

**TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION-MAKING IN FINANCE AND
CURRICULUM MATTERS.**

BY

JOHNSON MPIYAKHE JOHNNY

CHILI

**A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of
Education
in Educational Leadership, Management and Policy**

**UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL: EDGEWOOD
CAMPUS; DURBAN, SOUTH AFRICA**

DECEMBER 2011

SUPERVISOR'S STATEMENT

This dissertation has been submitted with/ without my approval.

Prof. V. Chikoko

DECEMBER 2011

DECLARATION

I, **JOHNSON JOHNNY MPIYAKHE CHILI**, declare that this dissertation is my own work “ **Teacher involvement in decision-making in Finance and Curriculum matters**”. All the sources used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged and listed in the references.

I further declare that this work has not been submitted previously for any degree in any University.

Signed.....

Chili JohnsonMpiyakheJohnny Chili

MARCH 2012

DEDICATION

To my late Father, Chili Mthukeni George Solvas and living mother Chili Sizeniwho sacrificed to send me to school, you did shine my future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to the following people:

I thank God Almighty for the power, courage and mental strength He gave me to undertake this arduous task.

I thank the education officials of Maphumulo Circuit, who allowed me access to conduct this research. I thank all my colleagues and principals of schools who allowed me to undertake this task from their schools. I also thank PL1 teachers who participated to the study by giving me a lot of time to respond to interviews and questionnaire items.

I also thank my colleague, namely MrsL. T. Zondifor her support and encouragement. I remember one day , when I was in the process of registration for M. Ed . I thought I won't manage to attend classes, but she said "You can do it".

Without the persistence, sound advice and wisdom of Professor VitallisChikoko. This thesis would not have been completed. His patience and advice cannot be explained. I thank you for lending me your books to assist me in formulating my thesis, and for moral support. I do not have enough words to thank you.

I thank my wife, Sithole Cynthia Nkosingiphile and our children (Thobani, Thobeka, Thobisani and Fanalesibonge) for their patience, prayers and encouragement during myabsence from the family.

I thank my brothers and sisters, Mcebiseni (Ndixa) , Lungani (Nodaka), Sthembiso (Mgodi, Qiko), Nombuso, Shiye and Tshengisile for understanding during my absence from the family in crucial times.

I also thank M.ed class-mates i.e. Myeza Faith, Mlungwana N.T. and others

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

PL1	Post Level One
SASA	South African Schools Act
SGB	School Governing Body
SMT	School Management Team
SDT	School Development Team
H.o.D	Head of Department
DoE	Department of Education

ABSTRACT

Since 1994, South Africa has experienced a focus on transformation. The National Department of Education has refocused the vision and direction of the South African education system through a series of policy initiatives. As a result of new legislation in South Africa, considerably more authority and responsibility for decision-making has been devolved to the school level than was the previously the case (Lumby, Middlewood&Kaabwe, 2003). This study investigates teacher involvement in decision-making in finance and curriculum matters in 16 selected rural schools in Maphumulo circuit. . The study sought to investigate the extent to which teachers' actual and desired involvement in decision-making in Finance matters and Curriculum.

Through the interpretive paradigm of the situation quantitative and qualitative approaches were used to provide rich and picture. The study utilized a questionnaire and focus group interviews to investigate the finance area in eight issues: budgeting, purchasing, record keeping, financial reporting, fundraising, monitoring, auditing and accounting. The second area was curriculum with seven issues: selection of books, year plans, work schedules and lesson plans, assessment (tests and projects) time tabling, language policy and instructional methods. Findings show that in both decision-making areas teachers tend to experience less decisional involvement than they desire. However, teachers do not necessarily desire to be involved in every aspect of the selected areas. I therefore conclude that school leaders need to invest in understanding what teachers desire to be involved in and what they do not.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
Supervisor Statement.....	i
Declaration	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Acronyms	v
Abstract	vi
CHAPTER ONE:INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background and purpose of the study	1
1.2 Rationale and significance of the study	2
1.3 Research questions.....	3
1.4 Definitions of terms.....	3
1.4.1 Teacher	4
1.4.2 Decision-making.....	4
1.4.3Participative Decisions Making.....	4
1.4.4 Decentralization.....	5
1.4.5 Finance.....	5
1.4.6 Curriculum	5
1.4.7 Team work.....	6
1.5Limitations of the study.....	6
1.6 Organizationof the study	7

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2. 2 Examining Concepts	8
2.2.1 Decision-making in schools.....	8
2.2.2 Participative Decision-making	9
2. 2. 3 Participative decision-making and Empowerment.....	11
2. 2. 4 Who should participate?.....	12
2. 2. 4 What and why decentralization?.....	14
2. 2. 5 Finance as keyarea of school decision-making.....	16
2. 2. 6 Curriculum as key area of school decision-making	16
2. 3 Legal framework for financial management in South Africa	20
2. 3. 1 School funding in South Africa	21
2. 4 Legal framework for curriculum in South Africa.....	21
2. 5 Theoretical frameworks	23
2. 5. 1 Enhancing the quality and acceptance of decisions	24
2. 5. 2 Quality rule	24
2. 5. 3 Leader information rule	24
2. 5. 4 Trust rule (Goal Congruence).....	24
2. 5. 5 Problem Structure Rule	25

2. 5. 6 Constrains on Decision-making	26
2. 5. 7 Decision-Making Styles	27
2.5. 8 The Hoy-Tarter Model of Shared Decision-making	27
2. 6 Conclusion	29
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	30
3. 1 Introduction	30
3. 2 Research design and methodology	30
3. 3 Respondents	32
3. 4 Data collection instruments	34
3. 4. 1 The questionnaire.....	34
3. 4. 2 Focus group interviews	35
3. 5 Data collection process and gaining entry	38
3. 6 Ethical issues	39
3. 7 Validity and reliability.....	39
3. 8 Data analysis.....	40
3. 9 Conclusion	40

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION.....	41
4. 1 Introduction	41
4. 2 Biographical information of respondent teachers	41
4. 2. 1 Biographical information.....	41
4. 2. 2 Questionnaire information.....	43
4. 2. 3 Focus group interview information.....	43
4. 3 Decision-making in Finance and Curriculum areas	44
4. 3. 1 Teachers' experienced actual involvement in Financial Decision-making.....	45
4. 3. 2 Teachers' desired involvement in Finance Decision-making.....	45
4. 3. 3 Teachers' experienced involvement in Curriculum Decision-making.....	52
4. 4. 4 Teachers' desired involvement in Curriculum Decision-making	52
4. 4 Emerging issues.....	58
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS.....	62
5. 1 Introduction	62
5. 2 Summary of the research.....	62
5. 3 Conclusions.....	64
5. 4 Recommendations	65

REFERENCES.....	67
APPENDICES	74
APPENDIX ONE: Letter to the Department of Education.....	74
APPENDIX TWO: Letter to school heads.....	75
APPENDIX THREE: Informed consent letter	76
APPENDIX FOUR: Questionnaire.....	77
APPENDIX FIVE : Focus group interview schedule	81
APPENDIX SIX : Ethical clearance	82

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Purpose of the study

This study sought to explore teacher involvement in decision-making in Finance and Curriculum matters. South Africa is committed to fundamental transformation of its social institutions and the values which underpin and shape them. This commitment finds its clearest expression in the new Constitution (Republic of South Africa 1996a). Since 1994, there has been a broad context of transformation and the National Department of Education has refocused the vision and direction of the South African education system through a series of policy initiatives (Lumby, Middlewood & Kaabwe, 2003). As a result of new legislation in South Africa, considerably more authority and responsibility for decision-making has been devolved to the school level than was the previously the case (Lumby, Middlewood & Kaabwe, 2003). As stated in the South African Schools Act No 84 of 1996 (SASA, 1996 p. 6) “democratization of education includes the idea that stakeholders such as teachers, parents and other people must participate in the activities of the school” .

Zulu (2002) indicates that “teachers as stakeholders in education are entitled to participate in decision making at school level” . However, there remain questions about which areas of school management teachers should be involved in.

The purpose of the study was to determine teachers actual and desired practices regarding decision-making in two specific areas of school management, namely Curriculum and Finance.

1.2 Rationale and significance of the study

In March 2004 I became a Head of Department (HOD) of the Intermediate Phase. Since then I have noticed that there are key aspects of school management which are core areas in terms of decision making at school. The two selected areas are the pillars of school management, curriculum and finance.

Then, in 2007, I was appointed Acting Principal. In this challenging situation I got support from departmental officials and other principals in a range of ways. As I performed the duties of both H.O.D and principal I conducted phase meetings or staff meetings and found that when teachers are excluded from the decision-making processes they complain. Also sometimes when they are involved in the decision-making they remain quiet. I believe that this study it will help me to know exactly which areas of school management teachers want to participate in.

As a principal I have realized that teacher involvement in decision-making is pivotal. Discussions with other principals suggested that participatory or shared decision making is a concern in many schools. And for this reason I decided to explore teacher involvement in the said focus areas. The findings of this research could be useful to principals of schools in terms of involving teachers in decision making processes. For instance, it may help the School Management Team (SMT) in curriculum planning and to be aware that teacher involvement is desirable. In this regard, teachers are the nuts and bolts or vehicles of the curriculum, because such decisions directly affect their work. This study aimed at understanding teacher participation in curriculum and finance areas. The policy makers also at school level may be assisted to understand the importance of involving the relevant stakeholders in decision making processes.

The study seeks to identify the gaps in the literature, for instance the available research failed to capture how and in which areas of school management teachers should be involved and which areas do teachers desire to be involved in decision-making.

Furthermore, the available studies concentrated on one area which does not give a full picture of the school. In this regard, the study addresses teacher involvement in curriculum and finance areas. This study will help the Department of Education with reference to Maphumulo circuit to improve teacher involvement in school decision-making. The study will be very important in a way that we will be able to understand teachers position in terms of decision-making and be able to tell how do teachers think about their involvement in decision-making.

1. 3 Research questions

Based on the context described above, this study was guided by the following questions:

1. To what extent are teachers involved and desire involvement in curriculum decision-making?
2. To what extent are teachers involved and desire involvement in school finance decision-making?
3. What can be said about teacher involvement in decision-making in two areas: Finance and Curriculum?

1. 4 Definitions of terms

In this study I have used some concepts that direct or guide the study. I therefore explain these terms in order to elucidate and assist the leader.

1. 4. 1 Teacher

According to SASA teacher means any person excluding a person who is appointed to exclusively perform extracurricular duties, who teaches, educates or trains other persons or provides professional educational services including professional therapy and educational psychological services at a school.

Duminy and Steyn (1985) teacher as adult constantly offers the child, by way of selected learning material, the chance to know and to experience more and more widely until eventually, as an adult, he will have his own points of view, visions and convictions. Furthermore, the authors proceed to say that teacher chooses from the available subject matter what he thinks will be valuable and suitable, in order to develop his people. In this study I use the term teacher to mean PL I

1. 4. 2 Decision-making

Decisions mean that something has to happen, a choice has to be made between alternatives or from a list of options. Decision-making is often a difficult process involving change, conflict and the risk of being wrong (Smith, 2002, p. 43).

1.4. 3 Participative Decision Making

Participation is defined as the mental and emotional involvement of a person in a group situation that encourages the individual to contribute to group goals and to share responsibility for them (Owens & Valesky, 2007, p. 316). They further indicate that because participation in this sense includes “mental and emotional involvement” , it can lead to the notion of ‘ownership’ of (or “buying into”) decisions. This in turn is likely to encourage participations to follow through with the decision taken.

The use of participative decision-making has two major potential benefits: Arriving at better decisions and enhancing the growth and development of the organization’s participants (greater sharing of goals, improved motivation, improved communication, and enhanced group-process skills).

1. 4. 4 Decentralization

According to Lauglo (cited in Bush, 2003. p. 12) decentralization in education means a shift in the authority distribution away from the central 'top' agency in the hierarchy of authority. Thus I use the term decentralization to mean the author further indicates that there are main forms of decentralization.

1. 4. 5 Finance

This term refers to matters related to money and how it is generated and spent in the school context. Khuzwayo (2009) refers to financial decisions as an act of deciding on monetary matters.

1. 4. 6 Curriculum

Curriculum can be a confusing or controversial concept because many scholars define it in various ways. For instance, Ross (2000) in Shoba (2009, p. 7) defines the curriculum as all the features which produce the school's life, the values exemplified in the way the school sets about its tasks and the way in which teaching and learning is organized and managed.

Ross further indicates that, it includes the formal programme of lesson in the time table and the climate of relationships, attitudes, styles of behavior and the general quality of life established in the school community as a whole.

According to National Education Policy Investigation (1992) curriculum refers to the teaching and learning activities and experiences which are provided by schools.

This definition includes the aims and objectives of the education system as well as the specific goals of schools. The selection of content to be taught, how it is arranged into subjects and programmes as well as what skills and processes are included as well as forms of assessment and evaluation are all curriculum issues. In this study I use the term to refer to the items under curriculum content (Foundation, Intermediate and Senior).

1. 4 . 7 Team work

According to Squelch & Lemmer (1994) a teamwork is a “group of individuals working together in such a way that they can achieve more collectively than working as individuals”. Steyn & van Niekerk, 2002) concur when they say that this concept is about a group of people with common objectives which can effectively tackle any task it is given.

