

(i)

**COLLEGIAL MANAGEMENT IN
GCEWU SECONDARY SCHOOL, KWAZULU-NATAL:
AN INVESTIGATION WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO
STAFF PERCEPTIONS**

by

DUDUZILE THERESA ZULU

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the *Master of Education (Education Management)* Degree
in the *Faculty of Education* at the *University of Natal* (Dbn).

November 2002

(ii)

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work, all sources used or quoted have been acknowledged by means of complete references.


.....
Duduzile Theresa Zulu

Durban, November 2002

STATEMENT BY SUPERVISOR

This mini-dissertation is submitted with/~~without~~ my approval.



.....
Professor M. Thurlow

ABSTRACT

The *South African Schools Act* No. 84 of 1996 and the report of the *Task Team on Education Management Development* (Department of Education, 1996), proposed greater involvement of major stakeholders, in particular the educators, in decision-making processes in educational institutions. This opened a new chapter of a major transformational shift from an authoritarian and bureaucratic style of management to a democratic and participative management style. The purpose of this research was to investigate, largely through the perceptions of staff, the extent to which the management of Gcewu Secondary School may be characterised as "collegial" and, as necessary, to make practical recommendations as to how the management arrangements of the school may be modified or enhanced to promote collegiality.

The questionnaires and interviews were used as the research instruments for this study. This study was conducted at Gcewu Secondary School at Umbumbulu District, Durban South Region.

The main findings that emerged from the study were as follows:

- ☞ The educators regard the decision made about the management of the school as directly affecting them.
- ☞ Educators were not adequately involved in decision-making.
- ☞ Educators were keen in participating in decision-making but the principal was not willing to share power with them (post level 1 educators).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

- ☞ God Almighty for the power, courage and mental strength He gave me to undertake this arduous task.
- ☞ There would have been no work of this magnitude without the persistence, sage advice and wisdom of Professor Mike Thurlow, who provided firm guidance and encouragement during the study.
- ☞ My colleagues, namely, principal, heads of departments and level one educators for giving up a lot of time to respond to interview and questionnaire items.
- ☞ My family for their support and encouragement during the course of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| TITLE PAGE | (i) |
| DECLARATION | (ii) |
| STATEMENT BY SUPERVISOR | (iii) |
| ABSTRACT | (iv) |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | (v) |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | (vi) |
| LIST OF TABLES | (x) |
| | |
| CHAPTER ONE : BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY | 1 |
| 1.1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.2 FOCUS OF THE STUDY | 2 |
| 1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS IN THE STUDY | 3 |
| 1.4 RESEARCH METHODS | 4 |
| 1.4.1. Literature Review | 4 |
| 1.4.2 Interviews | 4 |
| 1.4.3 Questionnaires | 4 |
| 1.5 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY | 4 |
| 1.6 THE LAYOUT OF THE STUDY | 5 |
| 1.7 CONCLUSION | 5 |
| | |
| CHAPTER TWO : LITERATURE REVIEW | 6 |
| 2.1 INTRODUCTION | 6 |
| 2.2 MANAGEMENT OF SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS IN THE PAST | 7 |
| 2.3 MANAGEMENT OF SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS IN THE NEW ERA | 7 |
| 2.3.1 New Principals and Values for the Education System | 7 |
| 2.3.2 Learning and Teaching As Main Aims of Education Management | 8 |
| 2.3.3 Self -Managed Schools | 8 |
| 2.3.4 Drawing on Other Levels for the Support (Shared Governance) | 9 |
| 2.3.5 Building Schools As Learning Organisation | 9 |
| 2.4 MODELS OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT | 10 |
| 2.4.1 Bureaucratic/Formal Model | 10 |
| 2.4.2 Collegial Model | 11 |
| 2.4.3 Political Model | 11 |
| 2.4.4 Subject Model | 12 |
| 2.4.5 Ambiguity Model | 12 |
| 2.4.6 Cultural Model | 12 |
| 2.5 Collegial Model of Management | 13 |
| 2.5.1 Major Features of Collegiality | 14 |
| 2.5.2 Application of Collegiality in a Secondary School Situation | 15 |
| 2.5.3 Advantages of Collegiality | 16 |
| 2.5.4 Limitations of Collegiality | 17 |
| 2.5.5 Further Criticism And Limitations of Collegial Model | 18 |

| | | |
|---|--|--------|
| | (vii) | |
| 2.6 | TECHNIQUES TO BE USED BY A SCHOOL MANAGER TO ENHANCE TRANSFORMATION | 19 |
| | 2.6.1 Collegial Relationship | 19 |
| | 2.6.2 Collaborative Power Sharing | 19 |
| | 2.6.3 Motivation of Teachers | 19 |
| | 2.6.4 Teacher Empowerment | 22 |
| | 2.6.5 Open Information System | 23 |
| 27 | CONCLUSION | 24 |
| CHAPTER THREE: RATIONALE FOR PROMOTING COLLEGIAL MANAGEMENT SELF-REPORTING BY THE DEPUTY PRINCIPAL | | 25 |
| 3.1 | INTRODUCTION | 25 |
| 3.2 | DECISION MAKING AND EDUCATION | 25 |
| 3.3 | APPLICATION OF COLLEGIALITY AT THE SCHOOL | 26 |
| 3.4 | CONCLUSION | 29 |
| CHAPTER FOUR : RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE | | 30 |
| 4.1 | INTRODUCTION | 30 |
| 4.2 | RESEARCH QUESTIONS | 30 |
| 4.3 | CASE STUDY SCHOOL | 30 |
| 4.4 | RESEARCH METHODS | 31 |
| 4.5 | RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS | 32 |
| | 4.5.1 Questionnaire | 32 |
| | 4.5.1.1 Types of Questionnaires | 33 |
| | 4.5.1.2 Types of Questions | 33 |
| | 4.5.2 Interview Schedule | 34 |
| 4.6 | DATA ANALYSIS | 35 |
| 4.7 | CONCLUSION | 36 |
| CHAPTER FIVE : PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS | | 37 |
| 5.1 | INTRODUCTION | 37 |
| 5.2. | QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EDUCATORS | 37 |
| | 5.2.1 Presentation of Section A - General Information | 37 |
| | 5.2.2 Presentation of Section B of the Questionnaire | 38 |
| | 5.2.3 Presentation of Section C of the Questionnaire | 41 |
| | 5.2.4 Presentation of Section D of the Questionnaire | 44 |
| | 5.2.5 Presentation of Section E of the Questionnaire | 47 |
| 5.3 | PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULES: PRINCIPALS AND HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS | 52 |
| | 5.3.1 Presentation of Section A: General Information | 52 |
| | 5.3.2 Presentation of Section B of the Interview Schedule | 54 |
| 5.3 | CO-ORDINATION OF FINDINGS | 57 |
| 5.4 | CONCLUSION | 59 |

| | |
|--|----|
| CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION | 60 |
| 6.1 INTRODUCTION | 60 |
| 6.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS | 60 |
| 6.2.1 Meaning of Collegial Approach to Management | 60 |
| 6.2.2 Official Position on Participatory Management in the School | 60 |
| 6.2.3 Staff Perceptions to the Way in Which Collegial Management Operate Currently At School | 61 |
| 6.2.3.2 Educators Are Keen in Participating in Decision-Making | 62 |
| 6.2.3.3 The Principal is not Willing to Share Power with Teachers (Post Level 1) | 62 |
| 6.2.3.4 The Principal Promotes Mutual Trust Between Him and Staff | 63 |
| 6.3 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT APPROACH THOUGHT TO BE DESIRABLE BY EDUCATORS | 64 |
| 6.3.1 The Principal Should Create Atmosphere Conducive To Participative Decision-Making | 64 |
| 6.3.2 The Principal Should Motivate Staff To Participate In Decision-Making | 64 |
| 6.3.3 The Principal Should Build Capacity Of Educators To Take Informed Decisions | 64 |
| 6.3.4 Duties Should Be Delegated According To Capacities | 64 |
| 6.3.5 Clear Guidelines And Support Should Be Provided To Delegated Duties | 65 |
| 6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR MODIFYING THE SCHOOL'S MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT TO PROMOTE GREATER COLLEGIALITY | 65 |
| 6.4.1 The Principal Should Consider Involving Teachers In Decision-Making Processes | 65 |
| 6.4.2 The Principal Should Establish Whole School Development Programmes | 65 |
| 6.4.3 The Principal Should Promote An Atmosphere of Trust by Displaying Fair Treatment and Proper Management Skills | 66 |
| 6.4.4 Suggestions to Educators | 66 |
| 6.4.4.1 Educators should take positive steps to become partners in managing their school | 66 |
| 6.4.4.2 Educators should learn to work with others | 66 |
| 6.5 CONCLUSION | 67 |
| 7. REFERENCES | 68 |
| 8. APPENDICES | 71 |
| 8.1 APPENDIX A | 72 |
| 8.2 APPENDIX B | 72 |
| 8.2 APPENDIX C | 73 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Position held at school | 38 |
| Table 2: Experience of respondents | 38 |
| Table 3: Educators should have a say in managerial decisions | 39 |
| Table 4: The principal should create opportunities for staff professional growth | 39 |
| Table 5: Sharing of power with teachers | 40 |
| Table 6: Educators' involvement in decision-making | 40 |
| Table 7: Educators' perceptions of school managerial decision-making | 41 |
| Table 8: Educators opinion as to who should be responsible for managerial decision-making at school | 42 |
| Table 9: Opportunities for educators in decision-making | 43 |
| Table 10: Formal staff meeting on how management can be improved | 43 |
| Table 11: Consultation of the staff by the management team | 44 |
| Table 12: Mutual trust promoted by principal | 44 |
| Table 13: Staff motivation to be united | 45 |
| Table 14: Teamwork at the school | 46 |
| Table 15: Attitude of management staff towards educators | 47 |
| Table 16: Responses to the extent of change of collegiality | 47 |
| Table 17: Educators involvement in decision-making | 48 |
| Table 18: Themes that emerged from the positive responses of question 2 | 49 |
| Table 19: Themes that emerged from the negative responses of question 2 | 50 |
| Table 20: Suggested steps for the school principal | 51 |
| Table 21: Teaching experience of respondents | 53 |
| Table 22: Number of years in current school | 53 |
| Table 23: Position held at school | 53 |

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The report of the Task Team on Education Management Development (Department of Education, 1996) suggested that, in line with similar trends in several other countries, the *South African School's Act* (Republic of South Africa, 1996) has placed South African schools '... firmly on the road to a school-based system of management: schools will increasingly come to manage themselves' (p.28).

The report suggests further that effective self-management must be accompanied by an internal devolution of power within the school and greater participation of all in decision-making processes. This view accords with that of Caldwell and Spinks (1992: 18), whose work on self-managing schools is seminal. They argued that devolution of power to institutions must be matched by an empowerment of people within the school. The implication of this argument is that school improvement is dependent, to a large extent, on dispersed management within the school as well as devolution of power to the institutional level.

In this connection, it has been suggested that "the notion of collegiality, which has become enshrined in the 'folklore' of education management, is the most appropriate way to run schools ... It has become closely associated with school effectiveness and improvement" (Campbell and Southworth (1993: 61), and has been described by Wallace (1989: 182) as the 'official model of good practice'. Bush (1995: 52) has defined collegiality in the following terms:

"Collegial models assume that organisations determine policy and make decisions through a process of discussion leading to consensus. Power is shared among some or all members of the organisation who are thought to have a mutual understanding about the objectives of the institution."

Notwithstanding the fact that collegial approaches to management have become increasingly popular both in the literature and in official pronouncements about school development, there is relatively little empirical evidence related to collegial approaches working in practice. This, in part, provides a motivation for this study. Further motivation is provided by the fact that it is now seven years since the enactment of the *Schools Act* and the publication and dissemination of the Task Team Report, and the notions of greater democratisation of school management and the needs for more participatory approaches have been actively promoted in various management development programmes and seminars.

The purpose of this research, therefore, is to investigate, largely through the perceptions of staff, the extent to which the management of Gcewu Secondary School may be characterised as 'collegial', and, as necessary, to make practical recommendations as to how the management arrangements of the school may be modified or enhanced to promote collegiality.

1.2 FOCUS OF THE STUDY

It is important to look closely at the South African education system with the view of determining how decisions are taken at schools. Prior to the introduction of the *South African Schools Act of 1996* educators did not have a say in decisions that affected them in their daily lives.

Non-involvement of educators in decision-making may result in conflict, as there is no consultation between principals and educators on policy matters, and operational procedures at schools.

Steyn (1998: 18 (3): 131) rightly points out that if the transformation of South African education is to succeed, power has to be shared equally at schools. Effective schooling can only take place when both principals and teachers are involved in decision-making. For many years South Africans have been clamouring for democracy even in schools. Chapman *et al.* (1995: 103) assert that there is probably only one day to democratise schools. To practise democracy means learning to be responsible for freedom, to make long-term strategic decisions and, most importantly, to accept the fact that democracy is possible only when all participants in the

educational process share it.

Chapman *et al.* (1995: 119) cite the following from the Australian education system: The government's effective educational program depends on a process of consultation and negotiation among those vitally affected. So the policies adopted will reflect their values and goals, thus increasing the prospect of wholehearted support.

The proposition has been put forward and adopted which increased employee participation in decision-making, in other words increased workplace democracy will enhance organisational effectiveness and efficiency and lead to greater productivity of higher quality.

