Report of the Committee to Review the Organisation, Governance and Funding of Schools* (Pretoria, Department of Education). Commonly known as the Hunter Report.

Department of Education (DNE)(1996) 'Education White Paper 2. The Organisation, Governance and Funding of Schools.' *Government Gazette.* (No. 368, No. 16987, February 1996. Pretoria, Government Printers).

ELMORE, R.F. (1993) *The Role of Local School Districts in Instructional Improvement.* In FUHRMAN, S.H. *Designing Coherent Education Policy.* (USA)

FERRIS, J.M. (1992) "School-Based Decision Making: A Principal-Agent Perspective." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis.* (Vol. 14, no. 4).

FISKE, E. (1996) 'The Politics of Decentralisation and Educational Reform Program.' *Decentralization and Education Reform Program.* (Background Paper, The World Bank).

GARSON, P. (1998) 'Applause and Flaws.' In *The Teacher Educating the Nation.* (Vol. 3, no.11, Braamfontein, M & G Media Ltd, Media Mill).

GREENSTEIN, R. (1995) 'New Policies, Old Challenges: Reshaping the Education System.' Wits EPU, *Quarterly Review of Education and Training In South Africa.* (Vol. 3, no.1, Johannesburg, Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand).

KGOBE, M. (1996) 'Realising Change: The Continuing Process of Policy Development and Implementation.' Wits EPU, *Quarterly Review of Education and Training In South Africa.* (Vol. 4, no. 2, Johannesburg, Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand).

LAUGLO, J. & MCLEAN, M. (eds)(1985) *The Control of Education. International Perspectives on the Centralisation - Decentralisation Debate.* (London, Heinemann Educational Books for the Institute of Education, University of London).

LEVAČIĆ, R. (1995) *Local Management of Schools - Analysis and Practice.* (England, Open University Press).

MC LAUGHLIN, M.W. (1990) 'The Rand Change Agent Study Revisited. Macro-Perspectives and Micro-Realities.' *Educational Researcher.* (Vol. 19. No.9).

MOKGALANE, E. & VALLY, S. (1996) 'Between Vision and Practice: Policy Processes and Implementation.' Wits EPU, *Quarterly Review of Education and Training In South Africa.* (Vol. 3, no. 3, Johannesburg, Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand).

MURPHY, J. & LOUIS, K.S. (eds)(1994) *Reshaping the Principalship -- Insights from Transformational Reform Efforts.* (United States of America, Sage Publications).

National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI)(1992) *The Framework Report.* (Cape Town, OUP/NECC).

SAMOFF, J. & JANSEN, J. (1991) *Decentralization in Africa: Specifying Who Rules.* (Stanford University).

SAYED, Y. (1992) 'A Critique of the Decentralisation of Educational Administration: Reconceptualising the Governance of Schools.' (Paper prepared for the National Education Policy Investigation - *NEPI subgroup: administration and control of education.*)(Faculty of Education, University of Western Cape).

SAYED, Y. (1996) 'Democratising School Governance: Policy Problems and Prospects.' (mimeo).

STURMAN, A. (1989) 'Decentralisation and the Curriculum -- Effects of devolution of Curriculum Decision Making in Australia.' *Acer Research Monograph, No. 35.* (The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.).

TIKLY, L. (1997) 'Redefining Community Involvement in South African Education: the Case for a Greater Role for the 'Local Level' in Finance and Governance of Schools.' (Paper submitted to the Oxford International Conference on Education and Development 1997: Education and Geopolitical Change, New College, Oxford).

VALLY, S. (1998) 'Inequality in Education? Revisiting the Provisioning, Funding and Governance of Schooling.' Education Policy and Implementation Developments, June to August 1998. Wits EPU, *Quarterly Review of Education and Training In South Africa.* (Vol.5, no. 4. Johannesburg, Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand).

VALLY, S. & SPREEN, C. (1998) 'Education Policy and Implementation Developments, February to May 1998.' Wits EPU, *Quarterly Review of Education and Training In South Africa.* (Vol.5, no. 3. Johannesburg, Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand).

VANDENBERGHE, R. (1992) 'The Changing Role of the Primary Schools in Belgium.' *Journal of Educational Administration.* (Vol. 30, no.3. MCB University Press).

WEBB, R. & VULLIAMY, G. (1996) 'The Changing Role of the Primary School Headteacher.' *Educational Management& Administration.* (Vol. 24 (3), London. Sage Publications).

WEILER, H. (1989) 'Comparative Perspectives on Education Decentralisation: An Exercise in Contradiction?' *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* (Vol.12, No.4).

WHITAKER, P. (1983) *The Primary Head.* (London, Heinemann Educational).

Author Bhana N M
Name of thesis The Chaning Role Of Head Teachers At Primary Schools In Gauteng 1994 - 1999 Bhana N M 1999

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.