According to Steyn (2001) teamwork is based on McGregor’s Theory Y assumption about management philosophy, namely that the ability to make decisions is widely distributed among staff members regardless of their position in the hierarchy. Donaldson and Sanderson (1996, p. 3) argue that teamwork is essential in building a professional culture in schools. In this regard in teamwork teachers become a part of the decision-making process and staff commitment, responsibility and involvement are promoted. Working together also adds value to thinking, services and achievements and helps the staff to realize that the school as a whole is important.

According to (Squelch & Lemmer, 1994) teamwork is a “group of individuals working together in such a way that they can achieve more collectively than working as an individual”. Steyn & van Niekerk, 2002) add to say that this concept is about a group of people with common objectives which can effectively tackle any task it is given.

1. 5 Limitations of the study

This study focused on teachers experiences and desires, did not go in to whether teachers have the capacity to participate effectively. It is also focused on Maphumulo circuit in the Ilembe District of KwaZulu -Natal. Therefore the study was subject to the following: The study focused on primary schools I am a primary principal, and my expertise lies in this area.

Because the findings of this study cannot be generalized to the whole District, KwaZulu-Natal province or South Africa.

1.6 Organization of the study

This study consists of five chapters . Chapter One presents the background. The focus area and the purpose of the study. The key questions are significance of study, definitions of terms, research setting, research methodology and organization of study. Chapter Two reviews literature on decentralization, finance and curriculum. It also explains the theoretical framework. Chapter Three present the design and methodology and research design adopted in the study that assisted to answer the three research questions listed in this study. Chapter Four presents and discusses the data. Chapter Five presents the main findings, conclusion and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2. 1 Introduction

Chapter One introduced the study. In that chapter I argued that the current legal framework for South Africa's education system puts an emphasis on democracy in terms of leadership and management. SASA stresses "shared decision-making" by all stakeholders in education. However, it is relatively silent on the nature and extent of teacher involvement in decision-making.

This chapter reviews related literature around teacher involvement in decision-making in curriculum and finance areas. Firstly, the chapter examines four key concepts, namely participatory leadership, decentralization, finance and curriculum. Secondly, the legal framework is reviewed. Thirdly studies in curriculum and finance are described. Fourthly, the theoretical framework of the study is discussed. Lastly, the chapter ends with a conclusion.

2. 2 Examining Key Concepts

2. 2. 1 Decision-making in schools

Ricketts (2003) argues that in the process of problem solving a new or different course of action will be taken to solve a problem or improve a situation. The author further argues that the process by which the course of action is selected is called decision-making.

According to van Deventer & Kruger (2003) decision-making is about making things happen as we wish them to in a school. They further claim that the quality of decision-making skills determines the effectiveness of planning, organizing and leadership style.

Decision-making therefore refers to the process of influencing a course of action. In this study the school context the decisions taken will influence learners, teachers and the future of the school.

2. 2. 2 Participative in Decision-making

According to Steyn (1998) democratization, shared decision-making, participative management and teacher empowerment are not new concepts in education. Participative decision-making is when decisions made affect certain individuals and the same individuals are influential in the formulation and implementation of those decisions (Lawler, Mohnrman & Ledforf, 1992). These authors explain that there are three prerequisites for participation and empowerment , namely the capacity to become psychologically involved in participative activities, the motivation to act autonomously and the capacity to see the relevance of participation for one's own well being. This suggests that capacity is an important factor to consider in matters of participative decision-making.

Owens & Valesky (2007) define participation as the mental and emotional involvement of a person in a group situation that encourages the individual to contribute to group goals and to share responsibility for them. They also claim that because participation in this sense is “mental and emotional involvement” , that it is likely to encourage the notion of “ownership” of (or “buying into”) decisions.

Drawing from these views teachers in a participative are expected to participate in all decisions as far as the school management areas are concerned. In this regard the school managers (Principals) need to understand that teachers can be involved in some stages of decision-making. The authors indicate that the use of participative decision-making has two major potential benefits. One benefit is that we arriving at better decisions. The second is enhancing the growth and development of the organization's participants (greater sharing of goals, improved motivation, improved communication, better developed group-process skills).

In terms of implementing participative processes in educational organizations and arriving at better decisions Owens & Valesky (2007) identified three factors that should be borne in mind. The need for an explicit decision-making process, the nature of the problem to be solved or the issue to be decided and criteria for including people in the process.

These factors suggest that for the school heads to be effective leaders and managers they need to consider the importance of different stakeholders in the making of decisions. In this study teachers are the first and foremost figures to be involved in terms of curriculum decision-making because they are the engine of the curriculum implementation process. Financial resources are required in order for the curriculum to be effectively implemented. It therefore would make sense that teachers are involved in decisions regarding finances.

For van Deventer & Kruger (2003) this form of decision-making has distinct advantages. For instance, it satisfies the needs of educators to have a say in matters which affect them. Greater involvement on the educators' part also reduces the possibility of conflict that often results from decisions made in an authoritarian manner Preez, Camphor, Grobler, Look & Shaba (2003) and van Deventer & Kruger, (2003) .

Positive results of participative decision-making include that participation and involvement tend to ease the process of implementation, through increased commitment of those involved to the outcomes of the decision. The other positive results are job satisfaction and acquisition of new skills by teachers (Martin & Krager, 1999).

Ricketts (2003) outlined the advantages of using groups in problem solving or decision making. He/ She argues that, there is a sense of ownership, shared responsibility and commitment by group members in the decision made. The author proceeds to say that there may be an increase in cooperation, unity and morale between group members.

Participative decision-making is seen as crucial notion in terms of teacher involvement in school decision making processes. In this regard for the school to be effective in educational activities, there must be a high involvement of teachers.

For Tosi and Mero (2003) decisions are made with bounded rationality. This means that decision-makers are able to recognize only a limited number of alternatives and are aware of only a few consequences of each alternative. They also argue that a second limitation in the decision-making process often occurs in response to problems that an organization may face. They suggest that when a problem occurs managers begin a search for “fixes” to that particular problem. To apply this notion at school level in terms of decision-making, schools as organizations have a time limitation, Principals have deadlines to comply with. They sometimes need to respond urgently to the departments’ officials (Ward Managers, Circuit Manager as well as the District manager). This means that at times Principals need or are forced by the situation to take the decision on the spot. Teachers are too busy in the classroom and so It is not just easy to involve them at all the times.

2. 2.3 Participative decision-making and Empowerment.

According to Owens & Valesky (2007) participative decision making requires the interaction of power and influence from two sources: the power and influence of the administrator and the power and influence of others in the organization. The authors indicate that the Tannenbaum-Schmidt model can be very useful both to the administrator and in training the staff about participation.

This model emphasizes the different kinds of behavior exhibited by both the leader and the followers as the participation of the followers becomes more intense and more responsible. Romanish (1991) and Dimmock (1995) (cited in Nyembe, 2002, p. 24) emphasize the importance of allowing teachers to participate in decision-making processes.

According to Dimmock (1995) in Nyembe (2002, p.27) Involving educators in decision-making does not mean relinquishing power and authority but it means developing and empowering them in order to make informed decisions and share equal power in the schools.

Dimmock (1995) in Nyembe (2002, p. 27) indicated “contemporary leadership theories emphasize leaders empowering others rather than exercising power over others”. In the study conducted by Steyn 1998 shows that teachers need to be empowered to participate more fully in decision-making. Steyn (1998) further argued that if the transformation of South Africa education is to succeed, teachers must be at liberty to make informed decisions and share power equally in schools. For Steyn this requires suitable training for principals and teachers and ample opportunities for power sharing. In the past teacher participation in decision-making at a local school level was a challenge. In this regard, the principals’ mutual support and empowerment are key elements for teacher involvement in decisions concerning the school. This raises a question whether principals capacitate or empower teachers to participate in decision-making processes.

2. 2. 4 Who should participate ?

New education policy such as SASA encourage democracy means participation in decision-making but silent on who should participate. The literature offers some assistance. For Owen & Valesky (2007) participative decision-making involve everyone in every decisions. Bridges, in Owen & Valesky (2007) suggested two tests for identifying decisions in which it is appropriate for teachers to participate: The Test of relevance: “ when the teachers personal stakes in the decision are higher” , Bridges has stated that, “their interest in participation should also be high”. The Test of expertise: It is not enough for the teachers to have a stake in the decision if his or her participation is to be significant, the teacher must be competent to contribute effectively.

(Bridges, in Owens & Valesky 2007) the third test to use in deciding about which problems the teachers should be involved:

The Test of jurisdiction: Schools are organized on a hierarchical basis. the individual school and staff have jurisdiction only over those decision-making areas that are assigned to them. Problems may be relevant to teachers and the teachers may have the requisite expertise they may not have jurisdiction. Participation in making decisions that the group cannot implement can lead to frustration at least as great as that caused by simple non participation.

As the head of institution it is very important to consider whether individuals themselves wish to be involved in making a decision. Barnard in Owens and Valesky (2007) pointed out that there are some things in which some individuals simply are not interested to participate or to be involved.

He referred to such matters as falling within the individual's zone of indifference. To seek active involvement of teachers in matters to which they are essentially indifferent is of course, to court resistance in various forms.

He highlights decisions in which teachers take great personal interest over a sustained period of time and calls these this zone of "sensitivity".

According to Tosi and Mero (2003) there are important steps when making decisions and these form a circle of reflection and evaluation. Decision-making usually begins with a judgement that a problem exists or a change is needed. Once a problem is recognized and identified, options are sought that could eliminate the negative condition or achieve the goal. To choose among alternatives, you have to use criteria to evaluate them. Eventually choices are made among options and once the choice is implemented, it becomes possible to evaluate once again.

At school level we make decisions day in and day out. Sometimes there is no space or time to follow these steps. This model assumes that we have time at school so we need to follow certain steps so that there will be successful involvement of teachers.

Teachers are always in the classroom teaching. We said that for principals is not easy to take out teachers away from the core function duties (teaching and learning).

2. 2. 4 What and why decentralization?

Participative decision-making in South African schools, is informed by the concept. According to Carlson (cited in Coleman, 2005) there is “no precise meaning” for decentralization . It is however closely connected with other concepts such as deregulation, delegation, devolution and deconcentration (Smith, 2002). For Hanson (1998) and Karstanje (1999) cited in Coleman (2005) decentralization of a system as the process whereby decision-making authority for particular functions and the power that is associated with it are shifted from a certain location to one that is less central or lower. They further argue that within the individual school or college power may be kept by the principal with no power being devolved to others in the institution. Whereas Green in Coleman (2005, p. 68) point out that decentralization has variously meant devolving power to the regions, the local authorities, the social partners and institutions themselves.

Smith (2002) agrees decentralization as the transfer of decision-making authority closer to the consumer or beneficiaries. This can take the form of transferring powers to lower levels of an organization.

A popular form of deconcentration in education is to give additional responsibility to schools. This is often called school autonomy or school based management. Deconcentration may also include empowering school directors and teaching faculty to make decisions within the school.

In the South African context, the reasons for decentralization are complex and associated with a coincidence of the interests of the two most powerful .

The broad democratic movement represented in the Government of National Unity by the African National Congress (ANC) and the former white ruling class. Their interests converged in two important ways which helped to shape schools policy .

There was a broad agreement between the two groups regarding the establishment of School Governing Bodies (SGB) with considerable powers Education Policy Unit (1998).

In this regard the literature on decentralization shows that this concept led to democratization of schooling by giving all the main stakeholders such as the SGB a powerful voice in the affairs school. This same thinking has also included as key stakeholders of the school who must partake in the making of some decisions of the school.

An important facet of school decentralization is distributed leadership. According to Spillane & Diamond (2007), distributed leadership is a shift of focus from school principals and other formal and informal leaders to the web of leaders, followers and leadership practice. They further argue that a distributed perspective acknowledges that the work of leading and managing schools involves multiple individuals.

Duignan (2006) regards distributed leadership as shared leadership which is a product of the ongoing processes of interaction and negotiations amongst all school members as they construct and reconstruct a reality of working productively and compassionately together each day.

Bennet (2003) summarises that despite some variation in definitions of distributed leadership, this concept is based on three main premises:

Firstly that, leadership is an emergent property of a group or network of interacting individuals, secondly that there is openness to the boundaries of leadership and who has a part to play both within and beyond the organization and thirdly that varieties of expertise are distributed across the many not the few. Thus, distributed leadership is represented as dynamic, relational, inclusive, collaborative and contextually situated. Taking this view, leadership is about learning together and constructing meaning and knowledge collectively and collaboratively (Harries, 2003: 314).

2. 2. 5 Finance as a key area of school decision-making.

This involves the pillars of finance which are: budgeting, record keeping, financial reporting, purchasing, accounting and fundraising. There is a shift in emphasis from external accountability to transparency and information sharing amongst all stakeholders (Campher, du Preez, Globler, Look & Shaba, 2002. p. 39).

For Bisschoff (cited in Campher, du Preez, Globler, Look & Shaba, 2002) in keeping with the concept of sharing information amongst all stakeholders, the following changes must be made decision-making should be done more collectively rather than only at management level, Staff, learners and the learners' parents should be made aware of the financial control process, so that they are informed of what is happening in the school.