The central challenge in a democratic education system of South Africa is to allow or assure a greater involvement of educators in managing schools. This, according to Steyn and Squelch (1997: 1) is a powerful means to improve schools and an essential ingredient if schools strive for excellence. The participation of teachers in managerial decision-making activities is therefore of paramount importance.

To determine to what extent the educators should, or must be involved to ensure their satisfaction as well as the achievement of the school's goals, an empirical study which is evaluative, will be conducted at Gcewu Secondary School.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS IN THE STUDY

This study sets out to answer the following questions:

- ☞ What is meant by a collegial approach to management?
- ☞ How does a collegial approach relate to alternative models of management?
- ☞ What is the 'official' position on participatory management in the school?
- ☞ What are the perceptions of educators in this connection? (Note: it will not be assumed that respondents are familiar with the term 'collegiality').
- ☞ What changes in management approach are thought to be desirable by educators?

- ☞ If necessary, what might be done to modify the school's management arrangements to promote greater collegiality?

1.4 RESEARCH METHODS

Research methods are fully dealt with in chapter three: only a brief summary is outlined here. The project proceeded along the following lines:

1.4.1. Literature Review

Relevant literature on collegiality has been reviewed for better understanding of pertinent concepts, and also helps to provide a conceptual framework upon which the problem can be analysed.

1.4.2 Interviews

An interview schedule was prepared and administered on the principal and HOD's of the school. The interview schedule itself was designed by drawing on key indicators of collegiality derived from the literature. The interview was tape-recorded to facilitate subsequent analysis.

1.4.3 Questionnaires

Questionnaires were administered among 12 educators. The questionnaires aim to elicit information relevant to the study. The questionnaire items were also derived from key indicators suggested in the literature.

1.5 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This study essentially is a focussed case study of management at one school. Its underlying intention is to generate information that may be used to improve the school's

management arrangements, in the interests ultimately of improving teaching and learning.

1.6 THE LAYOUT OF THE STUDY

The layout of the study is as follows:-

Chapter 1 - is introductory and provides the overview of the study as well as the justification. In this chapter a background of the study is given with an aim of justifying a particular model of management relevant to that period.

Chapter 2 - the literature relevant to management in schools is reviewed giving particular attention to different models of management as well as the transformational role of the school principals.

Chapter 3 - explains the researcher's rationale for promoting collegial management.

Chapter 4 - deals with the methods of research, which would be used, in this study.

Chapter 5 - would be analysis and interpretation of data collected from the research instruments mentioned in chapter 3.

Chapter 6 - presents the conclusion and recommendations based on the findings obtained in chapter 5.

1.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter provides an introduction, which includes the background of the study. The background serves as a mechanism to identify and evaluate management practices that are consistent with the current call for a participative mode of education management and governance. The research questions homes is on the essentials and value of this study. The structure of the research provides the reader with what to expect in ensuing chapters.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The central purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which the management of Gcewu Secondary School may be characterised as ‘collegial’. The level of conflict between principals and educators seems to have escalated in South Africa, probably because of the transformation process that started taking place after the 1994 democratic elections. Changes in the education system have been the results of modern concept of democracy, which prescribes participation by all stakeholders in decision-making.

Teachers as stakeholders in education are entitled to participation in decision-making at school level. This is not always the case: in some schools teachers are not part of the decision-making body. Often in those instances teachers mobilize themselves and engage in direct confrontation with those in management.

Transformation of South African education attempts to bring about participation and movement away from centralised to a more inclusive type of school system. According to Isherwood and Hay (1973: 125) in schools where hierarchical authority prevails it seems likely that decision-making will be at the hands of the few, namely, those in management. This is contrary to what the *South African Schools Act* is propagating. Guest and Fatchet (1974 : 21) point out that the interest in participation has been growing in recent years, because it is deemed a response and sometimes a solution to certain pressures within the society.

It was the intention of this research to examine to examine the perception that teachers own decisions, if they participate in decision-making process of their organisation. Also included or related to this perception is that participation minimises conflict. The purpose of this chapter was to review literature on collegiality and its role in creating harmony in school. This chapter begins with the overview of how South African schools were managed in the past and how South African schools are supposed to be managed in the new era. Thereafter in the chapter, different

models of education management are reviewed with a detailed examination given to the collegial or democratic model. Considering relevant literature that emphasizes the techniques to be used by a school manager to enhance transformation concludes the chapter.

2.2 MANAGEMENT OF SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS IN THE PAST

The apartheid school system was characterised by inequality: racially, regionally and terms of gender (Task Team Report, 1996: 18). It was structured so that control comes from the top. Principals had to manage the schools on their own, although the Department of Education made managerial decisions. A principal was seen to be successful if she / he was a good administrator.

Principals and teachers have considerably been at the receiving end of top-down management structures (Task Team Report, 1996: 19). They had to face community criticism. They worked in an environment, which was closely regulated and were used to receiving and giving instructions.

In the past, many South African leaders including educational leaders have been authoritarian. They made decisions without consultation and school-level leaders did not allow staff and learners to openly disagree with them. As a result, members of the community often did not feel that schools belonged to them, or they did not feel committed to the decisions that the leaders made (School Management Teams, 2000: 15). The leaders were always aloof from the group. According to Jones (1988) this system failed because it encouraged principals to ignore the basic human needs of participation, growth and recognition of staff.

2.3 MANAGEMENT OF SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS IN THE NEW ERA

2.3.1 New Principals And Values For The Education System

New education policy requires managers who are able to work in democratic and participative ways to build relationships and ensure efficient and effective delivery (Task Team Report, 1996: 25). The new approach to leadership challenges school leaders to change from apartheid values

to the values of the new constitution. New schools are expected to operate with values such as democracy, equality, human dignity, freedom and justice. School leadership needs to provide opportunities for teachers, learners, parents and community members to participate in the smooth running of the schools. Leaders should negotiate with others and bring them into leading and managing the school. This helps to motivate the school community and to make the members of that community feel a sense of responsibility for the school (School Management Teams, 2000: 14).

The challenge is to move from the more autocratic rule bound approaches, which government favoured, to the more democratic, accountable and equitable forms of leadership. In the new approach, school leaders need to consult more and to be more open and democratic than before.

2.3.2 Learning and Teaching As Main Aims of Education Management

It is in schools that the culture of teaching and learning must be created, and the foundation lessons of democracy learned (Task Team Report, 1996: 28). The main purpose of a school's existence is to enable teaching and learning to take place. The challenge is for school leaders to focus on this central task, and to organise schools so that teaching and learning happen in the best possible ways.

2.3.3 Self-Managed Schools

South Africa is following many other countries in adopting the trend towards self - managed schools. The new approach requires schools to build their capacity to manage themselves. Task Team (1996: 28) mentioned, "Schools which increasingly come to manage themselves". The report suggests further that effective self-management must be accompanied by an internal devolution of power within the school and greater participation of all in decision-making processes. This view accords with that of Cadwell and Spinks (1992: 18), whose work on self-managing schools is seminal. They argued that devolution of power to institutions must be matched by an empowerment of people within the school. The implication of this argument is that school improvement is dependant, to a large extent, on dispersed management within the

school as well as devolution of power to the institutional level.

A leader should constantly work towards making the school self-reliant by seeking commitment of teachers in devoting time and energy to change community attitudes towards the school. A leader should work with educators in a variety of ways in the gathering of information to guide efforts to enhance the quality of learning. A leader should also be concerned with human resources maintenance, which is an attraction and mainstay of a capable and committed teaching staff over time. Even though the school may be poor, leaders need to find resources - mostly human resources - that are based on people's contributions to make the school effective.

2.3.4 Drawing on Other Levels for the Support (Shared Governance)

The Task Team (1996 : 31) stresses that schools should accept prime responsibility for developing the capacity to manage themselves, and the capacity of those involved in management. This responsibility rests heavily on the shoulders of principals and school governing bodies that will look to other parts of the education system for support. The governing bodies are expected to play a key role in the school. They are expected to develop a school. Their task is to bridge the gap between the school and the community.

2.3.5 Building Schools As Learning Organisation

The learning organisation develops the capacity to innovate (Task Team Report, 1996 : 31). In a learning organisation, it is important for the organisation means that everybody is constantly learning and growing in their understanding and skills. Schools need to see themselves as in partnership with the provincial education department and private business to develop and find ways of growing and learning. School leaders have the responsibility:

- ☞ to develop and grow the whole school;
- ☞ to develop themselves as professional managers;
- ☞ to conduct staff development activities for the staff at school;
- ☞ to ensure that high quality learning teaching happen all day and every day in the

school;

- ☞ to provide opportunities for members of the SGB to have the training needed to perform the job properly;
- ☞ to involve parents and other members of the community in promoting the interests of the school.

(School Management Teams, 2000)

Principals as leaders and managers are needed to mentor others and help them to learn.

2.4 MODELS OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT

Various writers have presented many different theories of educational management. Cuthbert (1984: 39) describes the study of management as an eclectic pursuit. Bush (1995: 24) has classified the main theories and approaches into six major models of education, namely: formal, Collegial, Political, Subjective, Ambiguity and Cultural.

2.4.1 Bureaucratic/Formal Model

Bureaucratic models emphasise the official structure of the organisation, with recognised and accepted relationships between members. The organisation is hierarchal, vertical rather than horizontal. Generally the bureaucratic model has explicit goals, which guide decisions taken in an institution. The authority of the leaders is vested in them by virtue of their position and they are accountable to their superior. Principals are accountable for every aspect of the school. The limitations of the formal model are:

- Their emphasis on goals, which are not always easily attainable or measurable or identifiable.
- Decisions are assumed to be taken by means of a rational process when in practice decisions are often based on experience.
- The contribution of the individual is often ignored.
- Vertical hierarchy presumes that the leaders are most competent.
- The leaders assumed compliance from the organisation.

The past education system of SA was dominated by the formal models of management. Formal structure, rational decision-making and top-down leadership were regarded as the central concepts of effective management and attention was given to refining these processes to increase efficiency. Senior staff determined institutional goals and teachers support was taken for granted.

2.4.2 Collegial Model

A collegial model emphasise that power and decision-making should be shared among members of the organisation. Authority in the institution depends on specialist expertise and not position. The limitations of the collegial model are:

- Decision-making is slow and cumbersome;
- The effectiveness of collegiality depends in part on the attitudes of staff. If staff actively support participation then it may succeed, if they display apathy it will fail.

2.4.3 Political Model

A political model focuses on group activities rather than the institution as a whole and interaction between groups is one of the essential aspects. The political model is concerned with interest groups and interests which are personal, professional and political. They recognise and stress the existence of conflict within institutions and capacity of individuals to confront one another. Goals are a central feature because they are unstable and highly contested. Decisions are only reached after a complex process of bargaining and negotiation, and are determined according to the complex power relationships within the organisation. Limitations of this model include:

- The focus is on the formulation of policy rather than implementation;
- Too much prominence is accorded to interest groups rather than the institution;
- Too much emphasis on conflict and too little on collaboration.

2.4.4 Subject Model

The subjective model focuses on individuals, their different backgrounds, experiences and values rather than on the institution. This model depend on the different meanings ascribed to events by individuals, and these are often confused with organisational objectives. The organisation takes its structure through the members. Limitations are:

- strongly normative in that they reflect the attitudes and beliefs of their supporters.
- there is no clearly defined character to the organisation.
- there are no guidelines for management other than their own ideas and experiences.

2.4.5 Ambiguity Model

The ambiguity model emphasises that organisations are unstable and unpredictable. The goals of the organisation are used to justify any behaviour. This model is fragmented and unstructured, as there are problems regarding the power of the processes within the institution. Participation in management varies and decisions are frequently unplanned. The ambiguity model assumes that problems are foremost and, thus, should dominate and that other theories underestimate the complexity surrounding decision-making. Limitation are as follows:

- An exaggeration of the problem in institutions;
- Being inappropriate in stable institutions or in times of stability in institutions;
- Offer little practical guidance to leaders in educational institutions.

2.4.6 Cultural Model

The cultural model emphasises the informal rather than the official aspects of organisations. Ceremonies and rituals are common and they assume the existence of heroes and heroines who personify the values and beliefs of the organisation. These figures help to sustain the unity of the

organisation. The school culture is expressed through its goals and reflected in its structure. Limitations of this model include:

- The values of leaders may be illegitimately imposed on others.
- Subcultures may emerge which are inconsistent with predominant culture.
- The overemphasis of ceremonies and rituals detract from essential functions.

Two of the models namely formal and collegial might help us in particular to understand management in the past in South Africa, and the new approach, which has much in common with the collegial model. The collegial model is dealt with in more detail in the following paragraphs.

2.5 Collegial Model of Management

Collegial model includes all those theories, which emphasise that power and decision-making should be shared among some or all members of the organisation. These approaches range from a “restricted” collegiality where the leader shares power with a limited number of senior colleagues to “pure” collegiality where all members have an equal voice in determining policy (Bush, 1995:52).

“Collegial models assume that organisations determine policy and make decisions through a process of discussion leading to consensus. Power is shared among some or all members of the organisation who are thought to have a mutual understanding about the objectives of the institution” (Bush, 1995:52).

