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ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

South African School Act: SASA
Department of Basic Education: DBE
School Governing Body: SGB
School Management Team: SMT
Departmental Head: DH
Deputy Principal: DP
Code of Conduct for Learners: CCL
ABSTRACT

The Code of conduct for learners (CCL) as a subject has been of interest among scholars around the world, this is understandable because the subject is still an enigma to many schools. A considerable amount of time in a normal school day is dedicated to behaviour management. Thus, an investigation into its implementation is being explored as the use of corporal punishment has been for a long time a quick fix to unbecoming behaviour that threatens to disturb the tranquillity necessary for a conducive learning and teaching environment. Since the abolishment of corporal punishment educators’ contact time with learners is characterised mainly by teaching and behavioural management, where the latter involves the management of the school to resolve. In cases where school management and teachers are found guilty of contravening the law by using corporal punishment, the disregard of use Code of conduct for learners (CCL) measures to deal with behaviour is primarily the cause. This study through a qualitative enquiry was employed to explore the understanding of the implementation processes and how leadership acumen at different levels affects the implementation thereof in schools. Therefore, Distributive Leadership, Learning Teams and Systemic Thinking are the theoretical underpinnings of the study. Semi-structured interviews were used to explore the alignment of all leadership roles in the CCL implementation process and how far it is informed by the school’s shared vision. Thematic analysis of the data was used to interpret the findings. The study found that there are critical information gaps across all leadership levels, these suggest that distributive leadership is essential in school management and that schools are complex institutions and they will benefit from employing systems thinking through well-planned learning teams interactions. The results of the study have the potential to draw attention to monitoring the implementation of CCL and reviewing the guidelines for consideration by SGB in implementing CCL. It may add to the body of knowledge that explores behaviour management in schools as a multidimensional and interconnected phenomenon from systems thinking perspective.
STRUCTURES AND POSITION DESCRIPTION and FUNCTIONS

1. The South African Schools Act (SASA), No. 84 of 1996

The SASA, No.84 of 1996 in this study refers to the Act by which education in the Republic of South Africa is democratised and that all public schools should be governed through the establishment of democratic structures such as School Governing Bodies (SGBs). This Act which was promulgated in 1996 marked a new era of democratisation in education and the governance of schools Department of Education (1996). Hence the SASA compelled all public schools to establish SGBs comprising relevant stakeholders.

2. School managers/ Leaders

School managers/leaders for this study refer to the Principals, the Deputy principals (DP), the Departmental Head (DH), Teachers and School Governing body (SGB) members. They all have corporate responsibility in matters relating to maintaining discipline.

School Governing Bodies (SGB) is a statutory structure that governs a school in terms of the SASA, No. 84 of 1996. It comprises parents, educators, non-educators, co-opted members (optional) and learners who have a status of a minor (applicable in Secondary schools). A principal of a school becomes a member of the SGB by virtue of his official position (ex-officio). Therefore, the principal and elected members of the SGB represent the school community. In terms of the SASA section, 20 (1) spells out this structure’s functions as guiding governing duties. The South African School Act, Act 84 of 1996, which governs and regulates the general operation of South African schools, in Chapter 3, section 16A stipulates the duties of the School Management Team (SMT). The Employment of Educators Act, Act 76 of 1996 provides Personnel Administration Measures (PAM). PAM prescribes the main role of the Principal as a professional leader and manager, the Deputy Principal (DP) as the principal’s assistant and supervisor of the performance of the staff and the Department Head (DH) as a curriculum leader and manager.

3. The teacher/ educator

The principal, deputy principal, departmental head and post level one teacher are all educators with different responsibilities at different levels. The South African Schools Act (Act 84 of 1996) define a principal as “an educator appointed or acting as the head of the school”. Accordingly, a principal will be defined as a person who is serving as the head of the school. The South African Schools Act (Act 84 of 1996) define a deputy principal as “an educator appointed as a second in line to the principal”. He acts as a principal in the absence of the principal. According to the collective agreement, No 2 of 2020
the nomenclature for what was known as Head of Department (HOD) has changed to Departmental Head (DH) Governance (2020). This was changed to clear the confusion that is caused by the use of HOD for the one heading a department at school and also for the department’s accounting officer in the Province the DH is the curriculum leader in the school. Section 3(4)f of the National Education Policy ACL 1996 (Act No. 27 of 1996), determined Norms and Standards for Educators as National Policy the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) as stipulated in the Education Policy Act (No.27) of 1996, interpret the word teacher or educator comprehensively as a person who teaches or provides professional educational services at any public school, further education, and training institution or departmental office. The term includes educators in the classroom, heads of departments, deputy principals, principals, education development officers, district and regional managers, and systems managers Department of Education (2000). This includes The Teacher, Departmental Head (DH), Deputy Principal and Principal when they are in-class teaching. The term “Teacher” is used interchangeably with the term “Educator” in the department of education.

4. Code of Conduct for Learners

The Code of Conduct provides rules regarding learner behaviour at the school and describes the guidelines for a disciplinary system to be implemented by the school to manage behaviour. The Code of Conduct (CCL) applies to all learners while they are on the school premises or wherever they are when they are representing the school. Section 8(4) of the SA Schools Act provides that all learners attending a School are bound by the Code of Conduct of that School.

5 Corporal Punishment

According to guidelines “alternatives to Corporal punishment” corporal punishment is defined as any deliberate act against a child that inflicts pain or physical discomfort to punish or contain him/her. This includes, but is not limited to, spanking, slapping, pinching, paddling or hitting a child with a hand or with an object; denying or restricting a child’s use of the toilet; denying meals, drink, heat and shelter, pushing or pulling a child with force, forcing the child to do exercise Department of education (2000). Corporal punishment was replaced by Alternatives to corporal punishment, it is the way of instilling discipline through counselling, restorative justice and positive behavioural management options.
CHAPTER 1

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Section 12(1) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa provides that everyone has the right to freedom and security of the person, which includes the right not to be tortured in any way and not to be treated or punished in a cruel, inhuman or degrading way, Republic of South Africa (1996b). This provision applies to the protection of every citizen of the country without any discrimination. It follows therefore that it finds expression in section 10(1) of the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 (SASA) and also section 3(4)(n) of the National Education Policy Act 27 of 1996 (National Education Policy Act). Section 10 of the Schools Act specifically states that "(1) No person may administer corporal punishment at a school to a learner;(2) Any person who contravenes subsection is guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a sentence which could be imposed for assault." South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 (SASA). Also, as it is stated in National Education Policy Act that, "...no person shall administer corporal punishment, or subject a student to psychological or physical abuse at any education institution". Section 3(4) of the National Education Policy Act 27of 1996. These two pieces of legislation do not in any way suggest that lawlessness must prevail in the school environment. However, they should serve as the voice of caution in the application of guidelines when developing a disciplinary system in schools. They must underpin systems and processes while creating a conducive environment for teaching and learning as provided for by Act 84 of 1996 (SASA). These prescripts must be applied concurrently to ensure that discipline is maintained in every school and classroom situation to ensure that the education of learners is attained with as little disruptive behaviour and offences Government (1996). The responsibility of maintaining discipline is placed on the school community members and stakeholders by different legislative provisions.