McGinn & Welsh, National Central Regional Laboratory, Smith and Foster (cited in Chikoko, 2006. p. 59) indicate that decentralizing funding entails devolution of decisions about such important financial matters as: who decides about sources of funds budgeting and actual spending.

2. 6 Curriculum as key area of school decision-making.

Ornstein & Hunkins (2009) define curriculum as a plan for achieving goals such as producing quality results and maintaining effective teaching and learning.

Wiles & Bondi (cited in Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009, p. 10) view curriculum as a four step plan involving purpose, design, implementation and assessment.

For Smith (2002) effective schools will have a shared curriculum vision that all teachers understand and work with. He further says that curriculum is very broad stresses that the curriculum that is taught belongs to the state, the school and the child. He emphasizes that whatever we say about the curriculum, we have to be able to share school the vision as colleagues. This indicates that in order to deliver an effective curriculum, information needs to be shared and there needs to a be kind of leadership that encourages a shared understanding of and an active participation in the creation of the curriculum aims of the school.

Smith (2002) also states that the curriculum aims of the school must be accepted and understood by all teachers. The two basic aims to the curriculum are: It should aim to provide opportunities for all pupils to learn and achieve and it should aim to promote pupils spiritual, moral and cultural development and prepare all pupils for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of life. Smith implies or advocates that teachers become a very important human resource in such matters because they are there at school to implement the curriculum.

Doll (cited in Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009, p. 24) teachers should become involved “in every phase of curriculum making including the planning of specific goals, materials, content and methods. Teachers should have a curriculum “coordinating body” to unify their work and develop relationship with supervisors and other teachers involved in curriculum. Oliva (in Ornstein & Hunkins, p. 25) agrees that teachers are the primary group in curriculum development. Their role is to develop, implement and evaluate curriculum. They further indicate that teachers constitute the majority or the totality of the membership of curriculum committees and councils. In this regard teacher work in committees and initiate proposals, review proposals, gather data, conduct research, make contact with parents and other lay people, write and create curriculum materials. Ornstein & Hunkins argue that to guarantee curriculum continuity, integration and unity across subjects and grade levels, teachers must be actively involved in the curriculum.

The authors further indicate that the teacher has the best chance of implementing the curriculum at the classroom level. Sayed and Jansen (2001) agree with Smith that teachers are curriculum writers. In this instance they argue that curriculum can be defined at many levels. At the school level are the 'formal plans' that the teachers have then the curriculum as teachers present it.

They further emphasize that teachers have always been curriculum designers at school level. Furthermore, a classroom teacher is not simply a passive implementer of curriculum but a key decision maker in the enactment of the school. In the light of the above claim, it is clear that teacher involvement in curriculum decision is crucial. So to exclude teachers in the curriculum area would seem to be a great mistake.

The study is focusing on teacher involvement in making ideas about each of the following issues, namely: selection of books, formulation of year plans, work design, schedules, design of lesson plans, assessment; tests and projects as well as time tabling, language policy and instructional methods.

A review of literature around the curriculum undertaken between 2001 to 2006. In a research undertaken in Tasmania, Australia (Mulford et al 2001) (in Coleman and Earley 2005, p. 54) on perceptions of decision making indicated that the level of involvement in decision making is linked to the position in the hierarchy the participation occupies. Another research project on decision making in Australia (Wildy & Loudon, 2000) (in Coleman (2005, p. 54) showed that making decisions alone takes less time than setting up structure and processes to involve staff members. Dlundla (2002) studied participation in curriculum decision-making and argued that all teachers are curriculum developers because they make ongoing and autonomous decisions about what happens in their classrooms. Raubenheimer (1996) (cited in Dlundla, 2002. p. 13) further indicated that in South Africa teacher participation in curriculum decision-making has been very restricted, mostly, restricted to the involvement of a few nominated teachers in subject committees.

This is not enough as teachers are not representatively elected and so there are no mechanisms for reporting back to the broader group of teachers on decisions made. This strategy resulted in the perception that teachers cannot participate in curriculum decision making. Eventually, this produces an element of non-participation, that is, teachers are not involved in decision making and are never given the opportunities to develop the skills and confidence needed and even when asked to become involved they feel that it is not their duty or right.

The International Encyclopedia of Education (cited in Dlodla, 2002. p. 13) curriculum decisions in a school setting include aims and goals of the school curriculum content and materials. Dlodla (2002) argued that curriculum decisions are made at a higher (National level), middle (Provincial level) and at a lower level (District and school).

The decisions about curriculum at this level include the decisions made by the principal, teachers, pupils, School Governing Body and Representative Council of Learners in high schools.

Chikoko (2006) conducted research on negotiating roles and responsibilities in the context of decentralized school governance. The author discovered that decentralization of curriculum decision-making is a complex process. Chikoko also argued that in the eyes of most parents in the cluster, the curriculum area was left to those who are competent to decide about it i.e. educators. This indicates that curriculum decision-making is very crucial school based stakeholders and teachers are the experts and engine of the curriculum. With that said teachers have the potential to play an important role in terms of curriculum implementation in the classroom. In a study conducted by Chikoko (2006) about negotiating roles and responsibilities in the context of decentralized school governance.

The author noted that the decisions were centralized within the parent stakeholders, with the teacher being the most deprived constituency. Chikoko further argued that lack of shared decision-making practices is likely to result in disgruntlement among stakeholders (such as teachers) who are left out.

The author also suggested that the involvement of more players in decisions about school finance might widen the scope of decision-making in this area.

2. 3 LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR FINANCIALMANAGEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

As stated in the South African Schools Act No 84 of 1996 (SASA) “democratization of education includes the idea that stakeholders such as teachers, parents and other people must participate in the activities of the school”. On top of that SASA puts emphasis on “shared decisions” by all stakeholders involved in education.

This Act foresees that each public school will have a Governing Body that is representative of all stakeholders (teachers, parents and (learners in secondary schools) and clearly sets out the functions of SGB’s. SASA section 16 (1) emphasizes that governance of every public school is vested in it’s governing body. This tells us that teachers are there which indicates that teacher involvement is automatically but the Act is silent on how teachers should be involved in the school finance. In other words the framework is not provided on how much involvement do teachers expected to participate in which management areas are teachers able to make decision.

van Deventer and Kruger (2003). South Africa is struggling towards democratization in educational areas. School based management as an approach is overemphasized. This is whereby public schools are redesigned to give educational stakeholders, teachers, parents and the learners get the opportunity and power to improve and develop their school.

2. 3. 1 School funding in South Africa

According to van Deventer & Kruger (2003) South Africa education is financed by two sources. The private or individual funding which includes school fees contributed by parents and the public funding which refers to the responsibility of the state to fund the public schools from public revenue on an equitable basis.

In South African context Norms and Standards is received by all state public schools in the province. According to SASA Norms and Standards are rules that govern the way public schools are funded by the state. Furthermore, there are regulations that govern the establishment and control of school finance. The Norms and Standard which become a national policy on 1 April 1999 aimed at ensuring that the public funds of schools are paid on a progressive scale according to need. As indicated that state money for public schools is governed and controlled, it means that norms and standard fund is fenced bound. It means that the school should not do whatever they (SGB and Principal) want to do according to the school needs.

The South African Schools' Act 84 of 1996, as amended creates two categories of public schools : section 20 and section 21 schools. According to Anderson & Lumby (2005) in non- section 21 schools government funding allocation is not paid directly but is communicated by means of a "paper budget". The term Section 21 schools, is regarded nowadays as virtually synonymous with self-managing or self-reliant schools. In section 21 schools allocation functions is all about capacity of SGB.

The government allocations are paid directly into the schools bank account with the intention that schools are in a position to negotiate best prizes, discount and delivery dates for essential goods. There is much less top-down control by education departments and much less bureaucratic involvement Department of Education (2002).

2.4 LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR CURRICULUM IN SOUTH AFRICA

In South Africa, under apartheid regime the stakeholders were not allowed to contest the curriculum. This raised a concern for the new curriculum when a democratic government came into power.

The curriculum needs to accommodate everybody. As a result the legal framework (the Constitution Act 108 of 1996) became an answer, which contains the Bill of Rights promoting fairness, equality and parity. All other legislations (National Education Policy Act (NEPA) 27 of 1996 and South African Schools Act No: 84 of 1996 conform to the constitution. In this regard there are many changes that are taking place in South Africa in terms of curriculum management.

The South African curriculum (C2005) suggests that teachers act as curriculum developers. This resulted in the formation of many policies that have been implemented and legislation promulgated. Those policies and legislation include the South African Constitution (Act 108 of 1996) which stresses that education has to be transformed. In 1997 the National Curriculum Statement for Grade R-9 was published in Government Notice No. 1445. In a revised curriculum teachers are seen as vital role players in social and educational transformation such as: teachers need to be interpreters and designers of learning programmes and materials. This reveals an indication that teachers are very important in terms of school based curriculum management. As stated in Revised National Curriculum Statement Grade R-9 (Schools), the curriculum is to be implemented in schools by means of Learning Programmes. Teachers are encouraged to develop and implement their own Learning Programme.

According to SASA, School Management Team (SMT) is there at school to support curriculum management and to serve the goal of quality teaching and learning. The Act stresses that SMT is responsible for taking the lead in putting their school curriculum into practice and improving on it.

The Education White Paper 2 (1996) emphasizes that teachers need to be empowered to participate fully in Decision Making. This indicates that teachers spend a lot of time in teaching or implementing the curriculum. So teacher involvement is very crucial in curriculum decision making. In the curriculum issues teachers seem to be an experts (SASA 1996).

South Africa as a decentralized country, decision making are devolved to lower level. The strong decentralization of the curriculum will encourage high levels of teacher skill, participation in curriculum decision-making and openness of procedures and curriculum development. With that said SMT need to involve teachers in curriculum decision-making. The terms of curriculum decision-making, policies for increasing participation and openness are needed to give expression to the commitment to principles of democracy (National Education Policy Investigation, 1992).

2. 5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2. 5. 1 Shared Decision making: Empowering Teachers

The Vroom Model of Shared Decision Making

This study is located or framed around Vroom Model of Shared Decision-Making. In my theoretical framework I will be specializing on shared decision-making in schools in terms of teacher involvement or empowerment on decision. This theoretical framework will assists me to check if people (teachers) are involved in decision-making processes.

Vroom and Yetton (1973) and Vroom and Jago (1988) cited in Hoy and Miskel (2008) argued that this approach is the best known model of management of participation in organizations.

Vroom and Jago (1988) in Hoy and Miskel identify a set of problem properties that should influence subordinate participation in decision making in a variety of situations. Vroom and Jago (1988) cited in Hoy and Miskel (2008) outlined properties that are defined by a set of decision rules.

3. 5 . 2 Enhancing the quality and acceptance of decisions

Based on Vroom model, there are four rules that enhance the quality of decisions. In this study these rules will assist me to understand the quality of decision making that are made at school level.

2.5. 3. Quality rule. Use a unilateral approach to decision making only if, the quality requirement is low and the matter unimportant to subordinates.

- The quality requirement is low, the decision is important and will be readily accepted by subordinates.

2.5. 4. Leader information rule: Do not make a unilateral decision if-

- The quality of the decision is important and you do not possess sufficient information and expertise to solve the problem alone.

This rule is trying to tell us that teachers could be a very big expects in the curriculum. In this regard for principals they need to take teachers as expertise in some curriculum issues.

2.5. 5. Trust rule (Goal Congruence). Make a unilateral decision when

- The quality of the decision is important and you cannot trust subordinates to decide on the basis of the organizational goals.
- This rule is trying to tell us that there are times whereby managers take financial decision without the involvement of teachers because they lack knowledge required for certain decision to be made. As a result teachers become not forming part of crucial decision.

2.5. 6. Problem Structure Rule. Involve knowledge subordinates to collect relevant information when-

- The quality of the decision is important, the problem is unstructured, and you lack sufficient information or expertise.

In this regard knowledge is very important in terms of decision making. For instance in some areas of financial issues there is still a battle which seem to be very crucial because at times teachers sometimes complain about they are not being involved in some school finance decisions.

The Vroom Model of share decision making is also stressing that, although improving the quality of a decision is important, getting subordinates to embrace and accept decisions.

This model came up with four rules which enhance the acceptance of decisions.

The Acceptance Rule. Involve subordinates if-

Their acceptance of the decision is critical for effective implementation and you unsure if they will accept an autocratic decision.

In this rule we are told that involvement of teachers is very important if they are going to implement such decision. In this study the curriculum decision making become very important because teachers are the people who are always dealing with the butter and bread issues touching the curriculum. They are the curriculum implementers so their involvement is so important.

The subordinate Conflict Rule. Involve subordinates when-

There is conflict among subordinates, acceptance of the decision is critical, and an autocratic decision is unlikely to be unaccepted.

This is to say that when people are crying it is important to involve them. For instance at there are group dynamics, so to avoid them not to complain after the decision was made principals need to involve them.

Subordinate Commitment Rule. A group decision should be made-

- Even when the quality of the decision is not important, but its acceptance is critical and problematic. A group decision will likely generate more acceptance commitment than a hierarchical one.