This definition highlights the central features of collegiality in that it is assumed that decisions are made through a process of discussion leading to consensus, power is shared among members of the organisation, and the objectives of the institution are thought to be mutually agreed upon. Collegiality is a unifying thread that holds everyone together, co-ordinating their efforts, increasing understanding and supporting the school spirit (Cunningham and Gresso, 1993: 107).

Cunningham and Gresso (1993: 100) believe that collegiality results in comfort and trust allowing each member of a group to feel safe. Members are comfortable sharing successes and failures, happiness and sadness, problems and opportunities, good things and bad, as well as hopes and fears. Collegiality promotes respect more effectively than power, authority, knowledge or experience. Collegiality exists when each member feels free and encouraged to participate, and when members feel that they share equality in influencing the group.

2.5.1 Major Features of Collegiality

According to Bush (1995: 53-55) collegial models have the following major features:

- ☞ They are strongly normative reflecting how institutions should be managed, not necessarily what takes place in them, it is an idealistic model.
- ☞ Authority in the institution depends on specialist expertise and not position. Authority originates from knowledge and skills and not from position (ie it is an authority of expertise). Collegial models assume that professionals have a right to share in the wider decision-making process and need to collaborate for effective teaching and learning.

“The claim inherent in professionalism to self-determination in the exercise of professional functions was extended beyond the area of strictly professional competence in the sphere of general into the sphere of general organisational planning and its detailed execution. The extension of the dominant professional ethic to the administration of a large organisation implied the right of status equals to be respected and consulted”

(Noble and Pyn, 1970: 433).

Cunningham and Gresso (1993: 19) believe that successful educators spend considerable time developing an effective school culture, since nothing can be accomplished if the culture works against needed reform. Time and effort are spent building and supporting a strong and functional educational culture focussed on improving educational performance and effectiveness. Culture building requires that school leaders give attention to the informal, subtle and symbolic aspects

of life, which shape the beliefs and actions of each employee within the system. The task of leadership is to create and support the culture necessary to foster an attitude of effectiveness in everything done within the school. Once this attitude is achieved and supported by culture, all other aspects of the organisation will fall in line.

Campbell and Southworth (in Bennet and Crawford, 1993: 66) believe that in order for a culture of collaboration to exist, it needs to be built on four interacting beliefs viz. individuals are valued as people, valued for their contribution to one another, valued for their interdependence as a group and valued for their interdependence as a team. The Task Team on Education Management (Department of Education, 1996: 51) highlights working together, sharing information and expertise, as consistent with an open democratic education service.

- ☞ Staff members share the same educational goals and values. It is assumed that the members of the organisation have a common set of values, which guide the activities of the organisation to shared educational objectives. This assumption is used to justify how it is possible to reach agreement on goals and policy. According to Campbell (1989:76) collaboration relies not only on the ability of staff to meet together and share equipment and information, it also rests upon staff sharing common beliefs.
- ☞ Decisions are reached by consensus rather than division or conflict. Decisions are imposed but made by the very people whose lives are affected by them. Informal staff consultation is regarded as collegiality. Imposing decisions on staff is considered morally repugnant and inconsistent with the notion consent.
- ☞ The size of the decision-making group is very important. Groups need to be sufficiently small to enable everyone to participate. If the staff is large, there needs to be formal representation on decision-making bodies.

2.5.2 Application of Collegiality in a Secondary School Situation

The introduction of the collegial model in secondary schools has been slower, less complete and more piecemeal than in higher education. The tradition of all-powerful heads with authority over

staff and accountability to external bodies has stifled several attempts to develop participative modes of management. The formal position is that heads alone are responsible for the organisation and management of schools. This consideration has acted as a brake on some heads that wish to share their power and as a convenient justification for those reluctant to share power (Bush, 1995: 56).

In the 1990's collegiality has become the most appropriate way to manage schools and in particular, primary schools (Campbell and Southworth *op cit.* p.62). Little (1990) in (Bush 1995: 60) refer to it as a “demanding approach that requires commitment from staff.. and is an elusive model to operate even when staff is committed to the concept”.

In large schools, there is a need for sub-units/groups in order for staff to have formal representation on decision-making bodies, and there is the assumption that staff has formal representation on such bodies (Bush, 1995).

Research was conducted by Bush (1995: 57) at Churchfields High School in West Bromwich where the principal was committed in collegiality and had introduced several participative elements. Several collegial features were found in the school. Staff had ample formal representation within the decision-making structure and decisions were usually reached by consensus. Despite his good intentions, the principal recognised that the school was not collegial. “What was happening at Churchfields appears to be evolution towards collegiality not yet collegiality itself”. (Bush, 1995: 59).

2.5.3 Advantages of Collegiality

According to Bush (1995: 58) there are three main advantages of collegiality:

- ☞ The evidence that teachers wish to participate more fully in the management of their schools. Davies (1983) found that there is evidence that teachers wish to participate in the management of their institutions. This was supported by research conducted at Churchfields High School in West Bromwich (Bush, 1995).

- ☞ The quality of decision-making is likely to be better when staff participate in the process as it increases the experience and expertise brought in to solve the problem.
- ☞ Staff participation is important as they usually have the responsibility of implementing any changes.

According to Cunningham and Gresso (1993: 118) collegiality works best when it eliminates the capricious and inconsistent use of power over less powerful members. Collegiality does not require confrontation or conforming behaviours, but allows for open discussion and consensus. It employs personal power, not positional power. Positional power is temporarily set aside, since the group member communicates and co-operates in the spirit of caring for one another and the vision of the organisation. It changes interaction from those that arouse distrust and disrespect to those that are based on mutual trust, support, and feeling of personal worth. With collaboration, people do not try to defeat one another and the organisation, but work with colleagues towards success.

2.5.4 Limitations of Collegiality

According to Bush (1995: 67) the main limitations of collegiality are:

- ☞ It is so normative it obscures reality.
- ☞ Decision-making is slow and cumbersome. Meetings are often lengthy with issues often ending unresolved. Time and patience needs to be invested, and this is usually after hours when staff are tired as noted by Bush (1995) in Churchfield High School, Campbell and Southworth (1993: 63).
- ☞ There is no guarantee of unanimity of outcome after participation and debate. It is unrealistic to assume that consensus can be reached as the model undermines the significance of conflict.
- ☞ Tension that exists between different styles of management, as positional authority often surpasses the authority of expertise in reality.

- ☞ The accountability of leaders to external bodies or councils often leads to conflict as it is difficult to defend policies that have emerged but do not enjoy the support of the leader, and difficult to establish who is responsible for policy. There is also the possibility of conflict between internal and external bodies.
- ☞ Staff participation needs to be an adequate level for collegiality to be effective. When staff attitudes are not supportive, it will fail. Campbell and Southworth (*op.cit.*, p.64) question the desire of staff to work collaboratively.
- ☞ The heads play a vital role and collegiality depends ultimately on them. If they so choose, they can limit the scope of collegiality as diminishing their power, and perhaps ultimately their identity (Campbell and Southworth, *op.cit.*, p.63). The quality of management depends on personal and professional qualities of those that lead and manage (Campbell and Southworth).

2.5.5 Further Criticism And Limitations of Collegial Model

- ☞ Hargreaves in Bennet *et al.* (1994) argues that collegiality can be ‘contrived’ by administrative structures. He describes contrived collegiality as administratively regulated, fixed in time and place, not spontaneous, compulsory or voluntary, designed to be predictable not unpredictable, and not necessarily development oriented but structured for implementation by the leader rather than the participants. He believed that this led with genuine collegiality, describing it as spontaneous, voluntary, unpredictable, informal, without time constraints and geared towards development. If collegiality is mandatory, he suggests that it made it difficult for teachers to make individual adjustments to circumstances and children. He cautions of the system, which gives responsibility for development and implementation to individual schools where this could be manipulated.
- ☞ Campbell and Southworth (1993:62) believe the term collegiality is used to mean different things at different schools and contest that its advocates give precedence to the its advantages and not the practical problems encountered in implementation.
- ☞ Referring particularly to the South African context, the Task Team on Education Management (1996: 51) recognises that collaborative working and sharing of information has not been common practice in this country.

Despite shortcomings and other criticism Bush (1995) believes collegiality is an ideal model likely to become significant in education management.

2.6 TECHNIQUES TO BE USED BY A SCHOOL MANAGER TO ENHANCE TRANSFORMATION

2.6.1 Collegial Relationship

Building of effective teams is a major responsibility of the principal and other senior staff. Effective teams are necessary for the continued growth, development and day-to-day management of an organisation. The Senior Management Team (SMT) should create the environment where people feel they want to give extra discretionary effort. The school needs to develop a sense of identity. The sense of direction, belonging and identity are central to every team (Fraser and Neville, 1993:3-7).

According to Cunningham and Gresso (1993:43-44) participants enter a group with many highly developed perspectives and talents. Through collegiality, the team learns how to respect, appreciate and foster the individual identities of group members. Building a collegial group composed of diverse talents and perspectives requires a special sensitivity to make each person feel like a value and appreciated contributor. The group should develop a sense of mutual, shared responsibility. Team members cannot work toward a desired outcome until they have formed a sense of team spirit and learned to trust and support one another.

Trust is the foundation upon which school effectiveness is built. An effective work culture cannot develop unless trust exists within the organisation. Trust allows a rich culture to develop, and allows individuals to achieve their full potential. Trust develops as people expose themselves, share and take risks together. Trust tends to reduce fear of dependency on others and eliminates the potentially negative effects of conflicts (Cunningham and Gresso, 1993: 120). Cuthbert and Mc Donough (1985) see trust as the fundamental cement that binds an organisation together, facilitating good communication, rectifying badly timed actions, making goal attainment possible and creating the conditions for organisational success. Effective

collegial relations develop within the organisation only when all levels within an organisation have opportunities to come together at the beginning of the project. No party can be given a monopoly if a collegial relation is to develop (Cunningham and Gresso, 1993). The principal is expected to ensure that a collegial relation prevails within the school.

2.6.2 Collaborative Power Sharing

Collaborative power sharing arises as staff members learn to make the most of their collective capacity to run the day-to-day affairs of their school and solve problems. If teachers are involved in the running of the school, they are challenged in a number of ways, such as learning new ways of doing things and even values and attitudes often, lack of involvement results in fear and uncertainty which induce reluctance to change even if the fruits of change may be somehow desired.

Chalker (1992) agrees that collaborative power is of utmost significance if the school must succeed. He further comments that this form of power is unlimited because it enhances the productivity of the school on behalf of the students. His other view is that whereas top-down leadership may have a role in managing a school, a principal as collaborative leader has to find the right balance between top-down and bottom-up so that the school meets its challenges. His conclusion is that schools that are moving closer to the collaborative end of the power continuum are the ones that will succeed.

Roe and Drake (1980: 106) however, warn that participation and power sharing does not mean that a faculty needs to get together every time a decision is made. That in itself, they believe, would be poor leadership. The main objective in participative decision-making is to reach consensus.

Collaborative is, therefore, seen as reducing the chances of misunderstanding for all parties that are presented with information on which preferences of colleagues are based. According to Tate (1999:74) staff needs to be educated in the consensus based management process. This education would incorporate an understanding that each individual cannot unilaterally determine the

solution to decisions but can contribute to consensus being reached. It would also need to develop an understanding that shared participation leads to shared responsibility. Principals need to know that the principal who shares power with teachers is still a leader. This principal is a more effective instructional leader because empowered teachers are more likely to maximize their potential.

2.6.3 Motivation of Teachers

Sergiovanni (1987) argues that because of his/her position as a leader, the principal is best suited for staff motivation. He is the focal point of staff motivation and is also staff morale booster.

Sergiovanni (1987) argues that successful principals inspire confidence and enthusiasm in their teachers. Using group processes such as discussions, brainstorming sessions and sharing the chairing of staff development meetings, the principal listens to his teachers' needs and appears to have skills to take the initiative to sympathise with the teachers. The principal feels strongly when it comes to ensuring recognition of needs of his teachers. He becomes frequently critical of the restraints imposed by the Education Department and of inadequate resources.

If the teachers are motivated, committed, highly valued and working as a team, as then they will operate more effectively and find greater job satisfaction (Campbell and Southworth, 1993). Their knowledge, skills and qualities will then be utilised to the optimum. In order to achieve this motivation and team spirit, transparency, fairness, consultation, participation, trust, recognition of areas of expertise, valuing of initiative, recognition and tolerance of differences, clear and agreed upon goals, all need to be developed (Bush, 1995, Campbell, 1994).

Wood *et al.* (1985) see the principal as well placed to exercise more influence on the teaching and learning in their schools than any other individual. Among their other responsibilities, is staff motivation for good results. Wood *et al.* (1985) is convinced that teachers who are involved in decision-making that affects their jobs are motivated to implement those decisions.

2.6.4 Teacher Empowerment

Good relations are essential for effective change (Makau, 1994) and it is important that relations with teachers, who have the responsibility to implement these changes, are highly prized (Bush, 1995). Teachers need to have a sense of empowerment and need to be encouraged to participate in the changes.

“Empowering... involves releasing the potential of individuals - allowing them to flourish and grow, to release their capacity for infinite improvement”.

(West-Burnham, 1992:112).

Maeroff (1980) sees the teacher as a critical factor in student education. The conviction is that developing teachers as classroom instructors and giving them a greater voice in the decisions that affect the school will make teaching more effective. Teachers are empowered in a number of ways one of which is staff development. Needless to say, for teachers to be successful educators during transformation, they need to undergo some kind of development and training. Teachers are the key to all education and schooling. The *South African Schools Act* (No.84 of 1996) supports this view.