1.2 THE BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The effective enforcement of the learner code of conduct is an important condition for successful policy implementation. Nitsch, Baetz, and Hughes (2005) assert in this regard that one of the determinants of the effectiveness of a code of conduct is the degree to which code violations can be appropriately sanctioned. A decade later Mpanza (2015) still observe that from a historical perspective the legal demand for the adoption and implementation of social justice policies still presents challenges associated with learner discipline in South African schools. It has been 25 years since corporal punishment was outlawed in South African schools in compliance with the constitution. It remains a
question how much changing the law has served as a deterrent to the administering of corporal punishment.

The Media and social media have recently been exposing what happens behind classroom closed doors. During the launch of “Protocol to Deal with Incidences of Corporal Punishments in Schools” in 2018 Minister Angie Motshekga cited that “lately, incidences of the illegal administering of corporal punishment have been reported across various provinces. The department condemns, in the harshest possible terms, any subverted, reckless and irresponsible attempts by principals, teachers and/or any support staff member to undermine the existing legislative framework prohibiting the use of corporal punishment in schools” Department of Basic Education (2018:6). The problem statement of the launched document emphasises the fact that learners are illegally subjected to corporal punishment in schools; a place where they are expected to be taken care of. This, unfortunately, continues notwithstanding the efforts of the government and the progress made in creating a legislative framework Department of Basic Education (2017). Mpumalanga Province issued a directive that instructed schools to strengthen the implementation of the code of conduct for learners (circular No. 77 of 2017). The circular is stating the legislated provisions that schools should already be implementing, which is in the Code of Conduct for Learners (CCL), it suggests the formulation of class rules and enforcement thereof. However, monthly reports by district monitoring officials state that in response to this in several schools, principals addressed the circular in morning briefing meetings and created a consent form where every teacher should sign that they have been told to refrain from using corporal punishment and that they understand consequences stated in the circular. The reports further noted no implementation of the prescripts provided in the circular as measures to instil discipline in many schools.

1.3 RATIONALE

This study seeks to explore how leaders at different levels within a school environment see their roles, interpret, process and implement the Code of Conduct for learners (CCL) to collectively ensure conducive learning and teaching environment. Currently, schools distribute the written CCL for parent and learner signatures without taking time to explain it even to the new learners. Signing and acceptance of the CCL is only the first step of the advocacy process. According to the Guidelines for the Consideration of Governing Bodies in Adopting a Code of Conduct for Learners, this should be followed by the review of class rules which are informed by CCL and giving opportunity for amendments where there is a need. A merit and demerit system that is informed by CCL should be outlined. The short-circuiting of the process excludes the active participation of the SGB, the SMT and teachers as stipulated by law. The SGB as leader of parents do not address parents to set the tone and take responsibility. Deputy Principals, DHs and teachers miss the opportunity to consult class rules as a way of taking charge and ensuring compliance. This seems to be saving lesson contact time as lessons resume on the first school day. However, in most schools, the responsibility is then left with the
principal. When there are disciplinary issues, the SGB expect the principal to be accountable, teachers revert to corporal punishment and difficult learners are left to the principal who mostly will use corporal punishment or call parents and talk to them if and when they come. When the principal is seen as the only disciplinarian in the school, much truancy goes unresolved leading to ill-discipline and low morale among teachers. A probe into the awareness of the role expected to be played at each level in the school leadership might hopefully contribute positively to developing discipline mechanisms in schools guided by the following legislation:

1. The Guidelines for the Consideration of Governing Bodies in Adopting a Code of Conduct for Learners as provided

1.4 RESEARCH AIM

The topic of this research is investigating the implementation of the code of conduct for learners: a case study of Volksrust circuit schools. The research seeks to understand how the provisions and mandates on CCL are understood, implemented and impact the level of discipline in schools. It also aims to establish whether the stakeholders who by virtue of their position and mandate as leaders know their roles, responsibility, and extent of their authority in creating an environment of teaching and learning in terms of their mandate as outlined in legislation.

1.5 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The post-democratic Constitution of 1996 in South Africa provided the right to freedom and security which included amongst others freedom from violence, torture, and being treated in a degrading manner. The Abolition of Corporal Punishment Act 33 of 1997 further eliminated any opportunity for ambiguity in the matter. According to Mabaso (2019) more than two decades since the abolition of corporal punishment, a large number of teachers do not know any other means to instil discipline other than administering corporal punishment. They would rather resort to sending the learners to either the deputy principal or principal for every misconduct without any attempt to address the issue, as educators, they do not play their leadership role according to Section 8 of the Schools Act (1996) which stipulates that discipline must be maintained in the school and classroom situations for the education of learners to prosper without disruptive behaviour. The cases opened by parents against teachers who administer corporal punishment suggest that parents as represented by SGB do not take the
responsibility for the behavioural management of their children as provided in the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 (section 8(1)) which stipulates that a governing body of a public school is bestowed with a legal duty to adopt a code of conduct for the learners after consultation with the learners, parents, and educators of the school, Republic of South Africa (1996). There is a permeable interface between the SGB and SMT led by the school principal, where the SGB has policymaking authority and the SMT ensures implementation Mthiyane (2013). The lack of cooperation within the school communities suggests a blurred vision of the interface. The Code of Conduct for Learners has provisions for all the behavioural challenges, however, schools are held at ransom with ill discipline. News reports, Education Department and partners are inundated with cases of fights in schools, bullying and corporal punishment, Department of Basic Education (2018:6). The different levels of leadership in schools do not display an understanding of each mandate and responsibility to manage behaviour within the school system. The leadership within the school communities portrays a possible void in the cooperative understanding of the implementation of CCL.