The Subordinate Information Rule. Subordinates should not be called upon-

- To make a decision for which they have insufficient information or expertise.

This rule is trying to tell us that principals as school managers disempowered teachers because of no enough knowledge for a particular area for decision to be made.

4. 5. 7 Constraints on Decision Making

Hoy and Miskel (2008) added to the rules for improving the quality and enhancing the acceptance of decisions. They suggested two strong constraints on decision making.

- The Time Constraint (Motivation- Time). Time is often critical
Time is not free. The amount of time used in making a decision is a cost expressed in terms of the loss of attention to other activities.
- The Development Constraint (Motivation Development). Subordinates often do not have the knowledge and skills to contribute.
Decision making is a learned skill developed through practice. To empower teachers means to give them the skills and opportunities to make important decisions.

2. 5. 8 Decision Making Styles

Looking at decision making styles, Vroom and Yetton (1973) cited in Hoy and Miskel (2008) suggest five decision styles , namely:

- Autocratic: The leader using the existing information solves the problem unilaterally
- Informed- Autocratic: The leader solves the problem unilaterally after obtaining necessary information from subordinates.
- Individual –consultative: The leader shares the problem with subordinates, soliciting their ideas individually. The leader do this before taking an action.
- Group consultative: The leader share the problem with the group members. This tells us that this style help the leader if he/she wants to maximize the involvement of teachers, sharing the problem collectively and seek teachers views.
- Group agreement: The leader shares the problem with subordinates as a group and together attempt to reach consensus.

2. 5. 9. The Hoy-Tarter Model of Shared Decision Making.

In this Model subordinates accept some decisions without question because they are indifferent to them. As Barnard (1938) cited in Hoy and Miskel (2008) explains, there is a zone of indifference “in each individual within which orders are accepted without conscious questioning of their authority”. Other authors prefers the positive term as the zone of acceptance.

Barnard (1938) in Hoy and Miskel (2008) argue that the subordinates’ zone of acceptance is critical in deciding under what conditions to involve or not involve subordinates in decision making.

With the work of Barnard (1938), Simon (1947), and Chase (1951), Bridges (1967) cited in Hoy and Miskel (2008) advances two propositions about shared decision making:

- As subordinates are involved in making decisions located within their zone of acceptance, participation will be less effective.
- As subordinates are involved in making decisions located outside their zone of acceptance, participation will be more effective.

Bridges (1967) in Hoy and Miskel (2008) further suggests two tests to these two propositions.

- The test of relevance: Do the subordinates have a personal stake in the decision outcome?
- The test of expertise: Do subordinates have the expertise to make a useful contribution to the decision?

The purpose of this study is to explore teacher involvement in curriculum and finance decision making. The models that are used in the study will assist me to understand if teachers themselves are interested to participate in finance decision in the specific aspects: budgeting, auditing, financial reporting, fundraising, record keeping, accounting and purchasing.

The study will also try to understand if teachers like to be involved in curriculum decision in specific areas: work schedule, year plan, assessment, time tabling, instructional methods.

2. 5. 10 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to review on teacher involvement in finance and curriculum decision-making. The chapter has examined concepts such as Decision-making in schools, Participative Decision-making, who to participate, what and why decentralization, some key areas of school decision-making: finance and curriculum, theoretical framework: Vroom Model of Shared Decision-Making.

The next chapter discusses the research design and methodology.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3. 1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research design and methodology of the study. Firstly, the chapter explains the research design the study adopts. Secondly, it describes the respondents. This is followed by a description of data collection instruments, gaining entry, ethical considerations, validity and reliability . Finally, the chapter concludes with the process of data analysis.

3. 2 Research Paradigm and Design

The study is located within the interpretive research paradigm which strives to understand and interpret the world (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). The interpretive paradigm focuses on internal reality of subjective experience (Terre Blanche, Durreheim & Painter, 2006; 6). They further indicate that the interpretive paradigm involves people's subjective experiences seriously as the essence of what is real for them (ontology) , making sense of people's experience by interaction with them and listening carefully what are they saying. Characteristics of the interpretive paradigm include personal involvement of the researcher and interpreting the specific understanding of action or meaning rather than causes (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; 33).

In summary the interpretive paradigm focuses on understanding the subjective world of human action (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). In this study I want to understand teacher involvement in curriculum and finance decision making areas.

Within the study a mixed methods research design was used. This design is defined as a procedure for collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative approaches (Cresswell & Clark, 2007, cited in Cresswell, 2008) .

The mixed method study intended to provide richer data than either approach (Tashakkori & Teddlie; 1998). Regarding mixed methods designs of both quantitative and qualitative approaches, it means that there will be an integration of the two approaches.

For Miles and Huberman (1994) cited in Cresswell (2008; 552) when one combines quantitative and qualitative, we can develop “a complex picture” which is a “powerful mix”. In this study mixed methods is used to seek to build on the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative data (Cresswell, 2008).

According to Mc Millan & Schumacher (2006) the terms can be defined on two levels of discourse. The two terms qualitative and quantitative refer to distinctions about the nature of knowledge: how one understands the word and ultimate purpose of the research. On another level of discourse, the terms refer to research methods- how data are collected and analyzed and the type of generalizations and representations delivered from the data.

McMillan & Schumacher (2001) define a survey research as “the assessment of the current status, opinions, beliefs and attitude by questionnaires or interviews from a known population”. Whereas Cohen et al (2001) cited in Maree (2007, p. 155) says surveys “set out to describe and to interpret *what is*?”. Alreck & Settle (2004) see a survey as a “research technique where information requirements are specified, a population is identified, a sample selected and systematically questioned and the results analyzed, generalized to the population and reported to meet the information needs”. Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2007) surveys purpose is about gathering large scale data in order to make generalizations.

In this study the purpose is to explore teacher involvement in decision-making in curriculum and finance areas. Fink (2006) surveys seen as information collection methods used to describe, compare or explain individual and societal knowledge, feelings, values, preferences and behavior.

Fink further contend that survey can be a self-administered questionnaire that someone fills out alone or with assistance, or it can be an interview done in person. Attitudes, beliefs and opinions are ways in which individuals think about issues, whereas in practices are their actual behaviors. Longitudinal survey designs on the other side involve the survey procedures of collecting data about trends with the same population. In longitudinal designs, the participants may be the same individuals overtime.

In this study, cross sectional survey design is appropriate in a sense that the study seeks to explore teacher involvement in curriculum and finance decision-making. Cresswell (2008) qualitative approach is a type of educational research in which the researcher relies on the views of participants, asks broad general questions , collect data consisting largely of words from participants, describes and analyzes these words. Whereas quantitative approach is a type of research in which the researcher decides what to study asks specific, narrow questions, collect data from participants, analyzes these numbers using statistics. The strength of this design is that it combines the advantages of each form of data, that is quantitative data provide for generalisability, whereas qualitative data offer information about the context or setting (Cresswell, 2008). Moreover, Cresswell indicates that this design also enables a researcher to gather information that uses the best features of both quantitative and qualitative data collection. In this study the purpose in mixing methods was to provide a complete picture of teacher involvement in school management in curriculum and finance areas. It will show exactly some of the areas of school management teachers are currently involved in and areas they desire to participate fully.

3. 3 Respondents

The study consulted involve teachers as participants . In South African language Post Level- 1 refers to teachers. Teachers in the Maphumulo area form the population of the study.

The sample of the study comprises so many (59) teachers. The selection of the area was purposive because I had an access of it.

Maree (2007) says in qualitative research the term “participants” is used to refer to persons taking part in a research study, whereas in quantitative research “respondents” is used to refer to persons participating in a research study.

In this study, data was collected from Post Level-1 teachers in 16 selected rural primary schools in the Maphumulo circuit. In this regard, Maphumulo rural schools form the site of the respondents (teachers) because they are the source of information required by the study. To obtain 16 primary schools, random sampling was conducted resulting in 16 primary schools being selected as research sites to participate in the study. From each ward four schools were selected. Sampling refers to the process used to select a portion of the population for study (Maree, 2007).

A process of purposive sampling was used in selecting the schools and teachers that were to participate in this study. A purposive sample refers to the sample that is chosen for a specific purpose (Cohen et al, 2007). This type of sampling the researcher selects particular elements from the population that will be representative or informative about the topic of interest (Mc Millan and Schumacher, 2006).

The mixed method research study adopts purposive sampling simply means that participants are selected because of some defining characteristics that makes them the holders of the data needed for the study (Maree, 2007). On top of that they are the important human resource of all instructional programmes in schools. Decentralization and democratization of school governance entails that teachers should be more involved in school decision-making because such decisions directly affect their work (Chikoko, 2006).

This study intends to explore teacher involvement in curriculum and finance decision-making. Maphumulo circuit consists of four wards. Appointments were made with the school managers. They introduced me to teachers, and then I explained the need for the study and emphasized their contribution to the study. Due to different sizes of schools I made sure that all the selected schools were equitably represented. To achieve this I took 20 % from each selected school. I then gave them consent letters which were explained to them. The questionnaire copies were distributed to all participants and collected back after two weeks.

5. 4. Data collection instruments

Cresswell (2008) says although many different forms of surveys exist, survey researchers typically collect data using two basic forms : questionnaire and interview. Johnson (2002) defines data collection as a process that involves both interactive and non-interactive strategies. The use of more than one data collection is often referred to as triangulation (Maree, 2007). The term triangulation is defined as the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspects of human behavior (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007, p. 141). This study shall use two instruments of data collection, namely; questionnaire and focus group interviews. Each of these instruments is described in detail below.

3. 4. 1 The questionnaire

The study seeks to administer a questionnaire to teachers in the selected schools. To address the two main research questions, a questionnaire was administered to the post-level – 1 teachers. The questionnaire was divided into two sections (Section A- B) . The section A requested background information of the respondents, namely: sex and teaching experience. Respondents were requested to indicate their personal information by ticking in the appropriate box.

Teaching experience would indicate how long the respondent had been part of the decision-making process. Section B concentrated on involvement in decision making in finance and curriculum areas. The respondents were requested to indicate the extent to which respondent is currently and desire involvement in decision making.

This particular questionnaire aim to obtain data related to teacher involvement in curriculum and finance decision-making areas. Questionnaire are mainly paper and pencils method of data collection (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). For Vogt (1999) questionnaire is a group of written questions to which subjects respond. Cresswell (2008) questionnaire is a form used in a survey design that participants in a study complete and return it to the researcher.

Participants choose answers to questions and supply basic personal or demographic information. Oppenheim (2004) define questionnaire as a set of questions which have been casually jotted down without much thought. The author further indicates that questionnaire is an important tool, a tool for data collection.

According to Soer (1997) questionnaire is a document that is distributed to the respondents by post or filled in by respondents in the presence of the researcher, in order to obtain information from them about something. Whilst Johnson (1994) argues that questionnaires empower respondents in that the latter may read all the questions in his or her own time, before filling them in and may decide, not to fill them at all if he/she so desires.

Questionnaires are widely used and useful instrument for collecting survey information, providing structured, often numerical data, being able to be administered without the presence of the researcher and often being comparatively straightforward to analyze (Cohen, 2001. p. 245).

In this study the purpose of the questionnaire was to gather data regarding teacher involvement in curriculum and finance decision making experiences. In this regard questionnaire allow the respondents to come up with their own views.

The advantages for using questionnaires was that they allow respondents to be more honest in their responses. The respondents also do not get any pressure from the researcher in terms of choosing what is relevant to them. The use of questionnaire in this study was to allow respondents to answer from his or her thoughts, selecting what is relevant to him or her. The questionnaire in this study targeted teachers because they can read the questions for themselves and would be able to respond to them individually.

3. 4. 2 Focus group interviews

In this study focus group interviews were conducted with Post Level-1 teachers in Maphumulo circuit rural schools.

Focus group interviews was the second instrument in the study. It was a second data collection instrument because it was going to provide opportunities for sharing ideas or opinions to the participants. Focus group interviews with teachers was going to add more comments about answers given by them (teachers) to the questionnaire.

Interview is a powerful method of data collection in the research study. It provides one-on-one interaction between you (or your data collectors) and the individuals you are studying (or a small number of participants in a focus group (Krueger: 1994). Interview survey is a form on which the researcher records answers supplied by the participants in the study. The researcher asks the questions from the interview guide, listens answers and observe behavior and record responses on the survey.

De Vos, Strydom, Fouche, & Delport, 2005; Frey and Fontanna, 1991 (cited in Chikoko, 2006) focus group interview is a systematic questioning of several individuals simultaneously. The participants constitute a focus group in the sense that they have something in common in relation to the study's questions. Teachers are highly expected to be involved school decision-making therefore they were an essential source of information in this study.

With that reason, the use of the focus group method became an important technique to get their opinions as respondents in this study. Therefore, in this study focus group interview was used as data collection instrument from the group of teachers in eight schools (two schools from each ward). Because of different schools sizes in each school, one focus group of three/ four/ five teachers was created. A total of 35 teachers participated in eight focus group interviews held once off interviews.

The advantages of focus group interviews in the study is clearly stated by Bloor, Frankland, Thomas and Robson (2001) that focus group provides access to group meanings, processes and norms.