Leith, Wood, Bagley and Cousins (1992) affirm that school leaders help create useful staff development directly by providing the needed resources and indirectly, by fostering a staff commitment and a supportive collegial environment.

Barbules (1986) sees the function of the principal, *inter alia*, as teachers empowerment through programmes that set out to help teachers to become better. Barbules (1986) also shares the view that by raising their morale, deepening their intellectual background, and giving them access to decision-making, teachers would gain the confidence to conduct themselves professionally as they carry out their instructional activities.

Steyn (1998,18 (3): 132) argues that principals could save themselves a lot of time and create a tremendous culture of delegation, which could be seen as a complement to teachers’

involvement.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1982) remark that changing from the top-down approach to allowing teachers' access to collaborate in power sharing means "building the ladder they may climb" to escape isolation and gain the overview of their professional task and expectations that they usually do not attain. By doing this, the principal is actually empowering his/her teachers to feel free to make constructive decisions.

The changes proposed by the Task Team on Education Management (1996:28) suggest that the support needed for effective self management in schools will come primarily from the education system and in particular from staff, and that it is important to develop the capacity to manage change.

"Self-management must be accompanied by an internal devolution of power within the school and in transformational leadership.

Department of Education, 1996:2)

2.6.5 Open Information System

Management through participation, as proposed by the Task Team, is described as part of a 'new approach' with the purpose of improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools. West-Burnham (1993) describes a quality school as one, which is "restless, constantly questioning, never satisfied, and believing that things can always be better". The effectiveness of communication between groups and individuals is crucial in this regard (West-Burnham, 1992: 89).

Leonard (1989: 24) claims that under present day conditions, information has to be shared much more widely. In the context of the school, changes with regard to National and Provincial policy documents, the school procedures, role and resource allocation are all aspects of change that need to be communicated to the necessary constituencies. This may be done through regular meetings, workshops, and rotation of policy documents to members of staff. These are important procedures to enhance open communication systems where people can express their thoughts and

feelings freely. By working together in this way, the principles of transparency, accountability and trust are promoted. Cunningham and Gresso (1993: 46) believe that unless those who are employed within the organization have easy access to important information, they will not be able to use their abilities effectively.

In a collegial group, flexible patterns of communication are used so that all members feel free to participate equally and at will. Minority opinions are encouraged and understood.

Individuals know and understand one another, and are sensitive to each other's ideas and reactions. There is a level of trust and mutual respect that results in members dealing candidly with one another without fear of harmful effects. Doubts, resistance and concerns are discussed and resolved so that each member feels comfortable.

“Resistance to change flourishes where there is poor communication, little or no active participation and involvement in decisions and where tensions are allowed to simmer unchecked. To overcome such resistance, it is necessary that there be open lines of communication participation and involvement of all stakeholders, and on atmosphere of facilitation, support, negotiation and agreement”.

Task Team Report, 1996: 32).

27 CONCLUSION

This chapter has reviewed literature about collegiality and transformation role of the principal. The approach described requires an involvement and commitment from staff in order to bring about effective change. West Burnham *et al* (1995) suggest that a collegial model is difficult to implement even when staff are committed to it. The following chapter looked on the teachers' perception of the management and structure at the school and its effectiveness, thereby indicating whether or not this theory has impacted on the practice at the school.

CHAPTER THREE

RATIONALE FOR PROMOTING COLLEGIAL MANAGEMENT SELF-REPORTING BY THE DEPUTY PRINCIPAL

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The main task of managers and leaders is to ensure that the organisation works well. They need to set directions and get people to work towards shared goals effectively and willingly. Whilst management is often regarded as essentially a practical activity, theory can indeed be significant in the development of effective practice (West-Burnham *et al*, 1995). In this chapter the deputy principal (researcher) identifies links between theory and practice and highlights how decision-making fulfils a decisive role in management, as without it, there will be no planning, organising or control.

3.2 DECISION MAKING AND EDUCATION

In support of statements by West-Burnham (1993) it is the quality of decision-making and the way in which the implementation of decisions is managed, which makes or breaks an education system.

It is clear to the deputy principal that teachers also have a desire to participate in decision-making; and the SMT should not follow an autocratic style of management. Since different people hold different sets of values, which provides the standards for judgement, decisions will differ. Some staff members will challenge decisions made by SMT, especially if they hold different values. Participative decision-making where everybody has some input will facilitate a pleasant work climate and work satisfaction.

It is obvious to the deputy principal that effective school managers establish and support the conditions needed to ensure high productivity for themselves, their teaching staff and the schools as a whole.

The deputy principal believed that management of the school needed to embrace consultation,

participation, transparency, recognition and sharing of expertise, and clearly defined agreed upon goals in order to accommodate the professionalism as well as the personal circumstances of each tender (Bush, West-Burnham).

As each teacher realises they are of immense worth in a professional and personal capacity, enthusiasm and classroom performance is immediately enhanced (Campbell and Southworth). For successful implementation of changes, it is essential that good staff relations are established and maintained (Makau) and that provision and encouragement is there for them to participate in the changes.

A more collegial approach sees a shift away from the formal top-down management approach practised in many schools, to one where greater participation is encouraged, and an authority of expertise is recognised (Bush, 1995). The success of collegiality depends largely on creating opportunities for participation, and then creating a climate between management and staff whereby teachers choose to be involved in the running of the school and decision-making (Davies, 1983).

The deputy principal wishes to encourage the utilization of communication by educational leaders to make contact, inform, interpret, explain, express feelings, exchange ideas, give orders and solve problems in order to improve quality of teaching and learning. The task of school managers which includes the principal, the deputy principal, heads of departments and educators is to create and develop a culture that enables committed educators and learners to do their work.

The researcher had studied academic literature on collegial management models in the year 2001, after she was appointed as deputy principal of Gcewu Secondary School in 1998. The researcher had tried to promote collegiality within the school working in collaboration with the principal.

3.3 APPLICATION OF COLLEGIALITY AT THE SCHOOL

Certain structures were already in place at Gcewu Secondary School to allow for such changes. Time for weekly staff meeting was already allocated to each Friday and each Monday for weekly departmental meetings. While the deputy principal saw the necessity to fulfil a professional

leadership role herself, she hoped to facilitate opportunities for heads of departments to assist in this regard and make this an ongoing collaborative process. The deputy principal saw aspects of her role as providing professional guidance and facilitating discussions.

It was important that systems and structures were put in place in order that each staff member was familiar with opportunities available and that communication channels were open. The Friday meetings became opportunities for staff development as well as discussion and decision-making meetings. The disadvantage of these staff meetings was the time restraints, having to be conducted during break time due to the fact that staff members were not willing to attend staff meeting after school hours. Bush (1995) noted that in Churchfields High School staff meetings were held after hours when the staff was tired.

The notice board in the staff room was used for daily notices to keep the staff informed of important daily activities. As the school had only 17 academic staff it was not necessary to adopt representative collegiality (Bush, 1995: 54) as the size of the staff was sufficiently small to manage the whole staff as a group. The SMT (comprising of the principal, deputy principal and three heads of departments) meet once a week after school before the staff meeting. The SMT was joined the following day by the entire staff to participate in decision-making. Every member was given the opportunity to be involved. Almost all decisions were taken in these staff meetings. Almost no decisions were taken without consultation. Staff participated in school policy decisions like homework, discipline, staff appraisal and classroom policy. Learners were involved in formulating class rules to prevent misunderstanding.

The weekly staff meeting was frequently substituted by staff development meetings conducted by one head of department when there were not lengthy matters to discuss. It became the practice that any staff member who had attended a workshop would provide a feedback to the staff. "The team that trains together develops together" (West-Burnham, 1993: 132).

The delegation of responsibility for academic work goes to the heads of departments. It is up to them to keep abreast with proposals for curricular development and to establish communication within their departments. Class educators are largely responsible for the compilation of learners'

records under the HOD's supervision. The heads of departments have the task of welding the members of staff in their departments into a team.

All members of staff have their duties clearly spelt out to them. Their performance is monitored regularly; they are supported and assisted when necessary, and praised when good work has been done. The SMT works together in planning, developing and maintaining school organisational records such as the school's year plan, timetables and duty rosters. Each member of the SMT has a clearly defined portfolio to manage.

The deputy principal is proud that all staff members are given the opportunity to participate in the management and administration of the school, without reference to the educator's post level. This has fostered a spirit of teamwork and collaboration and that has created a positive school climate. All educators feel empowered and motivated, as they are involved in decision-making and management aspects of the school's activities.

In 2001, the school entered the process of drafting formal statements of values, procedures, policies and rules for the school.

- ☞ A code of conduct was drafted by the staff members together with input from the parents and learners through the Governing Body representative. This was presented to the general parents' meeting in October 2000 (Gcewu Secondary School Minutes, 2000) where it was debated and approved. This Code of Conduct sets out clearly the disciplinary procedures to be followed in the school.
- ☞ The School's Rules were redrafted by the parents, learners and staff and accepted at this meeting. Clear procedures to be followed were outlined and agreed upon and comply with the department criteria as laid down (Schools Act No. 84, 1996).
- ☞ In September 2001, the school mission statement was reformulated at a Planning Day and a partnership between the school and the community was highlighted.

All these have been published in a small Handbook for learners and educators, which is given to each family and staff member at the beginning of the first term.

3.4 CONCLUSION

The organisational structures reported in the school illustrate an attempt at lateral relationships rather than top-down relationships. The approach described requires an involvement and commitment from staff in order to bring about effective change. West-Burnham *et al.* (1995) pointed out that collegial model is difficult to implement even when staff are committed to it. The following chapter reflects on the teachers' perception of the management and structure at the school and its effectiveness, thereby indicating whether this theory has in fact impacted on the practice at the school.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this was to investigate, largely through the perceptions of staff, the extent to which the management of Gcewu Secondary School may be characterised as “collegial”, and as necessary, to make practical recommendations as to who the management arrangements of the school may be modified or enhanced to promote collegiality more effectively.

4.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The key questions of the study were:

- ☞ What is meant by a collegial approach to management?
- ☞ How does a collegial approach relate to alternative models of management?
- ☞ What is the “official” position on participatory management in the school?
- ☞ What are the perceptions of education in this connection? Note: it was not assumed that respondents are familiar with the term ‘collegiality’).
- ☞ What changes in management approach are thought to be desirable by educators?
- ☞ If necessary, what might be done to modify the school’s management arrangements to promote greater collegiality?

4.3 CASE STUDY SCHOOL

The name of the school under study is Gcewu Secondary School at Umbumbulu District, Durban South Region. It is situated at an area called KwaMahleka. The community on the site of the Ndlovu family built this school. It was then named after Mr Gcewu. The area where this school is, is underdeveloped and therefore has no electricity and the road used is gravel. There is no telephone.

The school starts from Grade 8 up to grade 12. There are 580 learners who are from the surrounding areas, like KwaMahleka, eZigeni, oGagwini and KwaMgugu. Learners travel long distances when coming to school.

The principal is the head of the school, and has only been at Gcewu for about three years. Then, there is a deputy principal (the researcher), three heads of departments and twelve staff (post level 1).

The following learning areas are offered: Language, Literacy and Communication (LLC main and LLC additional) Natural Sciences (NS), Technology (Tech), Life Orientation (LO), Arts and Culture (A&C), Mathematics Literacy, Mathematical and Mathematics Sciences (MLMMS), Economics and Management Sciences (EMS) and Human and Social Sciences (HSS) for Grade 8 to 9. For Grades 10 to 12 the following subjects are offered: isiZulu, English, Afrikaans, Agricultural Science, Physical Science, Mathematics, Biology, Geography, Economics, Accounting and Business Economics.

4.4 RESEARCH METHODS

The research methods proposed for this study were straightforward and relate directly to the key questions, identified earlier.

Questions 1 and 2 were answered by reference to a review of the relevant literature. Question 3 was addressed through a semi-structured interview with the school's principal and the heads of departments. The interview schedule itself was designed by drawing on key indicators of collegiality derived from the literature. The interview was tape-recorded to facilitate subsequent analysis.

Questions 4 and 5 were addressed through a series of open and closed items in a self-completion questionnaire by educators (post level 1.) The questionnaire items were derived also from the key indicators suggested in the literature. The option of follow-up interviews for further clarification on responses to open-ended items was reserved. Question 6 was answered both by reference to

the findings of research and by further reference to the literature, should it need to be addressed. It was hoped that the answers to this question might be framed as practical planning proposals.

4.5 RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

According to Schumacher and McMillan (1993: 153) there are various approaches used to gather quantitative information. These are: questionnaire, tests, interviews and observations.

The researcher aimed to gather data using two instruments, which were believed to be the most appropriate instruments taking into consideration time, expense and most importantly, the potential reliability of these instruments. It is for this reason that a written questionnaire and a semi-structured interview were used. In this chapter an account will be made as to why a particular method of gathering data was used in one setting and not in the other.

4.5.1 Questionnaire

In this research the questionnaire was used as a tool for research. A 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 (Soer, 1997: 107-108). The nature of questionnaire as a research tool is such that control remains in the hands of the respondents and is completed by him/her in his or her own time. They 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 (Johnson, 1994: 34).