1.6 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To establish how advocacy of the duly adopted Code of Conduct for Learners is done in schools.
2. To investigate who is involved in the development/review, adoption, and advocacy of the Code of Conduct for learners in every school?
3. To explore whether the School Governing body (SGB), School Management Team (SMT) members and teachers are aware of their roles to ensure learner discipline.
4. To establish how reports and information is used to influence decision making and strengthen/revive existing systems that maintain good behavioural standards.
5. To observe the inclusivity of the Merit and Demerit System

1.7 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How is the advocacy for the duly adopted Code of Conduct for Learners done in the schools?
2. Do stakeholders take part as legally prescribed in the development/review, adoption, and advocacy of the Code of Conduct for learners in every school?
3. Are the School Governing Body (SGB), School Management Team (SMT) members and teachers aware of their roles to ensure learner discipline?
4. How are the behavioural reports collated and used to improve the school environment?
5. Does the school have a Merit and Demerit system that is inclusive?
1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY SUMMARY
According to Creswell and Creswell (2018), Social constructivists hold the view that individuals develop subjective meanings of the world they live and work in. Relying on the varied and multiple views of participants, the researcher considers the complexity that gives meaning to their world by using the thematic analysis technique, Creswell et al. (2018). Unstructured interviews are used as the tool to explore the interactions between SGB, SMT and teachers in three schools as they manage learner behaviour. To make meaning, a thematic analysis is used. The researcher codes the data collected to identify patterns for further analysis allowing more clarity. Details are contained in chapter 3.
A qualitative research method is used as it allows the researcher to explore, interpret and form the meaning of the world participants, Creswell et al. (2018) explain qualitative research as an approach that explores how people interpret and give meaning to their world as individuals and groups. The targeted population is Volksrust circuit schools, where 1 SGB member, 3 STM members and two teachers of three schools will be sampled. The envisaged sample size is 18 school leaders. A snowball sampling technique is used, in each school, the principal is selected and thereafter refers to the other 5 participants based on their function in the school.

1.9 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY
This study is organised into 6 chapters, namely:

Chapter 1
Chapter one introduces the study by explaining its basis. It outlines the components of the study, which are: the introduction, background, rationale, key concepts, topic, aim, problem statement, objectives, the research questions, and research methodology summary.

Chapter 2
In this chapter, the literature review is presented. The legislative background, research done on the topic as well as a theoretical framework that underpins the study is tabled.

Chapter 3
This chapter details the selected research design and methodology that will guide the research. The explanation and justification for research design and choices of methodology will be given. The process employed to generate data including data analysis will be discussed.

Chapter 4
This chapter tables the data and data analysis

Chapter 5
This chapter presents a discussion of the findings.

Chapter 6
This chapter presents recommendations that are based on the findings.
CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This section focuses on reviewing the literature on learner discipline. The view of school management (leadership) on the learner discipline system and its implementation. The awareness of responsibility at the different leadership levels and interaction by leaders to achieve the best conducive learning environment through learner behaviour. The subject of learner discipline has increasingly commanded the attention of DBE as different media reports news of learners killing each other, learner to learner rape, and bullying has been escalating in direct proportion to cases of teachers where the use of corporal punishment in different news reports. These suggest that more needs to be done in the area of school discipline systems. It suggests a school leadership and management issue than a teacher in the classroom.

Chapter 1 presented the orientation of this study and gave an overview of the whole research project. The review of literature from empirical studies on school discipline systems in national and international contexts will be explored in this chapter. The literature demonstrates the extent to which the researcher is aware of the existing body of literature on learner discipline systems. The researcher also gives some insight on issues of the understanding and implementation of learner discipline systems and the role played by school leaders. The legal framework that guides the implementation, as well as theoretical frameworks that underpin the study, are incorporated in this chapter. The chapter consists of the following sub-divisions; Discipline systems as viewed by school leaders, Learning environment, examples of other school discipline systems, Legislative Background and theoretical framework.

2.2 LEARNER DISCIPLINE AS VIEWED BY SCHOOL MANAGERS

Bal, Afacan and Cakir (2018) argue that the search for a solution to behavioural problems in schools has largely been focused on individualistic and outcome-oriented studies at the expense of targeting systems. This has led school discipline researchers in the main to take an individual as a unit of intervention out of the context of the school environment. This view causes role players to compartmentalise challenges and often leads to a divided approach that weakens the system.

Wandasari, Kristiawan and Arafat (2019) assert that quality education is influenced by the leader’s supervision, his ability to motivate teachers and consistent discipline management through instructional leadership. Developing a shared vision, providing appropriate resources, and creating a conducive learning environment are important elements of building such an environment. However, Lumadi’s (2020) empirical discovery was that teachers, students, SGBs and community members are not equally represented in the design of turnaround disciplinary procedures. This can be a big misstep that can lead
to school management members being the only ones handling disciplinary issues, in some schools it can be left to the principal. While principals who are overwhelmed by disciplinary problems feel disempowered and let down by their subordinate’s lack of commitment instead of leading the organisation by using the human, physical and intellectual resources at their disposal, the latter being policies Department of Basic Education (2017). Though, Li (2015) produced findings that suggested that teachers have no trust or confidence in their leaders and as a result not keen to take leadership roles in their schools. Not taking lead does not mean they are content or think those in leadership are providing enough leadership but that the leaders are not open to any contribution that may bring positive changes. Segalo and Rambuda’s (2018) findings were that a teacher in one of the participating schools felt that the school rules do not have any effect on the learners, instead the rules are gathering dust with no effort in managing learners’ disrespect and misconduct. At another school they also found that a teacher has opted for a rigid teacher-centred approach as dealing with disruptive behaviour was taking too much of their teaching time. Demir (2015) in his study found that trust among colleagues is a requisite value that can enable teachers to take a leadership position in a school. However, Magaba (2018) noted that most teachers felt that in the new dispensation, there is too much confusion, contradiction, and frustration about what disciplinary practices are, and what teachers are expected to do. Other participants cited that they heard that the department introduced ‘alternatives to corporal punishment’ but they never saw the document in the school and what makes things worse is that SGB in the school does not have the skills to draw up effective codes of conduct for learners by which to discipline learners.