In this regard, information that is generated by focus group interview techniques provides rich information regarding what the group beliefs in, what processes lead them to construct meanings associated with a given issue and what norms are held by the group. For instance, using focus group interviews to study teacher involvement in curriculum and finance decision-making will produce data that contains collective meanings about their involvement experiences.

Cresswell (2008) sees focus group interviews as whereby the researcher locates or develops a survey instrument, convenes a small of the people who can answer the questions on the instrument, and records their comments on the instrument. Krueger (1994) (cited in Cresswell, 2008. p.396) focus groups provide for interaction among interviews, collection of extensive data, and participation by all individuals in a group.

Knight (2002) interviews are defined by face to face interactions. Whereas Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2000) an interview is an interchange of views between two or more people on a topic of mutual interest. The interviews emphasize the centrality of human interaction for knowledge production and also the social situations of research data. For Vogt (1999) focus group interview is the basic technique involves having about a dozen persons engage in an intensive discussion focused on a particular topic.

Knight sees focus group as a set of people invited to respond to researchers' questions, findings, from earlier studies, policy documents, hypothesis, concerns, views etc. Researchers often use them to explore provisional findings either by summarizing them to a selection of participants or by bringing the findings to other groups of stakeholders in the inquiry.

Bloor et al (2001) outlined some advantages of using focus group interviews which attracted my interest in using focus group in this study. These are as follow: During focus groups, participants feel more relaxed and less inhibited in the presence of friends and colleagues.

During focus group interview sessions participants may feel empowered and supported in the co-presence of those similarly situated to them. Lastly, focus group can be used to generate data on the group meanings that lie behind such collective assessments, on the group processes that lead to assessments and on the normative understandings that group draw upon such assessments.

3.5 Data collection process and gaining entry.

Maphumulo circuit consists of four wards. To obtain 16 primary schools, Random sampling was conducted resulting in 16 primary schools being selected as research sites to participate in the study. From each ward four schools were selected.

The appointment was made with the school managers (Principals). They introduced me to teachers, and then I explain the need for the study and to emphasize their contribution on the study. I then gave them consent letters which were clearly defined to them. The questionnaires were distributed to all participants and collected back after two weeks.

Regarding gaining entry, the first thing was to send letters requesting permission and explaining the study to the ILembe District, the Maphumulo Circuit manager, the ward managers and the school managers. To get permission to access the research field of study, in this study, official gate keeping and permission-granting involve Maphumulo circuit authorities (see appendix one) and school principals who manage Maphumulo rural schools (see appendix two) that form the sites of my participants. In this regard I submitted a letter of application for permission to the circuit manager, the cluster manager, the ward managers and the school principals. To receive acceptance and cooperation from respondents I had to visit the participants to social interaction related to the objectives of study.

3. 6 Ethical issues

The permission to conduct the research was requested by the researcher and granted by the Department of Education for conducting this study in 16 schools in Maphumulo rural schools. I also got ethical clearance from the University of KwaZulu Natal. The consent letter requesting the respondents to participate in the research was sent to the respondents. The ethical issues of anonymity, confidentiality and freedom of participation was guaranteed on the consent letters. The assurance on protection of their privacy and responses was also given.

3. 7 Validity and reliability

To ensure or enhance validity and reliability the study adopted a combination of strategies (qualitative and quantitative approaches).

By applying mixed methods design, the study will provide richer data. The study also used questionnaire which can be reviewed by experts. I even used focus group interviews as a follow up process on the responses given by teachers on questionnaire. Vithal and Jansen (2008) validity is an attempt to check out whether the meaning and interpretation of an event is sound or whether a particular measure is an accurate reflection of what you intend to find out. Prinsloo, Vorter & Sibaya (1996) and Vithal and Jansen (2008) validity concerns the soundness and effectiveness of the measuring instrument. Reliability on the other hand concerns the consistency with which the measuring instrument as measures what it is intended to measure.

Mc Millan & Schumacher (2001) validity is a judgement of the appropriateness of a measure for specific inferences, decisions, consequences or uses that result from the scores that are generated. They further indicate that validity is a situation specific concept, and validity is depended on the purpose, population and situational factors in which measurement take place. Neuman (1997) indicates that reliability deals with an indicator's dependency.

Reliability means that the information provided by indicators (e.g. questionnaire) does not vary as a result of characteristics of the indicator, instrument, or measurement device itself. The author further argues that reliability tells us about an indicator's dependency and consistency whereas validity tells us whether an indicator actually captures the meaning of the construct in which we are interested.

3. 8 Data analysis

In this study I used two data collection methods: questionnaire and focus group interviews means that data was captured in two sources. Henning (2004) data analysis is the "heartbeat" of the research. Data analysis involves examining, sorting, categorizing, evaluating, comparing, synthesizing, and contemplating the coded data as well as reviewing the raw and recorded data (Neuman, 1997: 427).

In this study I will use the responses given on the questionnaire and focus group interviews by teachers and put it together with information received from the literature.

3. 9 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the research paradigm, research design, methodology and methods that were used to collect and analyze data in the study. The following or next chapter presents findings from the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4. 1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore teacher involvement in Finance and Curriculum decision-making areas in Maphumulo circuit primary schools. The key questions of the research were as follows:

-To what extent do teachers feel involved and desire involvement in curriculum decision-making?

-To what extent do teachers feel involved and desire involvement in school finance decision-making?

-What can be said about teacher involvement in decision-making in two areas Finance and Curriculum?

This chapter presents and discusses the data. The findings are presented in accordance with the broader research questions as mentioned above. First I present and briefly discuss data on the biographical details of the participants. Second, I present and discuss findings on teacher involvement in Finance decision-making. This is followed by discussing findings on teacher involvement in Curriculum decision-making. Finally, the chapter highlights the main issues emerging from the presentation and discussion.

4. 2 Biographical information of respondent teachers.

GENDER	TEACHING EXPERIENCE	
Male 28(47%)	2 -5 years	6 (10%)
	6 -8 years	19(32%)
	9 -19 years	3 (5%)
	20 and more	
Female 31(53%)	2 -5 years	7 (12%)
	6 -8 years	12 (20%)
	9 – 19 years	10 (17%)
	20 and more	2 (3%)
TOTAL: 59 TEACHERS		

Table 4. 2. 1 shows that a total of 59 teachers responded in this study. Out of the 59, 28 of them are male while the remainder are female. Among both the male and female teachers, the majority had 6-8 years teaching experience. All teachers who participated in the study had taught in their respective schools for at least 2 years. Overall, all the teachers, by virtue of their teaching experience were quite familiar with decision-making processes in their schools. The findings that came out seem to be reliable because the participating teachers are not novice. They had reasonable experience to make decision-making processes.

TABLE 4. 2. 2 Questionnaire Information.

TABLE: 4. 2. 2 Questionnaire information	QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS	RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRE																									
GENDER																											
MALE: 28 (47%) <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Teaching experience</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2- 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6- 8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9- 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20 and more</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Teaching experience	2- 5	6- 8	9- 19	20 and more	<table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>NO</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	NO	Percentage	6	10%	19	32%	3	5%	0	0%	<table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>NO</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>5 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	NO	Percentage	6	10%	19	32%	3	5 %	0	0%
Teaching experience																											
2- 5																											
6- 8																											
9- 19																											
20 and more																											
NO	Percentage																										
6	10%																										
19	32%																										
3	5%																										
0	0%																										
NO	Percentage																										
6	10%																										
19	32%																										
3	5 %																										
0	0%																										
FEMALE: 31(53%) <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Teaching experience</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2- 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6- 8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9- 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20 and more</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Teaching experience	2- 5	6- 8	9- 19	20 and more	<table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>NO</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	NO	Percentage	7	12%	12	20%	10	17%	2	3%	<table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>No</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No	Percentage	7	12%	12	20%	10	17%	2	3%
Teaching experience																											
2- 5																											
6- 8																											
9- 19																											
20 and more																											
NO	Percentage																										
7	12%																										
12	20%																										
10	17%																										
2	3%																										
No	Percentage																										
7	12%																										
12	20%																										
10	17%																										
2	3%																										

Table 4. 2. 2 shows that a total number distributed questionnaire were returned back. The majority of the questionnaire are the 6-8 years teaching experience. 6- 8 teaching experience is a reasonable period to understand people and what you want. This is a fairly young group, people at that age are likely to participate. There were not many teachers with 20 years or more teaching experience.

TABLE 4. 2. 3 Focus group interviews information.

Number of schools per ward	MALE PARTICIPATED	FEMALE PARTICIPATED	TOTAL																				
Total: 8	12 (20 %)	18 (30 %)	30 (100 %)																				
2	<table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number of male per ward</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ward 1</td> <td>3 (10%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ward 2</td> <td>3 (10%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ward 3</td> <td>3 (10%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ward 4</td> <td>3 (10%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number of male per ward	Ward 1	3 (10%)	Ward 2	3 (10%)	Ward 3	3 (10%)	Ward 4	3 (10%)	<table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number of female per ward</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ward 1</td> <td>5 (17%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ward 2</td> <td>6 (20%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ward 3</td> <td>4 (13%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ward 4</td> <td>3 (10%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number of female per ward	Ward 1	5 (17%)	Ward 2	6 (20%)	Ward 3	4 (13%)	Ward 4	3 (10%)	
	Number of male per ward																						
Ward 1	3 (10%)																						
Ward 2	3 (10%)																						
Ward 3	3 (10%)																						
Ward 4	3 (10%)																						
	Number of female per ward																						
Ward 1	5 (17%)																						
Ward 2	6 (20%)																						
Ward 3	4 (13%)																						
Ward 4	3 (10%)																						
2																							
2																							
2																							

Table 4. 2. 3 shows that out of 16 schools selected, eight schools participated in focus group interviews. In four ward, two schools were randomly sampled for focus group interviews.

A total number of 30 (100%) teachers participated in the focus group interviews. Out of 30, 12 (20%) of them are male while the remainder 18 (30%) are female . Out of 30, the majority were female. This indicate that there is no balanced gender in terms of Employment Equity Act.

4. 3 Decision-making in Finance and Curriculum areas.

The study used two data collection instruments namely, questionnaire and follow up focus group interviews. The questionnaire copies that were sent to the respondents were completed and returned from 16 selected schools in Maphumulo. I went on to focus group interviews of eight (8) rural primary schools in Maphumulo circuit. The study intended to obtain data from the teachers.

It will focus on what teachers experienced and desired in terms of two areas. Data will be presented through both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The study used two data collection instruments namely, questionnaire and follow up focus group interviews. The questionnaire copies that were sent to the respondents were completed and returned from 16 selected schools in Maphumulo. I went on to focus group interviews of eight (8) rural primary schools in Maphumulo circuit.

TABLE: 4. 3. 1 Teachers' reported actual involvement in Finance decision-making.

ITEM	RESPONSES				
	0	1	2	3	4
1.Budgeting	3 (5%)	12 (20%)	30 (51%)	11 (19%)	3 (5%)
2.Purchasing	8 (14%)	15 (25%)	20 (34%)	16 (27%)	0 (0%)
3.Record keeping	23 (39%)	14 (24%)	12 (20%)	5 (8%)	5 (8%)
4.Financial reporting	25 (42%)	15 (25%)	16 (27%)	0 (0%)	3 (5%)
5. Fundraising	6 (10%)	10 (17%)	28 (47%)	8 (14%)	11 (19%)
6.Monitoring	31 (53%)	21 (36%)	6 (10%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
7.Auditing	37(63%)	13(22%)	8 (14%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)
8.Accounting	41 (69%)	11 (19%)	4 (7%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)

TABLE: 4. 3. 2 Teachers' desired involvement in Finance decision-making

ITEM	RESPONSES				
	0	1	2	3	4
1.Budgeting	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	7 (12%)	19 (32%)	30 (51%)
2.Purchasing	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	11 (19%)	27 (46%)	18 (31%)
3.Record keeping	20 (34%)	10 (17%)	10 (17%)	13 (22%)	6 (10%)
4.Financial reporting	18 (31%)	16 (27%)	14 (24%)	5 (8%)	6 (10%)
5.Fundraising	0 (0%)	5 (8%)	16 (27%)	22 (37%)	16 (27%)
6.Monitoring	28 (47%)	10 (17%)	12 (20%)	4 (7%)	5 (8%)
7.Auditing	32 (54%)	17 (29%)	7 (12%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)
8.Accounting	42 (71%)	10 (17%)	4 (7%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)

SCALE

0	No involvement at all
1	Very little involvement
2	Moderate involvement
3	High involvement
4	Full involvement

In this study, the Finance decision making area was broken down into eight sub-areas namely: Budgeting, Purchasing, Record keeping, Financial reporting, Fundraising, Monitoring , Auditing and Accounting. Budgeting entailed how money should be spent. Purchasing involved buying the school requirements.

Record Keeping entailed records or proof indicating how the money was spent. Monitoring involved checking financial records.

The teachers questionnaire responses, Table 4.3.1 shows that regarding budgeting , out of 59 teachers consulted , three (5 %) experienced no involvement in decision making. Twelve teachers (20%) had very little involvement. Thirty (51%) teachers reported moderate involvement in decision making. 11 (19%) of them said they were highly involved. Three (5%) reported full involvement . The highest group was (51%) and reality only 5% felt they had involvement.