The questionnaire has many advantages over other tools of information gathering. One advantage is that it saves time, as it can take only about one hour for the educator to complete, thus not infringing too much of their time. It can afford a good measure of objectivity in soliciting and coding of responses. It allows for uniformity in the way questions are asked, thus ensuring greater comparability in the response (Mahlangu, 1987: 84-85).

Questionnaires too, have disadvantages that must be borne in mind when using them. They have

a poor rate of return, opportunities for asking questions for clarification purposes are limited and chances for personal interaction are limited. Opportunity for probing responses is minimised and it may be expensive to administer in terms of large volume of printing work and postage, whilst at the time, less responses can be expected (Cohen and Manion, 1989: 308).

4.5.1.1 Types of Questionnaires

The basic objective of questionnaire is to obtain facts and opinions about a phenomenon from people who are informed on the particular issue. Different types of questionnaires can be distinguished, such as mailed or posted questionnaires, telephonic questionnaires, personal administered questionnaires and group administered questionnaires.

In this study the researcher opted for personal administered questionnaires. The rationale for this type of questionnaire was that they are more flexible than mailed questionnaires. This enabled the researcher to explain certain questions to the respondents with a view to eliminate uncertainties and misinterpretation of certain questions.

4.5.1.2 Types of Questions

Two types of questions can be distinguished closed-ended types and open-ended types.

Closed-Ended Type

In this type the respondent is offered ready-made alternative questions from which to choose his response. According to Ary, Jacobs and Razavlei (1972: 169) this type minimises the risk of misinterpretations, the administration and scoring of such types of questionnaire is straight forward and the result lend themselves readily to analysis.

Open-Ended Type

This kind calls for open-ended responses. The respondent is free to express his ideas, beliefs and

feelings, as he/she does not choose from predetermined answers. The disadvantages are that responses are sometimes difficult to score and analyse and some information given may sometimes fail to achieve the objectives of the study.

In constructing the questionnaire, the questions were both closed-ended and open-ended types. The questions were formulated according to the objectives of the study and were subdivided into four sections (Appendix B).

The researcher considered the following factors in formulating the questionnaire:

The first section, A of the questionnaire, was concerned with background data of the staff namely, position held at school and number of years in the teaching profession. The second section, B, focussed on involvement of educators in decision-making. The third section, C and D, focussed on the implications of educator involvement in decision-making.

The fourth section, E was to provide staff with the opportunity to contribute in a qualitative way to the issue under discussion, and to identify areas of concern for the future.

All 12 members of the staff were issued with a questionnaire. The researcher, though the deputy principal of the school and thus a staff member, did not complete a questionnaire.

4.5.2 Interview Schedule

In collecting the data for the study in the selected school, semi-structured interviews were preferred because it is a style most favoured in small-scale projects. It allows the limited number of interviewees to gain confidence and its flexible style can be adapted to the personality and circumstances of the people being interviewed (Johnson, 1994).

As the nature of the study requires an in-depth discussion rather than the provision of curt answers, a less formal approach allows the researcher to probe and elicit a fuller response by allowing the respondents to talk at length. Further, the researcher is able to maintain the

sequence of the interview questions and there is scope for questions to be repeated or simplified, unlike in the case of a formal interview.

Permission for research access was obtained from the principal prior to the interviews and the nature of the enquiry was explained to each interviewee. Time for interview appointments were mutually arranged. Confidentiality of the interviews was assured and a feedback of the research. Although each interview was scheduled to be approximately thirty minutes in duration, where necessary, respondents were allowed the flexibility of more time.

The researcher interviewed each respondent and all were asked the same ten questions during the interviews. The questions used in each interview were devised from the themes, which emerged from the literature in the previous chapter and focussed on the areas for research. All responses were immediately tape-recorded during the interview (see Appendix C for interview schedule).

4.6 DATA ANALYSIS

Both descriptive and content analysis was used in processing data for this empirical study. Descriptive statistics is the most fundamental way to summarize data and it is indispensable in interpreting the results of quantitative analysis (Schumacher and Millan, 1993: 192).

Descriptive analysis was used for close-ended questions, sections B, C and D, the primary data was in the form of response categories: yes/no (see-attached appendix for questionnaire). The score of similar responses were calculated as well as percentages for each category. The descriptive analysis was then employed for quantitative analysis of data. Content analysis was performed on responses to open-ended questions (section E). In this type of data analysis respondents focussed on an actual event in which they gave account on what they actually do under what circumstances.

This type of analysis was found suitable because of the dynamic nature of the role of the principal. The data was categorised according to the themes and then tabulated to show the

frequency with each theme appeared.

4.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter gave a description of the research instruments that were used to collect data. This chapter also outlined the research questions, descriptive of case study school and describes how questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were administered. In the next chapter a detailed analysis and interpretation of data will be discussed which will form the basis for suggestions in chapter 5.

CHAPTER FIVE

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This study aimed to investigate, largely through the perceptions of staff, the extent to which the management of Gcewu Secondary School may be characterised as “collegial”. It also sought to assess the principal’s understanding of his role in promoting collegiality within the school. A structured questionnaire with both open-ended and closed-ended questions was administered on educators in order to solicit information from them about their perceptions regarding practices of collegiality in their school. A semi-structured interview was also conducted with the school’s principal and head of departments.

In this chapter, data collected from educators, HOD’s and principal (SMT) was presented and analysed to obtain their views on collegial management. Tables were used to present data. The discussion of the data closely follows the sub-headings found in the questionnaires.

5.2. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EDUCATORS

The questionnaire for educators consisted of four sections, and the data collected was presented according to the questionnaire format.

5.2.1 Presentation of Section A - General Information

The researcher needed information from respondents regarding experiences and position they hold at the school. The following responses were recorded:

Table 1: Position held at School

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Educators | 12 |
| Total | 12 |

The majority of educators who participated in the survey were teachers (post level one) (12). Their participation helps in presenting a balanced view of their perceptions in general.

Table 2: Experiences of Respondents

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| 1-5 | 01 |
| 6-10 | 07 |
| 11-15 | 03 |
| 21-25 | 01 |
| Above | - |
| Total | 12 |

The majority of educators (07) had more than 5 years experience, and (01) had below 5 years experience. It is worth noting that the majority of educators were above 5 years experience, they have been in the educational field for a considerable time, and are still energetic and can bring about some changes and transformation in the education landscape.

5.2.2 Presentation of Section B of the Questionnaire

This section asked for information that would throw light on whether or not educators are involved in decision making in the school.

Statement 1: Educators should have a say in the decisions relating to the management of their school.

Table 3: Educators should have a say in managerial decisions

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Yes | 12 |
| No | - |

Table 3 shows that 12 educators agree with the statement that educators should have a say in the decisions relating to the management of their school. This correlates with Fullan (1992) who states that a principal who permits his/her teachers to share in the decision-making even though he/she has no formal obligation to do so, is letting them know that she/he values their judgement and recognises them as his colleagues in the common educational endeavour. Fullan concludes that teachers who work with such a principal will regard him/her as a colleague who seeks not to invade their professional prerogatives, but to enlist their full co-operation in accomplishing organisational objectives.

Statement 2: My principal creates opportunities for professional growth of his staff members.

Table 4: The principal should create opportunities for staff professional growth

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Yes | 11 |
| No | 01 |
| Total | 12 |

Table 4 indicated that a cumulative number of respondents (11) agreed that the principal creates opportunities for professional growth and 01 did not agree. Leithwood, Begley and Cousins (1993: 141) affirms that school leaders help create useful staff development directly, by providing the needed resources, and indirectly by fostering a staff commitment and a supportive environment.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1982) remark that changing from top-down approach to allowing teachers access to collaborative power-sharing means 'building the ladder they may climb' to escape isolation and gain the overview of their entire professional task and expectations that they

usually do not attain. By doing this, the principal is actually empowering his/her teachers to feel free to make constructive decisions.

Statement 3: My principal is willing to share power with teachers.

Table 5: Sharing of power with teachers

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Yes | 04 |
| No | 08 |
| Total | 12 |

In response to this question 08 respondents were not happy with the level at which the principal shares power with teachers. 04 respondents were happy with the principal's willingness to share power with staff.

The issue of power sharing in South African Schools in general is a challenge. The country has emerged from a very centralised, top-down education system; managers and principals in school and the whole educational system are called upon to be consultative and democratic. The South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 is the framework along which power in schools needs to be shared.

Statement 4: Involvement in managerial decision-making will contribute to professional development or empowerment of educators.

Table 6: Educators Involvement in Decision-Making

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Yes | 12 |
| No | - |
| Total | 12 |

According to these responses, educators believe that involvement in managerial decision-making

will contribute to professional development or empowerment of educators. This table shows that 12 respondents affirm that the involvement of educators in managerial decision-making will contribute towards professional development or empowerment of educators.

Barbules (1986) sees the function of the principal among other things as teacher empowerment through programmes that set out to help teachers to become better. Barbules also shares the view that by raising their moral, deepening their intellectually empowered and would gain the confidence to conduct themselves professionally as they carry out their instructional activities.

5.2.3 Presentation of Section C of the Questionnaire

Question 1: Who would you regard as making the most of the decisions in your school?

Table 7: Educators Perceptions of School Managerial Decision Making Process

| Response | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Principal | 02 |
| Principal & Management Team | 04 |
| SMT & Staff | 06 |

Table 7 shows that 06 educators regard the management team in consultation with staff, as making most of the decisions in their school. The same table shows that 04 regards the school decisions as being made by the principal and management, while 02 educators regard the principal alone as making most of the decisions of the school.

The finding in the table 7 shows the prevailing situation in school with regard to the decision-making processes. From the findings in table 7, it is remarkable that participative decision-making is taking place, a trend towards decentralization of school management in a democratic South Africa. Bush (1995: 58) states that the quality of decision-making is likely to be better when staff participates in the process as it increases the experience and expertise brought in to solve the problem. Staff participation is important as they usually have the responsibility of implementing any changes.

Question 2: Who in your opinion should be responsible for managerial decision making in a school?

Table 8: Educators' Opinion as to Who Should be Responsible for Managerial Decision-Making in School

| Response | Total |
|--|--------------|
| Principal | - |
| Principal & Management Team | 05 |
| Educators | |
| Educators, Principal & Management Team | 07 |
| Total | 12 |

Table 8 reflects the educator's opinions as to who they actually think should be responsible for managerial decision-making in school. The findings in table 8 show that 07 respondents say that the principal, the management team and the entire staff together, should jointly be responsible for managerial decision-making in school. According to Bush (1995: 52) collegial models assume that organisations determine policy and make decisions through a process of discussion leading to consensus. Power is shared among some or all members of the organisation who are thought to have a mutual understanding about the objectives of the institution.

05 Respondents maintain that the managerial decision-making in school is the responsibility of the principal and the management only. According to Campbell and Southworth (1992: 64) the heads play a pivotal role and collegiality depends ultimately on them. If they so choose, they can limit the scope of collegiality as diminishing their power and perhaps their identity.

Question 3: Would you say that opportunities exist in your school for participation by educators in managerial decision-making?

Table 9: Opportunities for Educators in Decision-Making

| Response | Total |
|----------|-------|
| Yes | 02 |
| Not sure | 01 |
| No | 09 |
| Total | 12 |

Table9 shows that 02 educators agree that opportunities for participation by educators exist in the school while 09 disagree. According to School Management Teams (2000:14) leadership needs to provide opportunities for teachers, learners, parents and community to participate in the smooth running of the school. Leaders are expected to allow people who are involved in the school to take part in making-decisions. By working together in this way, the principles of transparency, accountability and trust are promoted.

Question 4: Do educators in your school meet on formal basis to discuss how management issues of the school as a whole can be improved upon?

Table 10: Formal School Meeting on How Management Can be Improved

| Response | Total |
|------------|-------|
| Often | - |
| Occasional | 10 |
| Never | 02 |
| Total | 12 |

10 members of the staff believed that the educators meet occasionally to discuss the improvement of school management, while 02 educators believed there was no formal staff meeting. Leonard (1989: 24) claims that the under-present conditions, information has to be shared much more widely. This may be done through regular meetings, workshops and rotation of policy documents to members of staff. There are important procedures to enhance open communication system where people can express their thoughts and feelings freely.

Question 5: Does the management staff consult the rest of the staff before decisions regarding school management are made?

Table 11: Consultation of the Staff by the Management Team

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Often | 02 |
| Occasional sure | 09 |
| Never | 01 |
| Total | 12 |

09 members of the staff believe that the educators were consulted before decisions regarding school management are made, while 01 members believe there was no consultation. This implies consultation, although 01 educator shows there was no consultation. According to Task Team Report (1996: 131) resistance to change flourishes where there is poor communication, little or no active participation and involvement in decision-making and where tensions are allowed to simmer unchecked. To overcome such resistance, it is necessary that there be open lines of communication, participation and involvement of all stakeholders and an atmosphere of facilitation, support, negotiation and agreement.

5.2.4 Presentation of Section D of the Questionnaire

Question 1: Does your principal promote mutual trust between him and staff?

Table 12: Mutual Trust Promoted by Principal

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Yes | 08 |
| Not sure | - |
| No | 04 |
| Total | 12 |

An encouragingly high number of educators 08 agreed that the principal promotes mutual trust

between himself and staff while 04 educators disagreed. This indicates that an open and honest relationship exists among staff members and principal. The 04 educators indicate, however, a negative relationship built by principal, which may range from lack of transparency to unfair management practices. One respondent stated in an open-ended question “the principal is biased, he thinks that true teachers are people who are in the management, the others are minor, useless people”. If there is no trust in a relationship, then it is assumed that negative interaction will evolve.