Mestry (2017) argues that the school’s leadership role includes developing a shared vision, and providing appropriate resources, to facilitate the creation of a conducive learning environment, while setting a high expectation for staff and learners through coaching and mentoring teachers. However, many of the selected principals merely devoted most of their time to monitoring and controlling the work of staff and learners. This does not leave room for the supporting role that each should provide through mutual understanding of policies and processes. In her findings, Mabaso (2019) reflected that in one school, some teachers knew and apply the code of conduct, while others heard about it but were not sure what it contains, and those who are aware still use corporal punishment when all fails. However, they agree about the fact that there is no parental support on issues of learner discipline. The assumption by teachers is that the government took away the only means possible to instil discipline and left them to deal with unruly learners (id. Mabaso, 2019). In his research Campus, (2020) found that a lack of professional training in the use of alternative non-punitive disciplinary strategies leaves teachers with no choice but to use corporal punishment to correct behaviour. Administering corporal punishment is a double-edged sword as it is not only the learner who suffers the physically inflicted pain, but stakes are higher even for teachers as they stand to face criminal
charges and the abrupt end of a career and livelihood. The story of Philippine Rakosa a Grade 2 teacher who was sentenced to a year in jail, Khumela (2015) is one of the many incidents in South African schools, delivering this sentence the judge stated the intent to send a strong message to other teachers to refrain from administering corporal punishment. It is therefore imperative that schools provide systems that will assist teachers with discipline.

Maina and Sindabi (2016) point out that principals and teachers have the potential to model and encourage positive behaviour but do not trust their staff’s capabilities. It can be such an attitude that may become a hindrance to the advancement of positive behavioural management practices. Makhasane and Chikoko (2016) argue that when principals do not consider corporal punishment as a form of violence, it is the death of leadership in the schools. They further argue that changing perspective is part of change management because allowing change is associated with the opportunity for growth.

Propagating against the use of corporal punishment, Gershoff (2017) asserted that corporal punishment is constantly linked to harming learners’ education, however, there seem to be a limited number of school- and even community-level interventions to reduce school corporal punishment and venture into alternative practices, much still need to be done to change perceptions. Mwenda (2016) found that teachers who are qualified in guidance and counselling rated high in the successful use of alternatives to corporal punishment. This finding suggests that teacher development is essential to equip teachers in better handling of discipline. Chonco (2019) asserts that the success of implementing the CCL in the level of effective enforcement, the SGB delegates are endowed with the role to lead the implementation of the CCL and entrust the SMT and educator with the day-to-day behaviour management.

2.3 ENVIRONMENT FOR GROOMING LEARNER BEHAVIOR

Applied Behaviour Analysis measure and observe behaviour between socially significant conduct and environmental factors to make sense of the nature of functional relationships and to negotiate necessary change, leadership acumen is one imperative factor in managing behaviour in schools, Porter and Porter (2020). Characteristically, behaviour is regarded as important by that particular community, the one who analyses; which is the doer, will aim to improve. Behavioural change is likely to happen only because it will make an impact on someone significant Porter and Porter (2020).

According to Terry et al. (2017), the creation of a conducive environment for teaching and learning through appropriate discipline systems is intentional, leaders should, therefore, set a tone of safe, orderly, clean space where acknowledgement of good work and behaviour is a key instrument to grooming citizenship. To them, a principal’s office with pictures showing learners’ achievement is more learner-centred than the one with a succession of the school’s previous principals. It shows that tho leaders, merits take precedence over demerits and the goal is positive grooming than punishment. Kubheka (2018) concludes that though teachers still use corporal punishment as a quick fix solution, he
acknowledges the need for stakeholder involvement which is a framework on which a Code of conduct for Learners is developed.

The CCL, especially when correctly implemented, therefore, provide a platform for communicating acceptable and unacceptable behaviour, which should be a set standard to determine behaviour. The CCL and the Merit and Demerit system in a school should be aligned with the Constitution and SASA prescripts. These, therefore, set the standards for acceptable behaviour. This should be intensively consulted by involving all stakeholders so that it is designed to leave as little room as humanly possible for any ambiguity and questions. This thorough and intentional process will leave the community at large with a picture-perfect image of good behaviour, Government (1998).

Duke and Meckel (1980) explain that operant behaviour is purposeful and voluntary as it is reinforced and encouraged by the reward that is received soon after performance. For a behavioural pattern to be established the reward must be given repeatedly, which means consistency that is balanced by patience in the system is key. Often the mould of a behaviour fails because they want to see an immediate response to the corrective measure, this leads to the temptation of cutting too many corners too early in the implementation of procedures for instant results. Equally important, he further suggests that the reward must be favourable to the recipient for it to have an effect. These factors may decide between the success and failure of the system.

2.4 DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS EXAMPLES

2.4.1 ZERO-TOLERANCE DISCIPLINE SYSTEM

Zero Tolerance is a discipline system that is used in American schools. It is an example of a discipline system that minimises the leadership role that can be played by those endowed with the responsibility of educating a child. The United States Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights defines a zero-tolerance discipline policy as, "a policy that results in mandatory expulsion of any student who commits one or more specified offences" (Curran, 2015; U.S. Department of Education 2014). Curran (2017) explains it as a disciplinary shift that relied heavily on the use of exclusionary practices like suspension and expulsion. The term "zero tolerance" was borrowed, in part, from the field of criminal justice which has over the decades evolved into an expulsion machine that has seen a large number of learners in the impoverished and gangster-ridden parts of America being robbed of the only chance they have to better their lives. School discipline policy began to reflect this broader policy environment and societal view towards punishment, as school districts and some states adopted the use of the term “zero tolerance” and policies that favoured punitive approaches, particularly exclusion, to behavioural infractions. The teachers’ concern is that any student that is sent to the principal’s office for misbehaviour of any kind will almost automatically result in suspension, Curran (2017).
States like Massachusetts are facing the challenge of altering a status quo that is decades old through implementing Chapter 2 which is already found to be wanting in many philosophical aspects such as behavioural change and altered attitudes in learners, Heilbrun, Dewey & Lovegrove (2015). According to Richardson (2018), exclusionary discipline (Zero tolerance) is one of the most controversial aspects of U.S. education policy which is used as a tool for managing non-academic student behaviour.

Unfortunately, despite this extreme discipline measure statistics tells a gloomy tale as they show that as of 2012, 64 per cent of all public schools in the US use surveillance cameras, which is a 19% increase since 1999. Two-thirds of schools are using electronic notification systems, just over 10% of all schools use metal detectors, one-quarter perform random drug tests, roughly 90% control access to the building, and over 70% have uniformed police or school resource officers Brent (2015), this may suggest that the system has over decades failed to produce intended results of well-behaved learners but necessitated stricter measures. This study seeks to explore the impact of inclusion and exclusion of the loco-parentis aspect by school leaders at all levels.