With regard to their desired involvement in deciding matters of budgeting, Table 4.3.2 shows that one (2%) teacher did not desire any involvement at all. Two of them (3%) desired very little involvement. Seven (12%) said they desired moderate involvement. 19 teachers (32%) reported that they desired high involvement. Thirty (51%) teachers said they wished to be fully involved in deciding matters of budgeting.

Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers had far less decision making involvement than they desired. The majority (51%) desired full involvement. Responses from focus group interviews show that most teachers reported that it was only the School Management Team (SMT) and the School Governing Body (SGB) who designed the school budget.

Some respondents added that they had no chance “even to know the school allocation” and there was no transparency in terms of how much money the school got and how the money was going to be spent. Another respondent also indicated that the school principal did not consider the views of teachers (Post Level Ones) in school finance decision making. Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired more involvement in decision making budgeting than they had.

Regarding purchasing, Table 4.3. 1 shows that out of the 59 teachers consulted , eight (14%) reported no involvement. Fifteen (25%) experienced very little involvement. Twenty (34%) reported moderate involvement .

16 (27%) teachers experienced high involvement . No teachers reported full involvement. In terms of desired involvement in purchasing school goods .

Table 4. 3. 2 shows that one (2%) teacher did not desire any involvement at all. Two (3%) of them desired very little involvement. Eleven (19%) reported that they desired moderate involvement. 27 teachers (46%) reported that they desired high involvement. Eighteen (31%) teachers said they wished to be fully involved in deciding matters of purchasing.

Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers had less decision-making around purchasing involvement than they desired. Responses from focus group interviews I conducted with teachers show that, most respondents reported that they were only consulted and requested to do procurement such as textbooks selection and nothing else. One respondent added that “it is only the principal who decides on what to purchase. We are told what will be purchased without being involved in designing the school budget”. Responses from the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired more involvement in decision-making in than experienced.

On decisions about Record Keeping, Table 4. 3. 1 shows that out of 59 teachers consulted, 23 (39%) experienced no involvement in decision making. 14 (24%) reported very little involvement. 12 (20%) teachers perceived moderate involvement. Five (8%) of them said they were highly involved. Five (8%) of them reported full involvement.

With regard to their desired involvement in deciding matters of Record Keeping, Table 4.3.2 indicates that, 20 (34%) did not desire any involvement at all. Ten (17%) of them desired very little involvement. Ten (17%) said they desired moderate involvement.

Thirteen of them (22%) reported that they desired high involvement. Six (10%) teachers said they wished to be fully involved in record keeping decision-making.

Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers experienced no or little involvement. The majority of teachers desired no or little involvement in record keeping decision-making matters.

According to responses from focus group interviews, some respondents indicated that record keeping was done by the administration clerk. One respondent also added that “ as PL1 I know nothing about the school record keeping”. Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers did not desire involvement in decision-making in record keeping. It seems that teachers consulted did not want to be committed to the keeping of records. This may be understood given the many teaching records teachers keep.

Financial reporting Moving on to Table 4.3.1 shows that out of the 59 teachers consulted, 25 (42%) had no involvement at all in decision-making. 15 (25%) of them perceived very little involvement. 16 (27%) reported moderate involvement. No teacher experienced high involvement. Three (5%) reported full involvement.

With regard to their desired involvement in deciding matters of Financial Reporting, Table 4.3.2 shows that, 18 (31%) teachers did not desire any involvement at all. 16 (27%) of them desired very little involvement. 14 (24%) said they desired moderate involvement. Five (8%) reported that they desired high involvement. Six (10%) teachers said they wished to be fully involve in deciding matters of financial reporting.

Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers were far less decision-making they desire. The majority did not desire any involvement in financial reporting matters.

Responses from focus group interviews revealed that some respondents experienced principals and SGBs reporting about the school finance to the parents. Teachers were not involved or invited during the financial reporting process. Responses from both questionnaire and focus group interviews show that show that some teachers desired involvement in decision making in financial reporting.

Regarding fundraising, Table 4. 3. 1 shows that out of 59 teachers who participated in the study, six (10%) perceived no involvement at all. Ten (17%) perceived very little involvement. 28 (47%) reported moderate involvement. Eight (14%) of them said they were highly involved. Eleven (19%) reported full involvement.

With regard to their desired involvement in deciding matters of Fundraising, Table 4. 3. 2 shows that no teachers desired less involvement . Five (8%) of them desired very little involvement. Sixteen (27%) said they desired moderate involvement. 22 (37%) reported that they desired high involvement. Sixteen (27%) teachers said they wished to be fully involved in deciding matters of fundraising. Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers perceived less involvement than desired. Half of the teachers desired high involvement. While the other half desired full involvement.

In focus group interviews, some teachers reported that there was no fundraising taking place at their schools. One teacher reported that they were involved in fundraising activities only for sports and cultural activities purposes. Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired more involvement in decision-making in all the areas of fundraising than they experienced.

Coming to monitoring, Table 4. 3. 1 shows that out of 59 teachers consulted, 31(53%) experienced no involvement in decision-making. 21 (36%) of them perceived very little involvement. Six (10%) experienced moderate involvement. Only 1 (2%) teacher out of 59 reported high involvement. No teacher perceived full involvement.

Looking at desired involvement in deciding matters of Monitoring, Table 2 shows that 28 (47%) did not desire any involvement at all. Ten (17%) of them desired very little involvement.

Twelve (20%) teachers reported that they desired moderate involvement. Four (7%) said they desired high involvement. Five (8%) teachers said they wished to be fully involved in deciding issues of monitoring.

Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers perceived no or little involvement. The majority desired no or little involvement in deciding matters of monitoring. Responses from focus group interviews conducted with teachers show that, some respondents reported that only the principal and SMT who did monitoring processes. One respondent indicated "I do not even understand this term". Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired less involvement in decision-making in all the areas of monitoring processes.

Table 4. 3. 1 shows that regarding Auditing, out of 59 teachers consulted, 37 (63%) perceived no involvement in decision-making. 13 (22%) perceived very little involvement. Eight (14%) experienced moderate involvement. Three (5%) of them said they were highly involved. No teacher reported full involvement.

Concerning their desired involvement in deciding matters of Auditing, Table 4. 3. 2 shows that , 32 (54%) teachers did not desire any involvement at all. 17 (29%) of them desired very little involvement. Seven (12%) said they desired moderate involvement. Three (5%) reported that they desired high involvement. There were no teachers wished to be fully involved in deciding matters of auditing.

Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers did not perceive involvement in this area. The majority desired no involvement at all.

Responses from focus group interviews also confirms that, some respondents indicated that the school principal does auditing. While one respondent indicated that we do not know what are the requirements for auditing and who is the school auditor.

The theoretical literature reviewed indicates that there are areas of decisions where teachers seem to lack knowledge.

Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers did not desire any involvement at all in auditing decisions. This is a contradiction, Table 4. 3. 2 shows that, teachers desired full involvement in budgeting, but they did not wish to be involved in auditing. These findings seem to suggest that teachers did not understand the matters of finance or only those which impact directly on their professional practice

In terms of Accounting, Table 4. 3. 1 shows that out of 59 teachers consulted , 41 (69%) experienced no involvement in decision-making. Eleven (19%) perceived very little involvement. Four (7%) of them experienced moderate involvement . Three (5%) of them said they were highly involved. No teacher reported full involvement.

With regard to their desired involvement in deciding matters of Accounting, Table 4. 3. 2 shows that 42 (71%) teachers did not desire any involvement at all. Ten (17%) of them desired very little involvement. Four (7%) said they desired moderate involvement. One (2%) teacher reported high involvement. Two (3%) said they wished to be fully involved in deciding matters of accounting.

The overall picture suggests that teachers had far less involvement than they desired. The majority did not desire involvement at all in accounting decision matters. Responses from focus group interviews shows that , some respondents did not even understand the term “Accounting”. This findings gives us a picture that teachers do not want to account.

The overall picture about both perceived and desired involvement in school finance decision- making indicates that there are areas of finance decision making where teachers saw no need for them to be involved. For instance the areas : Auditing, Financial Reporting, Accounting and Monitoring teachers seem to have little interest in terms of participating in decision-making. The theoretical framework used to guide this study supports this by looking at a “Test of relevance” do the subordinates have a stake in the decision outcome? . It further talks about “the test of expertise” do subordinates have the expertise to make a useful contribution to the decision.

TABLE: 4. 4 .1 Teachers' experienced involvement in curriculum decision-making.

ITEM	RESPONSES				
	0	1	2	3	4
1.Selection of books	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	23 (40%)	27 (46%)	7 (12%)
2.Year Plan	3 (5%)	19 (32%)	14 (24%)	15 (25%)	8 (14%)
3.Work Schedule and Lesson plan	4 (7%)	4 (7%)	23 (40%)	19 (32%)	9 (15%)
4.Assessment: tests, projects etc	1 (2%)	5 (8%)	28 (47%)	18 (31%)	7 (12%)
5.Time Tabling	1 (2%)	5 (8%)	23 (39%)	21 (36%)	9 (15%)
6. Language Policy	6 (10%)	11 (19%)	24 (41%)	17 (29%)	1 (2%)
7.Instructional methods	1 (2%)	8 (14%)	30 (51%)	17 (29%)	3 (5%)

52

TABLE: 4. 4. 2 Teachers' desired involvement in curriculum decision-making.

ITEM	RESPONSES				
	0	1	2	3	4
1.Selection of books	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	6 (10%)	49 (83%)
2.Year Plan	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	9 (15%)	13 (22%)	36 (61%)
3.Workschedule and Lesson plans	0 (0%)	4 (7%)	7 (12%)	14 (24%)	34 (58%)
4.Assessment:tests, projects etc.	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	13 (22%)	43 (73%)
5.Time Tabling	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	8 (14%)	5 (8%)	44 (75%)
6.Language Policy	0 (0%)	6 (10%)	9 (15%)	19 (32%)	25 (42%)
7.Instructional methods	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	7 (12%)	11 (19%)	39 (66%)

SCALE

0	No involvement at all
1	Very little involvement
2	Moderate involvement
3	High involvement
4	Full involvement

In this study, the decision making area of Curriculum was broken down into sub-areas: Selection of books, Year plan, Work schedule and lesson plan, Assessment: Tests, Projects, Time tabling, Language Policy and Instructional methods.

Table 4. 4. 1 shows that, from the teachers questionnaire responses regarding selection of books, out of 59 teachers consulted, one (2%) perceived no involvement in decision-making. One (2%) experienced very little involvement.

23 (40%) perceived moderate involvement. 27(46%) of them said they were highly involved. Seven (12%) reported full involvement.

With regard to their desired involvement in deciding matters Selection of books, Table 4. 4. 2 shows that, out of 59 teachers two (3%) did not desire any involvement at all. One (2%) of them desired very little involvement. One (2%) desired moderate involvement. Six (10%) teachers reported that they desired high involvement . 49 (83%) teachers said they wished to be full involved in deciding matters of selection of books.

In all, the questionnaire data show that teachers had far less decisional involvement than they wished. The majority desired high involvement. Responses from focus group interviews show that, the majority respondents reported that “SMT give us catalogues to choose textbooks that we require”. Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired more involvement in decision making in the area book selection than they experienced.

With reference to drawing up Year plans, Table 4. 4. 1 shows that out of 59 teachers consulted, three (5%) experienced no involvement at all at school level. Nineteen (32%) reported very little involvement. Fourteen (24%) of them perceived moderate involvement. Fifteen (25%) of them said they were highly involved. Eight (14%) teachers experienced full involvement.

In terms of desired involvement in decision matters about Year Plan, Table 4. 4. 2 shows that there was no teacher desired no involvement at all. One (2%) desired very little involvement. Nine (15%) reported that they desired moderate involvement. Thirteen (22%) of them desired high involvement. 36 (61%) teachers said they desired to be fully involved in deciding matters of school year plan.

Overall, the questionnaire data indicates teachers experienced less involvement than they wished. The majority of teachers desired full involvement.

Responses from focus group interviews revealed that, some of them do year planning collectively. Some respondents said “we do not have year plan in our school”, and other respondent said “I do have my own plan, not for the school”. One respondent also said that “SMT gives it (year plan) to us , we do not know when was it designed and by who” . This indicates a picture that school leaders (Principals) need to involve teachers as far as planning is concerned. Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired more involvement in decision-making in all the levels of planning than they experienced.

Table 4. 4.1 shows that, regarding Work Schedule and Lesson Plans, out of 59 teachers consulted, four (7%) experienced no involvement in decision-making. Four (7%) perceived very little involvement. 23 (40%) of them said they experienced moderate involvement. Nineteen (32%) perceived high involvement. Nine (15%) said they were fully involved.

Looking at their desired involvement in deciding matters of Work Schedules and Lesson plans, Table 4. 4. 2 shows that, there was no teacher desired involvement . Four (7%) desired very little involvement. Seven (12%) of them desired moderate involvement. 14 (24%) sad they desired high involvement and 34 (58%) teachers wished to be fully involved in deciding matters of work schedules and lesson plans.

Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers experienced far less decision-making than they wished. The majority (58%) desired full involvement. Responses from focus group interviews show that, some respondents said works schedules are given by subject advisors.

One respondent said that “SMT (HOD) do it together with the staff. This depicts a picture that in some schools SMT work collectively with teachers to design work schedules but some work schedules are given by the subject advisors in the training workshops.

Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired full involvement in decision-making in areas of Work Schedule and Lesson Plans. This is supported by the reviewed literature that, teachers are the implementers of the curriculum and their involvement is very crucial.

On the experienced decision making about Assessment: Tests and Projects, Table 4. 4.1 shows that out of 59 teachers participated in the study, one (2%) experienced no involvement at all. Five (8%) of them perceived very little involvement. 28 (47%) reported moderate involvement. Eighteen (31%) of them experienced high involvement. Seven (12%) said they were fully involved.

Concerning their desired involvement in deciding matters of Assessment: Tests and Projects, Table 4. 4. 2 shows that there was no teacher who did not desire involvement in this area. One (2%) of them desired very little involvement. Two (3%) said they desired moderate involvement. 13 (22%) teachers reported that they desired high involvement. 43 (73%) teachers said they desired to be fully involved in deciding matters of assessment.

Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers experienced far less decision making involvement than they desired. The majority (73%) desired full involvement. Responses from focus group interviews show that, some respondents reported that they do not have moderation process at their schools. Other respondents said that “we assess without policy (School Based) even the departmental policies talking to assessment guidelines.

This indicates that there is still room for improvement for more teacher involvement in terms assessment in many schools. Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired fuller involvement in decision-making in the area of assessment .

Coming to Time tabling issue, Table 4. 4. 1 shows that out of 59 teachers consulted, one (2%) perceived no involvement at all. Five5 (8%) of them experienced very little involvement. 23 (40%) reported moderate involvement. 21 (36%) teachers experienced high involvement. Nine (15%) perceived full involvement.

With regard to their desired involvement in deciding matters of Time tabling, Table 4. 4. 2 shows that there was no teacher who did not desire involvement in this area. Two (3%) of them said they desired very little involvement. Eight (14%) teachers desired moderate involvement. Five (8%) teachers reported that they desired high involvement. 44 (75%) teachers said they desired to be fully involved in deciding matters of Time tabling.

Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers perceived less decision-making involvement than they wished. Responses from focus group interviews conducted from Post Level-1 teachers indicates that some respondents do time tabling jointly at their schools. Some respondents said that the SMT did it for (teachers) us. One respondent indicated that “Time Table committee” design it for all teachers. Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired more involvement in time tabling decision-making than they experienced.

Table 4. 4 1 shows that regarding Language policy, out of the 59 teachers participated in the study, six (10%) perceived no involvement in decision-making. Eleven (19%) teachers experienced very little involvement. 24 (41%) teachers perceived moderate involvement. Seventeen (29%) of them said they were highly involved. One (2%) reported full involvement.

Looking at their desired involvement in deciding matters of Language policy, Table 4. 4. 2 shows that there was no teacher who did not desire involvement in this area. Six (10%) of them desired very little involvement. Nine (15%) teachers said they desired moderate involvement.

Nineteen (32%) teachers reported that they desired high involvement. 25 (42%) teachers said they desired to be fully involved in deciding matters of Language policy. Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers much experienced less involvement than they desired. The majority (42%) desired full involvement.

Responses from focus group interviews show that, teachers desired full involvement in language policy decision making. Some respondents said that “in this area we are not allowed to have inputs , only the SGB who make decisions about this”.

One respondent highlighted that in our school there is no such “animal” meaning there is no language policy at all. Responses from both the questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired full involvement in decision-making in language policy than they experienced.

Regarding Instructional methods, Table 4. 4. 1 shows that, one (2%) teachers reported no involvement at all. Eight (14%) of them perceived very little involvement. 30 (51%) reported moderate involvement. 17 (29%) teachers experienced high involvement. Three (5%) teachers reported full involvement.

With regard to their desired involvement in making decisions about instructional methods, Table 4. 4. 2 shows that, one (2%) teacher did not desire any involvement at all. One (2%) desired very little involvement. Seven (12%) said they desired moderate involvement. Eleven (19%) teachers reported that they desired high involvement. 39 (66%) said they wished to be fully involved in deciding matters of instructional methods issues.

Overall, the questionnaire data show that teachers experienced far less decision-making involvement than they wished. The majority (66%) desired full involvement. Responses from focus group interviews shows that, some respondents said that they just taught according to what is in the textbook.

One respondent said that “my HOD did not convene Phase meetings”. One said “we teach without any proper supervision”. Some respondents said that SMT did not have curriculum policies. School principals did not give them policy documents. Responses from both questionnaire and interviews show that teachers desired more involvement in decision-making in curriculum issues.

This is supported by Vroom and Yetton (1973) and Vroom and Jago (1988) cited in Hoy and Miskel (2008) talk about (The Vroom Model of Shared Decision Making) . This model talks about the Acceptance Rule which says that “subordinates, their acceptance of the decision is critical for effective implementation”. In this regard instructional methods decision-making involvement is very important to teachers because they are going to implement curriculum issues in the class.

4. 4 Emerging issues

This chapter has presented data collected through questionnaire and focus group interviews. It explained these findings using the three key questions of the research mentioned in this chapter. Data were discussed and presented in an integrated way.

Emerging from the findings based on the respondents' biographical information was that 47% male 53% female participated to the study. Among both the male and female teachers, the majority (53%) had 6-8 years teaching experience.

The findings that came out suggest that the outcomes of the study seem to be reliable because the participated teachers are not novice in both males and females. Basically, teachers indicated how they perceived and desired involvement in finance and curriculum matters. Data collected from 16 schools on Finance decision-making indicate that currently, teachers are not involved at all or not fully involved in finance matters. The findings show that (51%) teachers desired full involvement in Budgeting area.

It came out that some cases teachers do not desire to be involved in some areas such as Auditing (54%) and Accounting (71%) . This suggests that teachers misunderstood what the terms refers to. But it seems to suggest that teachers do not understand some finance issues such as auditing and budgeting. It also shows that teachers lack full commitment and they fear responsibility of accounting. In some cases teacher involvement in decision-making suggested otherwise.

All what we see, is not what the literature say in Chapter Two.

For instance, Bischoff (cited in Campher, du Preez, Grobler, Look & Shaba, 2002) argued that decision –making should be done more collectively rather than only at management level.

The fact that there are areas in finance matters where teachers do not indicates that they do not want full involvement. It emerged that actual involvement by teachers in finance decision matters suggest that there are different understandings between teachers and the principals. My findings suggest that there is no proof of power sharing in finance matters. Moreover, it seems that principals dominate decision-making in finance issues.

With regard to curriculum decision-making, the majority of the respondents (83%) expressed the idea that teachers should be permitted to select books they would like to use for curriculum delivery. The findings indicated that teachers desired to be more involved in curriculum decision-making in schools. This is a very interesting or very pertinent matter in the South African context if teachers desire full involvement.

This is not just good for the learners' education but also in the interest of teacher development in curriculum issues. This findings also that teachers understand their role which is direct contact with learners, so to be fully involved in curriculum matters will keep them up to date.

From a management and leadership perspective, the school managers learn that if they do not involve teachers in certain areas teachers are likely to resist. The school leaders should understand which areas do teachers need to be involved or not. Sometimes we deprive them of participating in decision-making. In this regard there is a challenge about how to balance actual and desired. However, meaningful teacher involvement in decision-making in key areas of Finance and Curriculum needs to be implemented fully.

Comparing what teachers said about both Finance and Curriculum. Overall, indicate that teachers experienced less involvement in the school finance matters than curriculum issues. The area that seemed to experienced most substantially was fundraising. 11 (19%) teachers reported full involvement. Whereas in other areas teachers reported no involvement at all, very little involvement, moderate involvement and high involvement. The lowest areas of experienced involvement were, (63%) auditing, (53%) monitoring and (69%) accounting. I think this was as a result of the insufficient skills in finance matters.

Unlike what some literature saying. Bisschoff cited in Campher, du Preez, Globler, Look & Shoba (2002) stressing the issue of sharing information among all stakeholders. My findings suggesting something different. For instance teachers reported that they did not want to participate in some school finance issues. This suggests that teachers are not competent or fully empowered to contribute effectively in finance decision-making in particular. Moreover, Bridges talks about “Test of relevance” , teachers interest should be high in participation. The findings suggests that teachers were not very interested in some financial matters.

In the area of curriculum matters, 83% teachers desired full involvement in terms of the selection of books but they are experiencing a very low level of involvement. The findings suggest that teachers desired full involvement in curriculum issues.

The reviewed literature in Chapter Two supports that. For instance Doll (cited in Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009, p. 24) argued that teachers should be involved in every phase of curriculum planning and they are there at school to implement the curriculum.

The legal framework for curriculum in South Africa context also stresses that teachers act as curriculum developers (SASA, 1996). The findings suggests that teachers understand the role that they should play in curriculum matters. So as informed by the findings, teachers perceived very low extent which is not desirable as they are the curriculum implementers.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY , CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

5. 1 Introduction

This study sought to explore teacher involvement in Financial and Curriculum decision-making matters. Firstly, this chapter summarizes the research. Secondly, it draws conclusions from the research findings. Thirdly, it suggests the recommendations related to the conclusions. Lastly, it addresses the limitations of the study. The study has tried to answer the three questions below:

- To what extent do teachers feel involved and desire involvement in Finance decision-making?
- To what extent do teachers feel involved and desire involvement in school Curriculum decision-making?
- What can be said about teacher involvement in decision-making in two areas: Finance and Curriculum?

5. 2 Summary of the research

In the Chapter One I indicated that teacher involvement in decision-making is an important phenomena given the decentralized nature in South Africa. Chapter One outlined the background and the purpose, research setting, research methodology, limitations of the study and the organization of the study.

The Chapter Two has indicated that teachers learned to desire more involvement than they perceived. It has also reviewed literature, the following issues were discussed. Firstly, five concepts were examined, secondly, the legal frameworks of school finance and curriculum in South Africa were discussed.

Finally, one theoretical framework (Shared Decision-Making: Empowering teachers) was discussed as a lens for understanding the extent to which teachers experience and desire involvement in Financial and Curriculum matters. This Model advocates that decision-making must be shared if the organization is to succeed.

Chapter Three described the research design and methodology of the study. The study was located within the interpretive research paradigm. Two data collection instruments namely: questionnaire and focus group interviews were discussed. 16 rural primary schools were sampled in the Maphumulo Circuit. 59 teachers participated in the study. The data collection process and gaining entry were discussed. Ethical issues also were discussed. Validity and reliability of the study were discussed. Finally, data analysis was discussed.

Chapter Four presented and discussed the research findings. This was presented through five tables: Table 4. 2. 1, Biographical information of respondents teachers. Table 4. 2. 2, questionnaire information. Table 4. 2. 3 focus group interviews information. Table 4. 3. 1 teachers' perceived involvement in financial decision-making. Table 4. 3. 2 teachers' desired involvement in Finance decision-making.

Table 4. 4. 1, teachers' perceived involvement in Curriculum decision-making.

Table 4. 4. 2 teachers' desired involvement in Curriculum decision-making. Finally, emerging issues were discussed

5. 3 Conclusions

In terms of financial decision making the findings show that teachers do not necessarily desire to be involved in all areas. Teachers seem not want to commit themselves in Finance. For instance, the findings show that teachers misunderstand the finance matters. For example that, the findings suggest that teachers like to be involved in finance areas such as budgeting, but did not desire involvement in the auditing process. Budgeting and auditing cannot be divorced. They are interrelated to each other. This is an indication that teachers lack knowledge. Moreover, one may say that teachers are not the experts in terms of finance issues. School leaders should not assume that teachers not want to be involved in every decision-making processes.

Teachers are selective about the financial aspect they want . A question that arises is whether teachers are competent or empowered enough to contribute effectively in financial decision-making. It remains the responsibility of the principals of schools to empower and support teachers in participating in decision-making processes.

If this is performed effectively it is less likely that teachers will desire no involvement at all in some financial areas. Regarding teacher involvement in curriculum issues findings indicate that in most cases teachers experienced reasonable amount of involvement and they desired more than they experienced.

However, teachers had a huge interest in participating in curriculum matters. The reviewed literature, participative decision-making become very important as far as curriculum decisions are concerned. In as much as teachers would desire full involvement in curriculum decision matters, but capacity and capability are not there in an extent that it will equip them to enjoy full participation.

Teachers are expected to teach and implement the Departmental curriculum policies. However, school managers to capacitate teachers to understand the importance of their involvement in curriculum issues (Steyn, 1998).

5. 4 Recommendations

In the light of the above mentioned conclusions regarding teacher involvement in decision-making in Finance and Curriculum matters at schools, the following recommendations are suggested:

Where teachers desire involvement in curriculum matters, school leaders need to understand what teachers want to be involved in. It is also necessary for school leaders to understand why teachers desire involvement in certain areas and not desire involvement in other areas.

This is also a fertile ground for further research. Teachers need to be empowered to participate effectively in school decision-making processes.