Cuthbert and McDonough (1985) see trust as the fundamental cement that binds an organisation together, facilitating good communication, rectifying badly timed actions, making goal attainment possible and creating the conditions for organisational success. It becomes imperative, therefore, for school principal to model attitudes and behaviour that promotes mutual trust between himself/herself and staff.

Question 2: Does your principal motivate staff to be united?

Table 13: Staff motivation to be united

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Yes | 03 |
| Not sure | 04 |
| No | 05 |
| Total | 12 |

According to Table 13 05 educators think that the principal does not motivate staff to be united, while 03 educators indicated that the principal motivates staff to be united and 04 educators were unsure. It is important that the principal becomes aware that negative interaction with a staff member, can hamper unity among the educators. Cunningham and Gresso (1993: 118) believe that collegiality changes interactions from those that arouse distrust and disrespect to those that are based on mutual trust, support and feeling and of personal worth. With collaboration, people do not try to defeat one another and the organisation, but work with colleagues towards success.

Question 3: How would you describe the teamwork at the school?

Table 14: Teamwork at the school

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Excellent | - |
| Good | - |
| Fair | 04 |
| Poor | 08 |
| Total | 12 |

08 respondents regarded this as poor, while 04 regarded it as fair. One respondent in open-ended question “teamwork is poor because our ideas are opposed by the principal and SMT” Everard and Morris (1985: 182) sees a team as a group of people of people with common objectives, whose members possess different areas of expertise, skills personalities and abilities that complement one another, and who are committed to working together co-operatively on a common shared task and common purpose. West-Burnham (1992), Campbell (1993) and Bush (1995) say if teachers are highly valued and working as a team, then they will operate more effectively and their knowledge, skills and qualities will then be utilised to the optimum.

Effective teamwork is the hallmark of successful learning organisations. If a culture of teamwork and brainstorming has been developed in a school, it is likely that the imagination and creativity of people will be much greater. The task team teams that work together are far more likely to solve particular problems more imaginatively than if a single individual, perhaps the principal, is held responsible for doing everything (Steyn, 1996).

Question 4: How would you describe the management staff’s attitude towards educators participation in decision-making in your school?

Table 15: Attitude of management staff towards educators

| Response | Total |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Positive | 03 |
| Negative | 09 |
| Total | 12 |

This table shows that 09 respondents regard the management staff attitude towards educator's participation in decision-making as being very negative while 03 regard it as being positive. According to Fraser and Neville (1993: 3) the SMT should create the environment where people feel that they want to give extra discretionary effort. Cunningham and Gresso (1993: 19) believe that the task of the leadership is to create and support the culture necessary to foster an attitude of effectiveness in everything done within the school. Once this attitude is achieved and supported by the culture, all other aspects of the organisation will fall in line.

5.2.5 Presentation of Section E of the Questionnaire

Question 1-3

These questions were open-ended and they were designed to give the respondents an opportunity to express their view on the management of their school.

Question 1: To what extent have you observed the practice of collegial (participative) management in Gcewu Secondary School.

Table 16: Response to the Extent of Change to Collegiality

| Response | Total |
|---|--------------|
| Principal and SMT bring already made decisions to educators | 02 |
| Principal is bias | 01 |
| Agreed there has been a shift | 09 |
| Collegiality is limited to SMT | 12 |
| No mutual trust | |

The responses can be divided into three categories:

16. Those who believe that there is no practice of collegiality in the school. The following are reasons that were cited by educators.
 - ☞ The principal and SMT verbally recommend participatory, collegial style of leadership, yet in practice, they exercise authoritarian and bureaucratic style of management.
 - ☞ The principal and SMT often bring decisions to the educators that have been finalised and expect them to accept them without questioning.
 - ☞ The principal is “bias - he thinks that true teachers are people who are in management, the others are minors and useless people.”
 - ☞ There is no mutual trust between the staff and SMT and they suggested that the SMT should not be aloof but should come closer to teacher so that they feel welcome and part of the school.

2. Those who felt that there is practice of collegiality, thus claiming that formal staff meetings were held whereby decisions were unable concerning school time table, extra curriculum activities, examinations and other matters relating to school management. They recommend that their participation in management should not be limited to the classroom, because their greater contact with learners justifies the fact that their roles should be extended beyond teaching duties.

3. This group stated that collegial practice is limited only to SMT and the cause for this is the attitude of management staff towards educators and vice versa.

Question 2: Do you believe educators want to participate in the managerial decisions of a school?

Table 17: Educators Involvement in Decision Making

| Response | Total |
|------------------------|--------------|
| Participation (Yes) | 09 |
| Non-participation (No) | 03 |

Table 17 shows that 09 respondents feel that educators want to participate in the managerial decisions of a school.

Table 18: Themes that emerged from the positive response of question (2) participation Yes) in order of frequency

| Response | Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| Themes | 02 |
| Ownership | 01 |
| Direct Affection | 09 |
| Professional Development | 12 |
| Good human relation | 05 |
| High performance | 04 |
| Democracy | 03 |

The positive response of question 2 leads to the emergency of the themes listed in table 15. These themes account for the respondents' support of the educator involvement in managerial decision-making of a school.

The most prominent theme to emerge was 'ownership'. Six respondents said that if educators are allowed to participate in the decision-making process, they will develop a feeling of a collective enterprise and will have a stake in the future of the enterprise. Other said that such educators would co-operate with decisions and show responsibility towards the implementation of such decisions if they have been part of the decision-making process. Six respondents felt that educators should have a say because they are the ones who will have to implement the decisions.

The second theme is 'professional development'. Five respondents regarded the involvement of educators to decision-making as contributing to their professional development, empowerment and experience. The quote a respondent "educators are the implementers of most operations that are carried out in the school. Teachers feel empowered if they are included in important decision-making". The same number (05) of respondents regarded the involvement of educators as promoting human relations in a school. Four respondents regarded participation of educators

as a means or a contributory factor to effectiveness or high performance. Only three respondents gave a reason for involvement of educators as to “promote transparency and democracy in school”. Other educators regard decisions taken through consultation and consensus as often very effective and positive. The researcher’s experience in the education department tells that the notion of the work place democracy comes about when an educator feels that her basic right to participate in decisions, which affects her, her teaching and her pupils, is respected.

Table 19: Themes that emerged from negative responses of question 2 are grouped in order of frequency in which they were mentioned

| Themes | Frequency |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| Leadership style | 05 |
| Non-empowerment educators | 04 |
| Educators’ attitude | 04 |
| Poor staff relations | 02 |
| Time constraints | 01 |

With regard to table 19, five themes emerged. The most prominent theme to emerge preventing educators from participating in the managerial decision of a school (05) is ‘leadership style’. The following factors grouped under the theme ‘leadership style’ were regarded as being deterrents of successful decision making processes: non-consultation, favouritism, incompetence or insecurity of the principal as well as autocracy or dictatorship.

The second theme that emerged most often in question 2 was non-empowerment of educators. Four respondents regarded educator’s status of non-empowerment as preventing them from participating actively in the school’s decision-making processes. Some respondents referred to the disempowered educators as being incompetent, having a low esteem.

‘Educators’ attitude emerged as the third theme preventing educators from actively participating in decision-making processes (04). Some respondents used concepts such as passiveness of educators, negativity and irresponsibility to describe the attitude of some educators.

Two respondents regarded 'poor staff relations' as another factor preventing educators from actively participating in decision-making process. The final them (01) pertains to time constraints. Some respondents regard the unavailability of time for educators as preventing them from partaking in decision-making processes. They say that educators are overloaded with classroom work and no time is available in the school's decision-making processes.

Question 3: What steps could your principal take to improve management of Gcewu Secondary School?

Table 20: Suggested steps for the school principal

| Item | Frequency |
|---|-----------|
| Create atmosphere conducive to participative decision-making. | 07 |
| Motivate staff to participate in decision-making | 05 |
| Build capacity of educators to take informed decisions | 05 |
| Delegate duties according to capabilities | 14 |
| Provide guidelines and support to delegated duties | 02 |

Seven respondents argued that the principal must assure that staff members are given a chance to participate in decision-making. All barriers that might deter teachers from participating need to be removed. Teachers should be assured of fair treatment even if their views differ with that of the principal. Honest and fair participation of teachers in decision-making should be encouraged at all times. The principal can create an atmosphere conducive to participation by not threatening teachers with victimisation if they express contrary views.

Findings on this item indicated that five respondents held the view that the principal must encourage educators to take part in decision-making. Involving educators in deliberations regarding decisions to be taken at school can do this. If educators realize that the principal values their views, they could be empowered to contribute meaningfully to the decision-making processes at school. This could assist by ensuring that decisions taken are based on staff views and reflect their professional needs.

Five respondents suggested the principal needs to build capacity of educators for them to take informed decisions. Capacity building can take the form of workshops, seminars and staff development programmes, which the principal could organise. Campbell and Gregg (1957: 278) assert that through participation in decision-making process the professionalism of the principal and the teachers can be enhanced. The quality of decisions can be improved.

Four respondents indicated that the principal ought to delegate some of his responsibilities to staff members. Before assigning duties the principal needs to know who is best suited for a particular task. It is therefore important for the principal to know the potential of the staff under his supervision.

The use of skills and knowledge of professionals is paramount in affecting qualitative management and governance of school. Thus the principal needs to be fully informed about his staff members so that skills be matched with the task in order that may evolve a shared sense of responsibility in terms of management functions and duties.

Steyn (1998:18(3): 132) argue that the principal could save him or herself a lot of time and create a tremendous culture of delegation, which could be seen as a complement to the teacher's involvement. When delegating, the principal must ensure that clear guidelines as to how tasks should be carried out are provided.

5.3 PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULES: PRINCIPALS AND HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

5.3.1 Presentation of Section A: General Information

The researcher needed information from respondents regarding teaching experience, number of years in the present school and position held at school. It was found that they have been in the educational field for a considerable time, and are still energetic and can bring about some changes and transformation in education.

Question 1: How many years of teaching experience do you have?

Table 21: Teaching experience of respondents

| Number of years | 0-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 |
|-----------------|------|-------|-------|
| Number | 01 | 03 | - |

According to findings one educator had less than 10 years of teaching experience. Three members had over 10 years of teaching experience.

Question 2: How many years have you haven teaching at Gcewu Secondary School?

Table 22: Number of years in current school

| Number of years | 0-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 |
|-----------------|------|-------|-------|
| Number | 03 | 01 | - |

The majority of SMT members had less than ten years at the school, and only one head of department had eleven years of teaching experience at the school. It is hoped that the SMT members would co-operate with one another to bring about collegiality in their school.

Question 3: Which position do you hold at school?

Table 23: Position held at school

| Response | Total |
|--------------------|-------|
| Head of department | 03 |
| Principal | 01 |
| Total | 04 |

All the heads of departments participated in the study as well as the school principal. Their participation helps in presenting a balanced view about the “official” position on participatory management in the school.

5.3.2 Presentation of Section B of the Interview Schedule

Questions 1-7 were open-ended, and were designed in order to give the respondents an opportunity to express their views on the questions of participatory management in the school.

Question 1: How did you feel about the past hierarchical order where principals and teachers were at the receiving end of the top-down management structure?

The majority of respondents felt that the past hierarchical order was totally wrong because principals were seen as administrators rather than educational managers. A strong culture of resistance also developed among staff and learners in many schools and this undermined the legitimate role of school management and leadership. Teachers and learners opposed decisions that were imposed to them by principals. School principals found themselves in a dilemma that resulted in schools being dysfunctional and the culture of teaching and learning deteriorated.

Question 2: How do you perceive the education system of letting all stakeholders to participate in the decision-making?

The principal perceived the new paradigm shift in education of letting all stakeholders to participate in decision-making as creating problems in school because the School Governing Body and some educators were not willing to co-operate. The principal has found himself in a state of limiting collegiality to some educators (representing teachers in SGB) and SMT). This means that school leadership (principal's School Management Team and SGB) are not working towards a democratic way of running the school.

The SMT also felt that there were some members who come to decision-making forums to fulfil their own aspirations and tend to create conflict. This might be witnessed in situations where influential individuals who want to advance a certain point of view, lobby support prior to meetings. If this behaviour was recognised by others, it could lead to a conflict.

Question 3: As a principal/SMT member, how do you feel about the inclusion of teachers in the decision-making body in a school?

The majority of the respondents felt that inclusion of teachers in the decision-making is good. The following reasons were given:

- ☞ It could enhance teacher's performance in class and could be of benefit to the learners.
- ☞ Educators tend to own decisions if they were involved in decision-making process.
- ☞ Educators would co-operate with decisions and show responsibility towards the implementation of such decisions.
- ☞ It should be preached and practised to avoid segmentation within school.
- ☞ It enhances their capacity to deal with disciplinary problem to school, rather than referring it to SMT.
- ☞ It could reduce conflicts in school.

Question 4: There is a belief that teachers' own decisions if they participate in decision-making processes of their organisation. Do you agree to this? Why?