2.4.2 RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

Restorative justice (RJ) views an unjust act as not simply a violation of a rule or statute, but a violation of people and relationships” which affects the community, as such the whole must come together to repair the harm, Winn and Justice (2019). Chiromo (2021) observes that several studies on restorative approaches tend to focus on the impact RJ has on some selected outcomes while few studies explore its implementation and practice. González et al., (2018) acknowledge that the implementation of restorative approaches in schools takes form in various ways that depend on different goals that are informed by the unique culture and available resources. This may necessitate a high level of leadership acumen and optimal involvement of stakeholders which is the focal point of exploration in this study.

According to Murhula and Tolla (2020), RJ was one of the indigenous justice forums that were popularly used to resolve disputes in the pre-colonial African era. They were replaced by the adversarial trial of English and Roman-Dutch laws as RJ was regarded as an obstacle to development as they were not deterrent or punitive enough. Kilekamajenga (2018) postulates that as viewed by restorative justice, crime is not simply undermining the laws of the country but goes deeper into destroying relationships within involved parties and communities it, therefore, creates an obligation to restore what is broken, coming together is necessary to resolve the dispute amicably. He further highlights that the fact that the victim can safely describe their suffering whether financially, psychological or emotional forces the offender to confront the reciprocation of their deeds and be allowed to take responsibility. Restorative justice can be viewed as a process that has a dual benefit because while administering restorative discipline through conversation it results on restorative action to appease the victim Chiromo (2021).
Beckmann (2020) cautions that RJ should be introduced gradually while reflecting on gains because South Africa’s education environment is littered with failed policies due to improper implementation strategies and ill preparation of implementers-to-be. He further advocates that restorative school discipline should be implemented in a learner-centred approach that emphasises the importance of building relationships in the school community. Restorative practices in schools can be more far-reaching than in the courts if the main pillar of the foundation of restorative practices is the continuous supportive environment that teachers can create in the school community, Agu and Ibe (2020).

Louw and Van Wyk (2016) assets that RJ is not always a priority focused on the victim’s need for retribution while also not condoning the offender but on the harmony of the whole community. The central concepts of Restorative Justice (RJ) are implemented through RJ practices, including restorative conversations, circles, conferences, and peer mediation. These practices are viewed along a continuum, ranging from informal to formal According to the International Institute for Restorative Practices [IIRP] (2019) to facilitate practical implementation, restorative practices can be considered from Informal to formal strategies. Where informal actions can be used to resolve minor offences where mediation can require talks between the parties involved. in the middle of the continuum are activities that involve peer mediation and conversations by the whole community in contributing to an amicable solution that builds a plausible future for the whole school community. The formal end may be used for re-entry into a school community after a suspension or expulsion, which means formal disciplinary procedures are not ignored but rehabilitation is central to restoring harmony. Leadership that is inclusive and has a clear vision is imperative in the implementation process. Katic, Alba and Johnson (2020) emphasise that RJ practices should be systematically examined to facilitate a clearer understanding of RJ’s effectiveness. Teachers honestly acknowledge that where discipline is practised in more respectful ways, learners are more involved and happier to be in the classroom Magaba (2018).

Netshitangani (2017) argues that there are findings that suggest that the role of the police in assisting with violence in schools can be perceived as positive although it is inconsistent because there isn't enough capacity in the police services, that might be a threat should schools depend on it. Exploring the possibilities of strengthening the internal system provided by CCL may still be a better option for resolving behavioural challenges for learners, this is the gap this study hopes to close.

**SUMMARY: ZERO TOLERANCE and RESTORATIVE JUSTICE**

Zero Tolerance and Restorative justice are systems borrowed from the criminal law practices as possible strategies that can help curb unbecoming behaviour from learners. Their consideration stems from the observation that school rules seem not to yield the desired outcomes. Though by their nature they
operate at the extremes of the spectrum. The first isolates the wrongdoer in an attempt to correct them, while the second attempts to rehabilitate and restore.

The surging number of cases that are reported despite all interventions suggests a need for further scientific exploration into the challenge with the hope that the probe into the implementation of CCL can contribute to policymaking and implementation.

2.5 CCL LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

2.5.1 SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS ACT (SASA)

In line with the provisions of the Constitution, Section 8 (a) of the South African Schools Act (SASA) (1996a) empowers School Governing Bodies (SGBs) to adopt a learners' code of conduct. This mandate is to be carried out through consultation with teachers, learners, and parents and be distributed and advocated parents at the beginning of each academic year as it is intended to establish a disciplined and purposeful school environment for all and to the benefit of the entire school community (Republic of South Africa, 1996b). The main objective is to improve the quality of teaching and learning by institutionalising the Guidelines for the Consideration of Governing Bodies in Adopting a Code of Conduct for Learners as provided Republic of South Africa (1998). The Guidelines explicitly deal with how to deal with different types of possible misconduct by learners. These can range from minor offences such as not doing homework to serious transgressions such as to conduct that can endanger and undermine the safety of fellow learners and everyone in the school.

The adoption therefore of Section 8 (a) of the South African Schools Act (SASA) (1996a) Code of Conduct for learners (CCL) allows for the establishment of behaviour managing programs such as merit and demerit systems which serves to create a communication channel between the governing body, school management, the teacher and the learner, while giving undisputable feedback to the parent.

2.5.2 GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES IN ADOPTING A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR LEARNERS

According to the Guidelines for the Consideration of Governing Bodies in Adopting a Code of Conduct for Learners, Education, as enshrined in the constitution together with the rights provided for in the bill of rights, forms the principles and value system on which the CCL is based, Government (1998). The vision and mission of the department of education embrace and encapsulate the constitution and the bill of rights, therefore, schools must adapt theirs guided by one of the Department of Education as it provides blueprints of a calibre of a citizen that is aimed at moulding.

The guidelines for implementing CCL state that it must be distributed at the beginning of each academic year. Advocacy and distribution of the CCL document cannot be the end in itself but the means to the
end: it is simply not enough to ensure effective and fruitful implementation. An imperative condition for an effective CCL depends on its enforcement. Nitsch, Baetz, and Hughes (2005) state that the effectiveness of a CCL is dependent on the degree to which the code violations can be appropriately weighed and sanctioned. This necessitates that the leaders at all levels understand their environment and the implication of behaviour. In their absence during the normal school day, the SGB delegates the day-to-day enforcement of the code of conduct to the SMT and educators.