School Principals, SMTs and Staff Development Teams (SDT) should design a programme aiming to develop teachers in decision-making. To ensure this exercise, there must be a monitoring tool to be used by the SDT. To create and promote active participation of teachers in finance decision-making in particular, there must be transparency.

Principals need to trust and encourage all aspects of decision-making. This can be achieved through a democratic leadership style and teachers' commitment, responsibility and accountability.

Because teachers do not want involvement in all aspects of decision-making, school leaders must invest in understanding which areas teachers want to be involved and which areas teachers want no involvement. It seems that teachers need to be developed to be able to participate in some of the areas that they do not desire currently.

Principals of schools need to embrace the concept of decentralization in schools. School managers must allow democracy to happen. In this regard, teachers must be allowed to have a voice in some school decision-making curriculum in particular.

Furthermore, SASA put emphasis on "shared decisions" by all involved stakeholders in education, but the Act is silent on how teachers should be involved in the school finance.

In other words there is no framework provided by the Department indicating how much involvement of teachers is expected to in which areas of management are teachers should make decisions.

REFERENCES

- Alrerk, P. L. & Settle, R. B. *The survey research handbook* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Anderson, L., & Lumby, J. (2005). *Managing finances and external relations in South African schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Bennet, J. (2003). *Teaching and learning science*. London: Continuum.
- Bush, T. (1986). *Theories of educational management*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (3rd ed.). London: Sage publications.
- Campher, T., du Preez, P., Globbler, B., Look, C., & Shaba, S. M. (2003). *Effective education management series. module 5. managing schools finances*. Sandown: Heinemann.
- Carrim, N. (2001). *Democratic participation, decentralization and educational reform, in J. D. Yansen and Y. Sayed, implementing education policies. the South African experiences*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Chikoko, V. (2006). *Negotiating roles and responsibilities in the context of decentralised school governance: A case study of one cluster of schools in Zimbabwe*. University of KwaZulu-Natal).

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education* (5th ed.). London: Routledge/ Falmer Publishers.

Cohen, L. , Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6thed.). London: Routledge/ Falmer Publishers.

Cole, G. A. (2004). *Management Theory an Practices* (6th ed.). London: YHT Ltd.

Coleman, M. (2005). *Leadership and Management in Education: cultures, change and context*. London: Oxford University Press.

Cresswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research. Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). America: Pearson Education Ltd.

Department of Education (2002). *Towards Effective School Management. A guide to Norms and Standards for School Funding. Manual 5*. KwaZulu-Natal Province.

Dludla, L. E. *A study of participation in curriculum decision-making in two secondary schools in amanzimtoti circuit*. Unpublished University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.

Donalson, G. A & Sanderson, D. R. (1996). *Working together in schools: a guide for educators*. Thousands Oaks, California: Sage

Duignan, P. (2006). *Educational Leadership: Key challenges and ethical tensions*. America: Cambridge University Press.

- Duminy, P. A. (1967). *Trends and challenges in the education of the South African Bantu*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Everard, K. B., & Morris, G. (1996). *Effective school management* (3rd ed.). London: Paul Chapman.
- Fink, A. (2006). *How to conduct surveys. A step by step guide*. (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Hanning, E. (2004). *Finding your way in qualitative research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Harries, A. (2003). *Distributed leadership in schools: leading or misleading?*, paper presented at the British Educational Leadership, Management and Administration, Birmingham.
- Harrison, R., & Stokes, H. (1992). *Diagnosing organizational culture*. San Fransisco CA: Jose-Bass.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration theory, research and practice* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.
- Johnson, D. (1994). *Research method in education management*. London: Longman.
- Khuzwayo, Q. O. (2009). *The role of parent governors in school financial decision-making: Experiences of parent governors in Ndwedwe rural schools*. University of KwaZulu-Natal: Durban, South Africa.
- Knight, P. T. (2002). *Small scale research*. London: Sage Publications.

- Krueger, R. A. (1994). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lawler, E. E., Monrman, K & Ledford, G. E. (1992). *Employee involvement and Total Quality Management*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Love, J. R. (1994). *Liberating leaders from the superman syndroe*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Lumby, J., Middlewood, D., & Kaabwe, E. (2003). *Managing human resources in south african schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Maree, K. (2007). *First steps in research* (3rd ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Martin, L. & Kragler, (1999). *Creating a culture of teacher professional growth*. *Journal of school Leadership*, 9, 4, 311-320
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. United States: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social research methods. quantitative and qualitative approaches* (3rd ed.). United States of America: Allyn & Bacon.
- Nyembe, P. k. N. (2002). Educators perceptions about effective principals in secondary schools. University of KwaZulu-Natal).
- Oppenheim, K. (2004). *Questionnaire, DESIGN, interviewing and attitude measurement*. London: Printer Publications.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2009). *Curriculum: Principles and issues* (5th ed.). America: Pearson Education, Inc.

- Owens, R. G., & Valesky, T. C. (2009). *Organizational behavior in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform* (9th ed.). United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Prinsloo, E., Vorster, P. J., & Sibaya, P. T. (1996). *Teaching with confidence*. Pretoria: Kagiso Publishers.
- Republic of South Africa, (1996). *South African Schools Act 84 of 1996*. Government Printers.
- Ricketts, C. (2003). *Leadership: Personal development and career*. America: Delmar.
- Sayed, Y., & Jansen, J. (2001). *Implementing education policies: The south african experience*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Schumacher, S., & Mc Millan, J. H. (2006). *International edition. research in education. evidence based enquiry*. (6th ed.). America: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Shoba, M. E. (2009). A case study: The role of the school management teams in curriculum management. University of KwaZulu-Natal, 2009).
- Smith, R. (2002). *Creating the effective primary school: A guide for school leaders and teachers*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Soer, J. W. A. (1997). *Research Methodology, National Higher Diploma: Educational Management*. Pretoria: Azaliah College of Further Education
- Spillane, J., & Diamond, J. B. (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Squelch, J., & Lemmer, E. (1994). *Eight keys to effective school management in south africa*. Durban: Southern Book.

- Steyn, G. M. (1998). Teacher empowerment and leadership role of principals. *South African Journal of Education*. 18(1), 131-131-138.
- Steyn, G. M. (2001). The realization of empowerment and teamwork in quality schools: *South African Journal of Education*. 20(4), 267-267.
- Steyn, G. & Van Niekerk, E. (2002). *Human Resource Management in Education*. Pretoria: Unisa Press.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches: Applied Social Research Methods Series Volume 46*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Terreblanche, M., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (2006). *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*. (2nd ed.). Rondebosch: University of Cape Town Press.
- Tosi, H. L., & Mero, N. P. (2003). *The Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior: What Managers Need to Know*. America: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Van Deventer, I., & Kruger, A. G. (2003). *An Educator's Guide to School Management Skills*. Van Schaik Publishers.
- Vithal, R., & Jansen, J. (2008). *Designing your first research proposal. A manual for researchers in education and the social sciences*. Cape Town: Juta.
- Vogt, W. P. (1999). *Dictionary of Statistics and Methodology: A Nontechnical Guide for the Social Sciences* (2nd ed.). California: Sage Publications.
- Zulu, D. T. (2002). *Collegial Management in Gcewu Secondary School, KwaZulu-Natal: An Investigation with Reference to Staff Perceptions*: Unpublished thesis, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban.

APPENDIX ONE: LETTER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

P. O. BOX 2961

KWADUKUZA

4450

25 October 2010

The Circuit Manager

KZN- Department of Education

MAPHUMULO CIRCUIT

Dear Sir/ Madam

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH STUDY: “Teacher involvement in decision-making in finance and curriculum matters”.

My name is Johnson. M. Chili. I am currently doing M. Ed in the School of Education and development of the University of KwaZulu- Natal (Edgewood campus). I hereby request to conduct a research study in your school. I wish to interview Post level-1 teachers.

I promise that upon your granting me permission, the information I shall gather shall be used solely for research purposes and shall be treated in strict confidence. All participating schools and respondents shall be referred to through pseudonyms.

I wish to thank you in advance

Yours humbly

Chili J.M. (082- 3662024)

APPENDIX TWO: LETTER TO SCHOOL HEADS

P. O. BOX 2961

KWADUKUZA

4450

22 October 2010

The school head

.....Primary School

KZN- Department of Education

ILEMBE DISTRICT

MAPHUMULO CIRCUIT

Sir/ Madam

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH: “Teacher involvement in decision-making in the matters of curriculum and finance”.

My name is Chili J. M. I am currently doing M. Ed in the School of Education and development of the University of KwaZulu Natal (Edgewood campus).

I write to seek your permission include your school as one of the participants in the study. I promise that upon your granting me permission, the information I shall gather will be used only for research purposes and shall be treated in strict confidence. All participating schools and respondents shall be referred to through pseudonyms

Attached please find a letter of permission granted to me by the Department of Education (Maphumulo Circuit- Circuit Manager)

I wish to thank you in advance

Yours humbly

Chili J. M. 0823662024

APPENDIX THREE INFORMED CONSENT LETTER: TEACHERS

P. O. BOX 2961

KWADUKUZA

4450

25 October 2010

Dear colleague

**Re: CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY: TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN
DECISION-MAKING IN THE AREAS OF CURRICULUM AND FINANCE.**

My name is Chili J.M. I am an M. Ed student in the School of Education and Development of the University of KwaZulu Natal (Edgewood campus). In order to fulfill the requirements of the said degree I intend to conduct a study on teacher involvement in decision-making in curriculum and finance.

I request you to participate in the study by way of completing a questionnaire or participating in a focus group interview. Please note that participating in the study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw or discontinue your participation at any time. I promise to treat all the information you provide in strict confidence and to use it for research purposes only. Your name or any of your identity shall not be disclosed. Please note that you shall not incur any financial cost by participating in the study. There are no financial benefits accruing to you. However, I hope that this will help us as teachers to understand teacher involvement in decision-making.

If you accept to participate please complete the attached consent form.

I wish to thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully

Chili J.M. (082 3662024)

I....., fully understand the conditions of participating in this study and agreed to be a respondent.

Signed.....Date.....

APPENDIX FOUR: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR POST LEVEL-1 TEACHERS

SECTION- A: Biographical information

Please place a cross (x) or put your answer in the relevant spaces

Kindly indicate your:

1. Sex

1. 1 Male	
2. 2 Female	

2. Teaching experience

2. 1	2- 5 years	
2. 2	6- 8 years	
2. 3	9- 19 years	
2. 4	20 and more	

SECTION- B: Involvement in decision-making in school finance and curriculum areas.

Scale

0	No involvement at all
1	Very little involvement
2	Moderate
3	High involvement
4	Fully involvement

Questions 3: Using the given scale, please tick in the appropriate box to show the extent to which you are currently involved in making decisions about each given item. Please give any additional comments in the space provided.

Finance:

	0	1	2	3	4	Comments
1. Budgeting						
2. Purchasing						
3. Record Keeping						
4. Financial reporting (How money was spent)						
5. Fundraising						
6. Monitoring (Checking financial records)						
7. Auditing						
8. Accounting(Collective responsibility)						
9. Other (Please specify)						

4. Please indicate on the same items below how much involvement in decision-making you desire?

Finance

	0	1	2	3	4	Comments
1. Budgeting						
2. Purchasing						
3. Record keeping						
4. Financial reporting(How money was spent)						
5. Fundraising						
6. Monitoring (Checking financial records)						
7. Auditing						
8. Accounting						
8. Other (Please specify)						

5. Using the given scale, please tick in the appropriate box to show the extent to which you are currently involved in making decisions about each given item. Please give any additional comments in the space provided.

0	No involvement at all
1	Very little involvement
2	Moderate
3	High involvement
4	Fully involvement

Curriculum

	0	1	2	3	4	Comments
1. Selection of books						
2. Year plan						
3. Work schedule and lesson plan						
4. Assessment: tests, projects etc						
5. Time tabling						
6. Language policy						
7. Instructional methods						
8. Other (Please specify)						

6. Please indicate on the same items below how much involvement in decision-making you desire in the areas of curriculum.

Curriculum

	0	1	2	3	4	Comments
1. Selection of books						
2. Year plan						
3. Work schedule & lesson plan						
4. Assessment: tests, projects etc						
5. Time tabling						
6. Language Policy						
7. Instructional methods						
8. Other (Please specify)						

Scale

0	No involvement at all
1	Very little involvement
2	Moderate
3	High involvement
4	Fully involvement

APPENDIX FIVE : INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR POST LEVEL-1 TEACHERS

SECTION- A :

FINANCE.

(a) Decision in finance

Let us talk about your involvement in making ideas about each of the following areas.

1. Budgeting
2. Purchasing
3. Record keeping
4. Financial reporting
5. Fund raising
6. Monitoring
7. Auditing
8. Accounting
9. Other (please specify)

(b) What do you see as some factors hindering your part of decision?

(c) What do you see as enabled you to be part of part of decision-making?

CURRICULUM:

(b) CURRICULUM DECISION-MAKING

Let us talk about your involvement in decisions about each of the following:

1. Selection of books
2. Year plan
3. Work schedule and lesson plans
4. Assessment: Tests, projects
5. Time tabling
6. Language policy
7. Instructional methods
8. Other (Please- specify)

APPENDIX SIX: Ethical clearance