All the SMT members agreed with the statement and mentioned the following points as their reasons:

- ☞ Teachers would not mobilize themselves and engage in direct confrontation with those in management.
- ☞ The staff would be more supportive of them and ready to take responsibility for them as no finger could be pointed at anyone. This supports the research by Campbell and Southworth (1993) into effective schooling where participation in the decision-making of education institutions, and in the initiation and implementation of practices promoted ownership.
- ☞ Understanding of different viewpoints and decisions taken would be promoted. This understanding helped to build the staff together as a team and promoted caring for one another.

- ☞ Participation and discussion helped the staff to have a better knowledge of the issues and activities of the school.

Question 5: From your experience as the head of the school / SMT member, is it easy to create a self-reliant school by seeking commitment of teachers in devoting their time?

- ☞ Unwillingness of educators to accept change and to participate in decisions involving responsibilities. They also believed that openness to accept change is essential and particularly in this period when the South African education system is undergoing transformation.
- ☞ Educators who are never willing to put in extra-time of work, but always complain that they are excluded from managerial decision-making. Educators' behaviour has led to the SMT behaving against the ethos of collegial management.
- ☞ Intolerance of other opinions. Intolerance manifests itself when certain members dominate the decision-making process only pushing for their ideas to be considered. As a result some members might feel left out and therefore never participate meaningfully in the decision-making process.

Question 6: A “restricted” collegiality is an approach where the leader shares power with a limited number of senior colleagues, while a “pure” collegiality is where all members have an equal voice in determining policy. Which approach would you prefer and why?

The principal prefers “pure” collegiality to “restricted” collegiality because the new education system calls for participation of all school stakeholders in managing and leading schools. If all stakeholders were involved in decision-making no one would point fingers at anyone, but would work together as a team to correct their fault.

One head of department agreed with the principal's view by stating that participative (collegial) management is limited to SMT only. The cause of that is the attitude of management staff towards educators and vice-versa. It was also stated that there is no mutual trust between SMT and staff educators (post level 1).

Question 7: Which approach do you use in your school? Why? Is it successful?

The SMT prefer “restricted” collegiality as good approach to be used in school. The following reasons were given as to why they had made such a choice:

- ☞ The staff educators do not want to take responsible decisions.
- ☞ “Pure“ collegiality involves a lot of lengthy discussions until consensus is reached.
- ☞ Educators do not want to sacrifice time while others would want to see things go wrong in the school.
- ☞ Educators want to avoid leadership and dislike power and do not favour participation in decision-making.
- ☞ Some educators felt that their responsibility is teaching and that they do not want to be burdened with myriad responsibilities of school management.

The SMT believed that this approach was successful because the school was running smooth and school results have improved.

5.3 CO-ORDINATION OF FINDINGS

The following findings were recorded after data had been analysed.

The school management functions remain dominantly in the hands of the principal and SMT. The extent of teacher involvement in management of the school is limited to the classroom. Nine respondents indicated that opportunities for participation in the managerial decision-making do not exist.

Five educators indicated that the principal does not motivate staff to be united. One respondent stated, “My principal cannot get all the staff united in one staff room.” Three respondents indicated the principal become aware that the principal motivates staff to be united, it is important that the principal becomes aware that negative interaction with staff members could hamper unity among the educators.

Teamworkers in school was regarded as poor. Educators mentioned that the cause for poor teamwork was the principal and SMT who oppose their ideas. Involving level one educators in decision-making allows staff and management to work as a team. Team building is a challenge for all leadership positions. If the school was to adopt a policy of teamwork, there could be less tension among staff members, high quality work could be the result.

Negative attitude between staff members and SMT prevails at schools. The SMT gives the following reasons are source of negative attitude: educators do not want to take responsible decisions, educators are never willing to put in extra time to work, but always complaining that they are excluded from managerial decision-making and some educators want to see things go wrong at school.

Six respondents agreed that when teachers are involved in decision-making they tend to own decisions. This data is indicative of the fact that involvement of educators in decision-making is helpful and that if this could be done, all could respect decisions. This could ensure implementation of those decisions.

The leadership style of the principal emerged as a theme preventing educators from participating in the managerial decision-making. The following factors which were grouped under the theme. "Leadership style was regarded as being deterrent of successful decision-making process: non-consultation and favouritism of the principal as well as autocracy or dictatorship.

Educators suggested that the principal could take the following steps to improve management of Gcewù Secondary School:

- ☞ Create atmosphere conducive to participative decision-making.
- ☞ Motivate staff to participate in decision-making.
- ☞ Build capacity of educators to take informed decisions.
- ☞ Provide duties according to capacities.
- ☞ Provide guidelines and support to capacities.

5.4 CONCLUSION

There is evidence to support Hargreaves (1994) argument about contrived collegiality. The principal who structure the agenda with very little allowance for additional items occasionally holds the formal staff meeting at Gcewu. Meetings are fixed in time and place, compulsory, and are designed to be predictable in that it is expected that the end of most meetings reach decisions. It is clear that the principal can however limit the scope of collegiality as found by Bush (1995). The principal of the school pointed that he used restricted collegiality to manage the school because of the SMT's co-operation.

While there is evidence of aspects of subjective, political and formal models operating in the school, there appears to be no evidence of the ambiguity and cultural models.

Empirical evidence from this research project confirms that theories of collegiality models reflect what should take place and not regard Gcewu Secondary School as a model of collegiality. Staff participation is limited and restrictive form of collegiality is operative in the school. Summary of finding and suggestions for modifying the school management arrangements to promote greater collegiality are made in the next, but the investigation reveals that there is clearly willingness from staff to participate and pursue collegial model.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

On the basis of the presentation and interpretation of data done in the previous chapter the researcher draws summary and presents suggestions that might be used to modify the school's management arrangement to promote greater collegiality to principal and teachers (post level one).

6.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

6.2.1 Meaning of Collegial Approach to Management

This study has among other things found that the collegial models assume that organisations determine policy and make decisions through a process of discussion leading to consensus. Power is shared among some or all members of the organisation who are thought to have a mutual understanding about the objectives of the institution (Bush 1995:52). This definition highlights the central features of collegiality in that it assumed that decisions are made through a process of discussion leading to consensus, power is shared among members of the organisation, and the objectives of the institution are thought to be mutually agreed upon.

Cunningham and Gresso (1993:100) state that collegiality exists when each member feels free and encouraged to participate, and when members feel that they share equality in influencing the group. Collegiality works best when it eliminates the capricious and inconsistent use of power over less powerful member. Collegiality is regarded as a unifying thread that holds everyone together, co-ordinating their efforts, increasing understanding and supporting the school spirit.

6.2.2 Official Position on Participatory Management in the School

This study has found that the SMT in managing used "restricted" collegiality. Participative

management was only limited to those in the Senior Management Team because they co - operate with the school head. “Restricted” collegiality is where the leader shares power with a limited number of senior colleagues (Bush 1995:52).

The following are reasons that were given by the SMT for limiting participative management amongst them:

- ☞ The staff educators do not want to take responsible decision.
- ☞ Educators do not want to sacrifice time while others would like to see things go wrong in the school. Decision making is slow and cumbersome. Meetings are often lengthy with issues often ending unresolved. Time and patience needs to be invested and this is usually after hours when staffs are tired as noted by Bush (1995) in Churchfields High School.
- ☞ Educators want to avoid leadership and dislike power and do not favour participation in the decision - making.
- ☞ Some educators felt that their responsibility is teaching and that they do not want to be burdened with myriad responsibilities of school management.

This approach was regarded as successful because everything was in order although there was a tension between teachers and principal. It is clear from the findings that in the spite 0of the fact that the South African School Act 84 of 1996 prescribes that all stakeholders participate in decision - making ; there are clear indications that the principal ignores this. According to Campbell and Southworth (1993:62) the heads play a pivotal role and collegiality depends ultimately on them. If they so choose, they can limit the scope of collegiality as diminishing their power, and perhaps ultimately their identity.

6.2.3 Staff perceptions to the way in which collegial management operate currently at school

From the analysis of educator responses to the perception in which collegial management operates currently at the school, the following points emerged:

6.2.3.1 Educators are not adequately involved in decision - making in school

Twelve respondents in this study expressed the view that the educators should have a say (involved) in managerial decision-making. Actual opportunities for such participation occasionally exist at school. It is concluded, on the basis of data that the principal verbally recommends participatory, collegial or consultative style of leadership, yet in practice, he exercises authoritarian and bureaucratic style of management. According to Bush (1995) collegial models assume that professionals have a right to share in the wider decision - making process and need to collaborate for effective teaching learning.

6.2.3.2 Educators are keen in participating in decision-making

The educator in this study accept the responsibility of becoming role players in managerial decision - making. They support the argument that their participation in management should not be limited to the classroom. The educators think that their greater contact with learners justifies the fact that their roles should be extended beyond teaching duties. They also think that their extended participation is important for their professional development and also for increasing their motivational level as it boots their morale and enhances their self - esteem. This development could be regarded as a fertile ground on which to build the collaborative forms of decision - making proposed by the Task Team in 1996. This supports Bush (1995) where decision were not to be imposed but “made by the very people whose lives are affected by them”. Decision-making should be the joint responsibility of the principal, management team and the entire staff.

6.2.3.3 Principal is not willing to share power with teachers (post level 1)

Eight respondents indicated that the principal was not willing to share power with educators. The respondents regarded the principal’s leadership style as preventing them from participating actively in decision-making process in the school. The unwillingness of the principal does not establish situations or structures for teachers to make suggestions on matters that affect their work. In these instances the teacher’s scope of operation is limited to classroom activities. Decision-making is still perceived by the principal as only a management function.

According to Bush (1995) power is shared among some or all members of the organisation who are thought to have a mutual understanding about the objectives of the institution. Chalker (1995) agrees that collaborative power sharing is of utmost significance if the school must succeed. He further comments that this form of power is unlimited because it enhances the productivity of the school on behalf of the students. His conclusion is that schools that are moving closer to the collaborative end of over continuum are the ones that will succeed. The head play a pivotal role: and collegiality depends ultimately on them. If they so choose, they can limit the scope of collegiality as diminishing their power, and perhaps ultimately their identity (Campbell and Southworth 1993:63).

6.2.3.4 The principal promotes mutual trust between him and staff

The indicates that an open and honest relationship exists among some staff members and the principal. Trust is the foundation upon which school effectiveness is built. An effective work culture cannot develop unless trust exists within the organisation. Trust allows a rich culture to develop, and allows individuals to achieve their full potential. Trust develops as people expose themselves, share and take risks together. Trust tends to reduce fear of dependency on others and eliminates the potentially negative effects of conflicts (Cunningham and Gresso, 1993:120). Curthbert and McDonough (1985) see trust as the fundamental cement that binds an organisation together, facilitating good communication, rectifying badly timed actions, making goal attainment possible and creating the conditions for organisations for organisational success.

Four respondents indicates that the principal does not promote mutual trust between him and staff. This indicates negative relationship built by principal, which may range from lack of transparency; to unfair management practices. If there is no trust in a relationship, then it is assumed that negative interaction will evolve.

6.3 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT APPROACH THOUGHT TO BE DESIRABLE BY EDUCATORS

6.3.1 The Principal Should Create Atmosphere Conducive To Participative Decision-Making

Seven respondents suggested that the principal can ensure that staff members are given a chance to participate in decision-making. All barriers that might deter teachers from participating need to be removed. Teachers should be assured of fair treatment even if their views differ with that of the principal. Honest and fair participation of teachers in decision-making should be encouraged at all times. The Principal can create an atmosphere conducive to participation by not threatening teachers with victimisation if they express contrary views.

6.3.2 The Principal Should Motivate Staff To Participate In Decision-Making

Five Respondents held the views that the principal must encourage educators to take part in decision-making. Involving educators in deliberations regarding decision to be taken at school can do this. If educators realize that the principal values their views, they could be empowered to contribute meaningfully to the decision-making processes at school. This could assist by ensuring that decisions taken are based on the views of staff and reflect their professional needs.

6.3.3 The Principal Should Build Capacity Of Educators To Take Informed Decisions

Five respondents argued that the principal needs to build capacity of educator for them to take informed decisions. Capacity building can take form of workshops, seminars and staff development programmes, which the principal could organise. Campbell and Gregg (1957;278) assert that through participation in the decision-making process the professionalism of principals and teachers can be enhanced. The quality of decisions may be improved.

6.3.4 Duties Should Be Delegated According To Capacities

Four respondents indicated that the principal ought to delegate some of his responsibilities to staff members. Before assigning duties the principal needs to know who is best suited for a particular

task. It is therefore important for the principal to know the potential of the staff under his supervision.

6.3.5 Clear Guidelines And Support Should Be Provided To Delegated Duties

When Delegating, principal must ensure that clear guidelines as to how tasks should be carried out are provided. Steyn (1998) argued that principals could save themselves a lot of time and create a tremendous culture of delegation, which could be seen as a compliment to the teacher involvement.

6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR MODIFYING THE SCHOOL'S MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT TO PROMOTE GREATER COLLEGIALITY

6.4.1. The Principal Should Consider Involving Teachers In Decision-Making Processes

The Principal as facilitator of change in school should involve teachers in decision-making. By doing so there will be power sharing and possibly a reduction in the level of conflict. Teachers should be recognised by the principal as valuable partners in the education. They need to be allowed to gain hands on experience in all functions of the school. In accordance with the South African School Act of 1996, the principal should involve teachers in decision-making and should guide them in making decisions.