2.5.3 NORMS AND STANDARDS FOR EDUCATORS

The Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) as stipulated in the Education Policy Act (No.27) of 1996 regarding a teacher as a leader and manager in the classroom as he /she is a decision-maker appropriate to the level at which they are appointed to operate. The teacher at the lowest level also manages to learn in the classroom, carry out classroom administrative duties efficiently, and participate in school decision making structures. Therefore, Leadership competencies are imperative in performing this role, Department of Education (2000).

2.6 THEORY OUTLINE

It is interesting to draw the connection with section 12(1) of the constitution that provides the right of freedom and security, with a focus on the right to be free from violence, torture, and to be treated with dignity. And this as mentioned before ultimately finding expression (SASA) 10(1) states that anyone who administers corporal punishment to a learner is guilty of a criminal offence and the Abolition of Corporal Punishment Act 33 of 1997 categorically abolishes any law that gives authority to punish including traditional authorities.

2.6.1 ORGANISATIONAL LEADERSHIP

School leadership research has for a long time viewed the principals as the sole authoritative heads who ensure the school's success, the debate which looks at a school as an organisation is an important one as it raises the question of who participates in school leadership, Lu and Hallinger (2018). The same as a living organism, all parts of the school must be viewed as essential. On-going research on school leadership suggests that both principal and teacher leadership are important for school improvement. Few studies have begun to focus on the interaction of principal and teacher leadership as separate but linked systems Sebastian, Huang and Allensworth (2017). Organizations are made up of different components that are corporately vital for their growth and survival. The structure which is made up of physical and human resources, culture, values and beliefs interacts in the context of organizational
learning. In this sense, an organization produces an organizational learning culture which is defined as a set of norms and common values shared by every member of an organization (Waruwu et al., 2020). Organizations, by design (Fidan and Balcı, 2017:12) “are open, social systems which endeavour to survive in contemporary, unpredictable environments.” Relationships between all these components that develop from how they interact are crucial and determine their growth and survival. Initial conditions, and past and present leadership decisions influence the adaptivity of the whole system.

Present-day societies pose completely different types of challenges to school leaders, for the study, a school leader is to be understood according to the Norms and standards. That is from the Post level 1 teacher in class to the principal as the leader in the space they operate in and also SGB members by virtue of their mandate. The school environment is largely influenced by the outside and at the same time expected to be the agent of change. According to Shaked and Scheter (2017) students are changing at an unprecedented speed of technologies mirroring the media-saturated society. Unfortunately, the same society holds the school accountable for ameliorating its children’s academic progress. They further critically look at how principals in particular focus on finding the solution for individual challenges instead of connecting the interactions of all the parts: managing the organisation with a holistic view enables the leader to track how parts impact each other.

2.6.2 DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP

According to Thien (2019) Distributed leadership theory perceive leadership as a shared asset in the organisation, it looks beyond the formal position but rests on the expertise of the performer. A leader who observes interactions is guided by patterns that reveal people’s strengths and character. Distributed leadership recognises many sources of influence within an organisation and encourages shared vision, collaboration, and participative commitment. Lu and Hallinger (2018) argue that where the principal is a sole provider of leadership the potential contributions of deputy principals, departmental heads and teachers can be undermined. For distributed leadership to be successful, good and effective communication skills are paramount for a principal to establish good relationships with educators, parents, and the community they serve. Leaders are regarded as the communicators in disseminating information about reform initiatives in their schools (Buthelezi, 2021)

According to Spillane (2005), the implementation of a discipline system should provide an opportunistic environment to demonstrate a shared vision of the organisation. This can be achieved by practising distributed perspective forms of leadership practice which is distributive (shared) leadership. Distributive Leadership (DL) practice is the result of the interactions of school leaders and followers interacting with their environment. It enables shared responsibility for leadership routines by multiple leaders in one institution (Spillane, 2005). As Chatwani & Chatwani (2018) expand on Spillane’s views argues that DL calls for leaders who know how to follow and followers who know how to lead. Leaders
who are capable of playing their different and respective roles so well that others are best supported and can fulfil their specific roles. They also advocate that the “social construct underlying DL promotes the understanding that leadership is a collective social process created by interactions of multiple actors and not something that one group of people (leaders) does to another group of people (followers). In this way, it is more like the idea gestalt, whereby the sum of its parts is more than the whole which is the result of a more holistic approach to leadership”. The recognition of every role player by all across the organisational hierarchy stands to yield greater gains if well-orchestrated.

2.6.3 SYSTEMS THINKING

According to Thien (2019) Distributed leadership theory perceive leadership as a shared asset in the organisation, it looks beyond the formal position but rests on the expertise of the performer. A leader who observes interactions is guided by patterns that reveal people’s strengths and character. If there is a change to improve any school, before rules are changed, there must be a turnaround in how people think and interact together.

Gharajedaghi (2011) Defines systems thinking as the art of simplifying complexity. It is about seeing through chaos, managing interdependency, and understanding the choices of an individual in a collective. The focus of this view is on how people learn to understand human interactions in a way that they can effectively deal with the forces that influences their actions. Ultimately, they become cognisant of themselves in space concerning thought, action and how the self is developing concerning the system and others. In a framework of a system, the development of self and the school is focused on the creation of a better and sustainable future for all children that become part of the school Shaked et al. (2017). In a school situation, Senge et al. (2012) view the substance of school as a place where deep connections are made through deeply personal and inherently social interactions, connecting not only the intellect but people that form the visual part of the organisation. This theory is used by complexity theorists to understand management in complex organisations and situations. A school is surely a complex organisation, where the SGB, the SMT, the teacher, and the learner in the capacity of the Learner Representative Council (LRC) have the same mandate of academic excellence that must be achieved where behaviour management is an imperative enabler. All these stakeholders must achieve different objectives, given different authority and accountability in the same environment. The fifth discipline, namely Self Mastery, Mental Models, Shared Vision, Learning Teams, and Systems Thinking are enablers of managing a complex organisation as a connected unit Senge et al. (2012). Systems thinking is the theory that underpins this study as it puts the spotlight on the different and individual parts of the organisation and how the leadership positions, responsibilities and relationships interact to form the envisaged whole or the organisation giving an effect that the sum total of the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The available literature has widely explored behaviour management and discipline at school as a responsibility of the teacher in the classroom environment and separately looks at the
principal as a leader with the sole responsibility to manage the school. This study seeks to close the literature gap as it looks at behaviour management in schools through the implementation of CCL in a holistic view where all stakeholders recognise each other’s roles and responsibilities as implemented comparatively as opposed to the teacher alone in class and the principal controlling the school as a manager.

2.6.4 LEARNING TEAMS

Waruwu et al. (2020) argue that it is the responsibility of leaders to forge communication systems among members of the organisation this becomes an important channel to transfer knowledge and skills needed for positive outcomes. Initiating learning structures that facilitate teamwork and development is pivotal. Teams of professionals who learn together develop dynamic interactions between teachers, workgroups and the organizations as a whole. Therefore, an important leadership role in the development of a shared vision and provision of appropriate resources that will enable a conducive teaching and learning environment, Mestry (2017). Charlotte Jones, Ruth Naylor, Tal Rafaeli, Yeukai Mlambo, and Ann Nielsen (2020) argue that collaborative work in form of learning teams is more productive and allows on the job learning and support that results in an improved workforce. A positive environment that leads to a successful school improvement process can be achieved through introducing development models such as professional learning community (PLC). DOE has introduced PLC as an enabling environment for teacher development was introduced as a voluntary choice for teachers. It is currently under review between the employer and unions as it cannot be used as a management tool. It has the potential to reach everyone who needs help as it allows small group interactions that can transform teachers into leaders through the decision-making relationships, they become exposed to Cherkowski and Schnellert (2017).

Senge et al. (2012) argue that great teams do not start great, they do not start as teams but as individuals who over time learn to work as a whole group, On the aspect of people management within a school environment, which has staff, parents, and learners. Clarke (2007) thought everyone is important as they are necessary connections, he, however, elevates learners by pointing out that the schools exist not for the staff or parents but for learners. Therefore, according to him, it must be learner-centred. Senge et al. (2012) explain the importance of connection by explaining a Zulu greeting:

“Among the tribes of northern Natal in South Africa, the most common greeting, equivalent to “hello” in English, is the expression: Sawubona. It means, "I see you." If you are a member of the tribe, you might reply by saying Sikhona, “I am here.” The order of the exchange is important: until you see me, I do not exist. It’s as if, when you see me, you bring me into existence.”
In an organisation or school, it is important to see each other and the value that each brings. At the same time hoping to persuade each to see others as partners, they need to achieve a common objective which is academic excellence and nation-building. Shaked et al. (2017) asset that an organization that is open to continuous learning providing opportunities to learn for all is investing in itself and is likely to increase the success and capacity of the organization.

2.2.5 CONCLUSION

Chapter 2 discussion shows how research is contributing to the understanding of learner behaviour in schools. Most of the literature focuses on the interactions at the level of the classroom where the technical learning that is measurable through academic results takes place. The term discipline or discipline systems is wildly used because the need is to negate any behaviour that disturbs a conducive teaching and learning environment. This narrows the literature to discipline and misses the bigger picture of behavioural management that is inclusive of all management and leadership at all levels within a school environment. This study seeks to explore the implementation process of CCL to shine a spotlight on how leadership acumen at every level impacts behavioural management and its outcomes. Developing school leadership away from looking at principals as the only leadership authority toward a cooperative form of leadership is gaining momentum. Theories such as; distributive and organisational leadership towards better school behaviour management and restorative justice that considers the whole community as opposed to discipline response towards single action while isolating the doer or the problem from the system will be explored. The intergraded leadership development theories such as learning teams and systems thinking towards building positive behavioural systems are the researcher’s interest in this study. The theory outline explained theories that can guide and manage the change. The legislative background gives the provisions for the environment that allows adaptation in the department of education.

CHAPTER 3

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the design and methodology that the researcher used by highlighting their merits as enablers to explore the research questions. In this chapter, the researcher's understanding of the research approach, paradigm, philosophy, design, and study area is displayed to help connect the reader and the researcher. It also gives clarity on how sampling techniques were employed, data generation methods used, and how the data was analysed. A detailed description of how ethical issues are addressed and also provides the validity of the data, limitations of the study, and the chapter summary as a conclusion.
3.1 RESEARCH APPROACH

3.1.1 PARADIGMS

According to Rahi (2017), the term Paradigm is described as a crucial collection of beliefs that are shared by scientists, it is an acceptable criterion to define problems as they unfold in their world and thus, direct how research is conducted. The paradigms contain fundamental beliefs or assumptions that guide our inquiries of a chosen research. The chosen paradigm guides the development of philosophical knowledge. Paradigms that have been widely used in research include Positivism, Interpretive, Advocacy and Pragmatism. Paradigm also refers to a high-order way of thinking about or categorizing the approach or logic that underpins all aspects of research from the idea, how it develops and holds the interest of the researcher to the final design, conduct and outcomes of the research Ling and Ling, (2016). The interpretive paradigm takes interest in the deep understanding of a concept allowing the exploration and the understanding of the world in which participants live. For this study, I interview an SGB member, Principal, DP, DH and Educator in each of the 3 selected schools to get views at different levels of leadership. Interacting with the participants in their natural setting allows me to observe multiple realities about my research topic. According to Rahi (2017), a paradigm is also called Constructivism, Social constructivism or Qualitative Research paradigm. This study explores Social Constructivism within interpretivism philosophy, Social Constructivists hold the view that individuals develop subjective meanings of the world they live and work in. Relying on the varied and multiple views of participants, the researcher aims to look for complexity that gives meaning to their world Creswell et al. (2018). Interpretivism uses inductive, unlike deductive reasoning which explains relationships in the theory that focuses on cause and effect, inductive thinking’s approach is concerned with the context in which events take place Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2016). This approach allows me as the researcher to understand each participant’s view of the CCL development, advocacy and implementation at the level they operate and also concerning other participants at the level and how they are or should cooperate in the implementation. It importantly allows the participants to connect the pieces of information that already exist within the school and hopefully connect individuals’ efforts towards the creation of the learning and teaching environment.

The researcher is expected to display a rich understanding of the complexity by collecting what is meaningful as depicted by the culture, language, and history of the participants to create meaning, Saunders et al. (2016). Interpretivism is appropriate for this study as it enabled the participants while reflect on their understanding and implementation of the code of conduct for learners, they also discovered how fellow implementers in their school attach meaning and respond to the prescripts. Each
participant is afforded an equal opportunity to reflect and draw from experience to critically analyse leadership dynamics in their response to CCL mandates.

3.1.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

A research design is a general plan of how the researcher will attempt to respond to the research question/s that are clearly defined, the type of questions, sample size, the interaction between the researcher and participants are some of the elements that form the bases of the choice of this research design Saunders et al. (2016). This research has eighteen (18) participants, the enquiry is based on 3 schools which are organisations by nature and the researcher uses a descriptive and exploratory questions to understand policies and processes through unstructured interviews. Research questions and objectives are consistent with the interpretivism and exploratory philosophy to ensure coherence throughout the research design, Saunders et al. (2016).