6.4.2 The Principal Should Establish Whole School Development Programmes

From the study it becomes clear that teachers are not involved in decision-making. The principal felt that teachers do not want to involve themselves in responsible decisions. Teachers should not just be limited to classroom work. The principal/SMT must facilitate teacher development in decision-making, just as they should facilitate the development of School Governing Body.

Whole school development is of all stakeholders that are part of the school system. It is through whole school development that a principal can empower educators to play a meaningful role in decision-making. Development of skills in decision-making should be viewed by principal as an

integral part of the process of professional development of educators. If this is done the principal can be assured of helpful decisions that teachers may take.

6.4.3 The principal should promote an atmosphere of trust by displaying fair treatment and proper management skills

It is important for the principal to model attitude behaviour on the principles of democracy. Fair treatment of educators is prerequisite for building an atmosphere of trust and accountability. In the climate of transformation, it becomes imperative for a principal to display proper management skills so that his/her credibility as a leader is not brought into disrepute.

6.4.4 Suggestions To Educators

6.4.4.1 Educators Should Take Positive Steps To Become Partners In Managing Their School

Educators must not be complacent but be active participants in terms of self-education and managing school affairs beyond the boundaries of the classroom. However, it becomes necessary for educators to respect the positional power of the principal, which grants him/her the authority to make certain decision unilaterally, that the principal may adopt a unilateral mode of decision-making as discussed by Wilkinson and Cave (1987). It is recommended that educators acknowledge the warning resounded by Roe and Drake (1980:106) that participation and sharing of power does not mean that a faculty needs to get together every time a decision is made. This in itself, they believe, would be poor leadership.

6.4.4.2 Educators Should Learn To Work With Others

Involvement in decision-making is about working collaboratively with common goals in mind. This is clearly an interactive process, which demands that individuals become self-motivated to work with others for the school to attain its goals. In their workshops teachers must be taught how to collaborate with others.

Teachers should be prepared to accept criticism if things do not go according to plan. If credit is due it has to be shared among all. Working with others demands all to recognise and value each other's contribution. Teachers should also be prepared to learn from others.

6.5 CONCLUSION

This Chapter has drawn summary and made suggestions on the study. The whole project has examined the perceptions of staff on collegial management in school. It raised many issues regarding the type of decisions in which educators may or are keen to participate.

7. REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., and Razavieh, A. (1985) *Introduction to Research In Education*, New Jersey: Holt.
- Bush, (1995) *Theories of Educational Management*, 2nd edition, London : Paul Chapman.
- Bush, T. (1993) Exploring Collegiality : Theory, Process and Structure, Milton Keys : Open University Press.
- Barbules, A. (1986) Changing Legitimately, New Jersey : Zed Books.
- Blumberg, A., and Greenfield, W. (1982) The Effective Principal : Perspectives on School Leadership, Boston : Allayn and Bacon.
- Caldwell B., and Spinks, J. (1993) Leading The Self-managing School, London ; Falmer Press.
- Campbell, P., and Southworth, P. (1993) Rethinking Collegiality : Teacher's Views, in Bennet, N., Crawford, M. and Riches, C. (eds), Managing Change in Education : Individual and Organisational perspectives, London : Paul Chapman.
- Chalker, D. "Refocusing School Leadership for Twenty First Century" *Vocational Digest*, Vol.58 (3) (1992) pp. 14-22.
- Chapman, J.D., Froumin, I.D., and Aspin, D.N. (1995) Creating and Managing the Democratic School. London : Falmer Press.
- Cohn, L., and Manin, L. (2000) *Research Methods in Education* (5th ed), New York : Routledge.
- Cunningham, W.G., and Gresso, D.W. (1993) *Cultural Leadership : The Culture of Excellence in Education*, Boston : Ally and Bacon.
- Cuthbert, S., and McDonough, J. (1985) Radial Management, New York : Free Press.
- Department of Education (1996) Changing Management to Manage Change in Education, Report of the task Team on Education Management Development, Pretoria : Department of Education.
- Department of Education (2000) School Management Teams, Managing and Leading Schools, Pretoria : Department of Education.
- Fullan, M. (1992) Successful School Improvement, Buckingham : UK Open University Press.
- Fraser, A., and Neville, S. (1993) Team Building, Sterling : New Delhi.

Gcewu Secondary School Minute Book 2000.

Guest, D., and Fatshett, D. (1974) Worker Participation, Individual Control and Performance, London : Garden City Press Ltd.

Hargreaves, A.(1994) Contrived Collegiality : The Micro Politics of Teacher Collaboration in Bennet, N., Crawford, M., and Riches, C. (eds), Managing Changes in Education : Individual and Organisational Perspectives, London : Paul Chapman.

Idherwood, G.B., and Hoy, W.K.(1973) Bureaucracy, Powerlessness and Teacher Values, British Journal of Educational Administration, 11: pp. 121-134.

Johnson, D. (1994) Research Method in Education Management, London: Longman.

Leithwood, K., Bugley, P.T., and Cousin, J.B. (1992) Developing Expect: Leadership for Future Schools, London: The Falmer Press.

Leonard, M. (1989) The School Governor's Handbook, Great Britain : Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Maeroff, G.I. (1980) The Empowerment of Teachers : Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence, New York : Teacher College Press.

Mahlangu, D.M.D. (1987) Educational Research Methodology, Pretoria : DeJager HAUM.

Makau, B., and Coombe, C. (1994) Teacher Morale and Motivation in Sub-Saharan Africa : Making Practical Improvements (Donors of African Education Working Group on The Teaching Profession).

Noble, T., and Pym, B. (1970) Collegial Authority and Receding Locus of Power, British Journal of Sociology, 21 :pp. 431 - 445.

Roe, W.H., and Drake, T.L. (1980) The Principalship 2nd edition, New York : Macmillan.

Schumacher, S., and McMillan, J.H. (1993) Research in Education : A Conceptual Introduction, USA : Harper Collins.

Sergiovanni, T.J (1987) The Principalship : A Reflective Practice Perspective, Massachusetts : Allyn and Bacon.

Soer, J.W.A. (Compiler) (1997) Research Methodology, National Higher Diploma : Educational Management (notes), Pretoria : Azaliah College of Further Education.

Steyn, G.M. (1998) Teacher Empowerment and the Leadership Role of Principals, South African

Journal of Education, 18(3) pp. 131 - 143.

Wallace, M. (1989) Towards a Collegiate Approach To Curriculum Management in Primary and Middle Schools, In Preedy, M. (ed), Approaches to Curriculum Management, Milton Keynes : Opening University Press.

West-Burnham, J. (1992) Managing Quality in Schools : ATQM Approach, Harlow : Longman.

Wood, C.L., Nicholson, E.W., and Findlay, D.G (1985) The Secondary School Principal, Massachusetts : Allyn and Bacon.

Tate, J.A.T. (1999) Collegiality at Carrington Height Junior Primary School : An Investigation with Particular Reference to Staff Perceptions, Unpublished M.Ed (Education Management) Dissertation, University Of Natal (Durban).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

W 148
Umlazi Township
4031
July 2002

The Educator
Gcewu Secondary School
P.O. Box 131
Umbumbulu
4105

Dear Colleague

**RESEARCH-COLLEGIAL MANAGEMENT IN GCEWU SECONDARY SCHOOL,
KWA-ZULU NATAL : STAFF PERCEPTIONS**

I am presently doing research on collegial management. Your school has been chosen for this purpose. I therefore appeal for your assistance by filling the questionnaire and may be later, having a brief interview with me.

I promise that all the information you supply is for this study and will be used only for it. The information you provide is strictly confidential and I will keep it that way. I wish to further encourage all participants to participate in this study as will enlighten the Senior Management Team about realities in our school which may justify the present policy or warrant a different one.

I thank you in anticipation of receiving your returns

Yours faithfully

D.T.Zulu

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A - GENERAL INFORMATION

Make an (x) in the appropriate block in response to each question.

1. Position held at school :
2. Number of years on the position

| | |
|-------|--|
| 1-5 | |
| 6-10 | |
| 11-15 | |
| 21-25 | |
| Above | |

SECTION B : PLEASE PLACE A CROSS (X) ON THE APPROPRIATE RATING THAT DESCRIBES YOUR EXPERIENCE.

Indicate whether you agree or not with the following statement.

1. Educators should have a say in the decisions relating to the management of their school.

| | |
|-----|--|
| Yes | |
| No | |

2. My principal creates opportunities for professional growth of his staff.

| | |
|-----|--|
| Yes | |
| No | |

3. My principal is willing to share power with teachers

| | |
|-----|--|
| Yes | |
| No | |

4. Involvement in managerial decision-making will contribute to professional development or empowerment of educators.

| | |
|-----|--|
| Yes | |
| No | |

SECTION C : FOR EACH QUESTION TICK (✓) ONE BOX ONLY.

1. Who would you regard as making the most of the decisions in your school?

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| The principal alone | | |
| The principal and his management team | | |
| The SMT in consultation with the staff | | |
| The educators themselves | | |

2. Who in your opinion should be responsible for managerial decision-making in a school?

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| It should be to the principal | | |
| It should be left to the principal and his management | | |
| It should be left to the educators | | |
| It should be a joint effort involving the entire staff | | |

3. Would you say that opportunities exist in your school for participation by educators in managerial decision-making?

| | | |
|-----|----------|----|
| Yes | Not sure | No |
|-----|----------|----|

4. Do educators in your school meet on formal basis to discuss how management issues of the school as a whole can be improved upon?

| | | |
|-------|------------|-------|
| Often | Occasional | Never |
|-------|------------|-------|

5. Does the management staff consult the rest of the staff before decisions regarding school management are made?

| | | |
|-------|------------|-------|
| Often | Occasional | Never |
|-------|------------|-------|

SECTION D

In your Opinion

1. Does your principal promote mutual trust between him and staff?

| | | |
|-----|----------|----|
| Yes | Not sure | No |
|-----|----------|----|

2. Does your principal motivate staff to be united?

| | | |
|-----|----------|----|
| Yes | Not sure | No |
|-----|----------|----|

3. How would you describe the teamwork at the school?

| | | | |
|-----------|------|------|------|
| Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
|-----------|------|------|------|

4. How would you describe the management attitude towards educator's participation in decision-making in your school?

| | |
|----------|----------|
| Positive | Negative |
|----------|----------|

SECTION E

5. To what extent have you observed practice of collegial (participative) management in Gcewu Secondary School?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Tony Bush from Leicester University describes institutions, which are assumed to be collegial as those where policymaking and decisions are determined through as process of discussion leading to consensus, and power is shared among members of the organisation who are thought to have a mutual understanding about the institution and its objectives.
 (Bush, Theories of Education Management, 1995:52)

2. Do you believe educators want to participate in the managerial decisions of a school? Why?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....
.....
.....

3. What steps could your principal take to improve management of the school?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank you for completing this questionnaire

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPAL AND HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

SECTION A : GENERAL INFORMATION

1. How many year of teaching experience do you have?

| | |
|-------|--|
| 0-10 | |
| 11-20 | |
| 21-30 | |

2. How many years have you been teaching at Gcewu Secondary School?

| | |
|-------|--|
| 0-10 | |
| 11-20 | |
| 21-30 | |

3. Which Position do you hold at school?

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Principal | |
| Deputy Principal | |
| Head of Department | |

Section B : Questions for all interviewees

1. How did you feel about the past hierarchical order where principal and teachers were at receiving end of the top-down management structure?

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. How do you perceive the decision by the education system of letting all stakeholders to participate in the decision-making?

.....

.....

.....

3. As a principal/SMT member, how do you feel about the inclusion of teachers in the decision-making body in a school?

.....

.....

.....
.....

4. There is a belief that teacher’s own decision if they participate in decision-making of their organisation. Do you agree to this? Why?

.....
.....
.....

5. From your experience as the head of the school/SMT member, is it easy to create a self-reliant school by seeking commitment of teachers in devoting their time?

.....
.....
.....

6. A “Restricted” Collegiality is an approach where the leader shares power with a limited number of senior colleagues, while a “pure” collegiality is where all members have an equal voice in determining policy. Which approach would you prefer and why?

.....
.....
.....

7. Which approach do you use in your school? Why? Is it successful?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

;

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work, all sources used or quoted have been acknowledged by means of complete references.



.....
Duduzile Theresa Zulu

Durban, November 2002

STATEMENT BY SUPERVISOR

This mini-dissertation is submitted with/without my approval.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Thurlow', written in a cursive style.

.....
Professor M. Thurlow

ABSTRACT

The *South African Schools Act* No. 84 of 1996 and the report of the *Task Team on Education Management Development* (Department of Education, 1996), proposed greater involvement of major stakeholders, in particular the educators, in decision-making processes in educational institutions. This opened a new chapter of a major transformational shift from an authoritarian and bureaucratic style of management to a democratic and participative management style. The purpose of this research was to investigate, largely through the perceptions of staff, the extent to which the management of Gcewu Secondary School may be characterised as “collegial” and, as necessary, to make practical recommendations as to how the management arrangements of the school may be modified or enhanced to promote collegiality.

The questionnaires and interviews were used as the research instruments for this study. This study was conducted at Gcewu Secondary School at Umbumbulu District, Durban South Region.

The main findings that emerged from the study were as follows:

- ☞ The educators regard the decision made about the management of the school as directly affecting them.
- ☞ Educators were not adequately involved in decision-making.
- ☞ Educators were keen in participating in decision-making but the principal was not willing to share power with them (post level 1 educators).