3.1.3 QUALITATIVE STUDY

A research design according to Mabaso (2019) is a strategy employed by the researcher to collect and analyse the data that is required to answer the research questions. Creswell & Creswell (2018), explain qualitative research as an approach that explores how people interpret and give meaning to their world as individuals or groups.

This study is based on a qualitative study of findings that are collected and transparently interpreted to enable the reader to understand how new information is developed. Themes are used and aggregated to develop a coherent and compelling argument fit to contribute to the existing body of knowledge. According to Hammarberg, Kirkman, and De Lacey (2016), quantitative research methods are most appropriate where factual data are defined and isolate variables to test probability to answer the research question/s. The qualitative method, which is used for this study, requires the researcher to collect data which is used to seek in-depth understanding that allows participants to interpret, understand and/or create their plausible future. This is achieved by assuming that each participant is a true representative of a population and whose views, feelings and emotions are important to be used for interpretation. In qualitative research the objective stance is obsolete, the researcher is the instrument, and subjects become participants who may contribute to data interpretation and analysis Hammarberg et al.(2016).

In this study each level of leadership in each of the three schools is represented by one person in the sample, each participant’s feelings, emotions and thought is treated as important in the research process.

The researcher keeps in mind that the research experience is meant to facilitate social construction by ensuring that the research participants represent their grounded knowledge, and importantly treat them with respect and continuously point to the research benefits for their school Edwards and Brannelly
(2017). The participants are allowed to state their views about how things are done, and how they should be done to achieve a high level of learner discipline.

3.1.4 CASE STUDY

Saunders et al. (2016) define a case study as an inquiry into a topic about a person, event or entity that takes place in a real-life setting. In this study, the case is the three selected schools and the topic which determines the boundary of the inquiry is the CCL within the context of school leadership. Unstructured interviews with individual participants allow the researcher to ask follow-up questions. The nature of research questions that are used for this study is exploratory and descriptive in keeping with the research objectives, the use of open-ended questions permits the participant to give insight into the topic of interest Saunders et al. (2016). The main benefit for the researcher is to have an in-depth understanding of the contextual complexity of the participant’s views and emotions that unfolds within their natural setting Ngidi (2018). The SGB members, SMT, and teachers engage freely as they are in their familiar territory. According to Saunders et al. (2016), the interpretivism paradigm embraces multiple realities which can be multiple cases or different levels of operation within an organisation. Multiple cases, the 3 schools as well as different leadership levels within each school are explored in this study, to replicate findings across cases and levels Saunders et al. (2016). The multiple realities are explored because the nature of the CCL mandate resides at all leadership levels within each school, i.e., the SGB, the principal, and everyone under him are each given mandate differently in the endeavour to groom the best citizen. Furthermore, the DBE has three main types of schools, namely Primary, Secondary, and combined schools that exist in either urban, township, semi-rural, or rural communities which though they offer different contextual factors in the implementation of CCL, they are expected to produce a well-groomed learner Government (1996) all schools, therefore, need to lay a foundation that will continue and allow a successful adaptation into another school or community by the learner.

3.1.5 SAMPLING

According to Saunders et al. (2016) collecting data until data saturation is reached is generally recommended, he suggests that in-depth interviews among a homogenous group can generate sufficient data, therefore between 5 and 30 interviews are recommended. This study has 18 participants.

3.1.5.1 PURPOSEFUL SAMPLING

According to Saunders et al. (2016), the researcher’s judgment is important in purposeful sampling to select cases that will respond to research questions and achieve objectives. Creswell et al. (2018:185)
maintain that by saying “the idea behind qualitative research is to purposefully select participants that will best help the researcher to understand the problem and the research question”.

The main strategy of purposive sampling is to ensure that the is a variety of participants who are knowledgeable about the culture and are able and willing to represent as they engage in interpreting the culture Moser and Korstjens (2018). This study requires participants who are leading in the implementation of disciplinary policy in schools as defined by CCL policy and the Norms and Standards for Educators. Purposive sampling is used to select participants.

Schools are selected firstly by being in the selected Circuits for the research, secondly, the monitoring reports reflect those principals who, though they are sure that teachers know that corporal punishment is outlawed are equally unsure whether it is not secretly used in the school, and thirdly the schools had no discipline system that yields positive results. Three schools are selected for the research. All three schools are categorized at quintiles 1 and 2 which means the socioeconomic status of the community served by the schools is very low as it is characterized by a high level of unemployment, the schools are nearly the same size and ecocultural status. The secondary and the primary schools are semi-rural, and the combined school is in a rural setting. Principals in these schools are chosen as participants because they are expert participants and the custodians of policy, representatives of DBE in schools and executive leaders in their schools.

3.1.5.2 SNOWBALL SAMPLING

The researcher as an outsider is therefore contextually unable to know and select the best people in the study to achieve purposeful sampling. Snowball sampling was used to select the principal as the leader who directs the researcher to whom to recruit based on the sampling criteria of the study. Saunders et al. (2016) suggest that the researcher contact one or two cases that identifies further participants. In this study principals are the first contacts in their schools as they are leaders and experts who know the dynamics in their schools, they, therefore, recommend other participants within their school to engage and ensure representation at all levels of leadership.

3.1.6 THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER AND REFLEXIVITY

Qualitative research is interpretive, the researcher is involved in the experience of the participants, therefore ethical issues come into play. Where biases, values, and personal background cloud judgment, the researcher explicitly reflects on her thinking to remain impartial Creswell (2018). The researcher focuses on generating data instead of judging how they feel about the information. Her engagement led them to explore their feelings about the data. To be reflexive, notes are taken by the researcher during
the interviews as Creswell (2016) advises that a qualitative researcher should write reflective notes about their observations during the research process to assist them in making consideration of their influence in the interpretation of the results.

3.1.7 PERSONAL EXPERIENCE AND HOW IT CAN INFLUENCE INTERPRETATION

The researcher’s work is in a Teacher Development Directorate in a unit that works in partnership with the South African Council for Educators (SACE). The mandate of the directorate is to ensure that teacher professionalism is upheld, by monitoring and giving support to schools and teachers in the implementation of the Code of Professional Ethics (COPE) and other developmental issues. This includes the non-administration of corporal punishment by educators. The monitoring and support implementation of the CCL reside in Learner Affairs which is a sister unit in the same directorate, the researcher is not directly involved as the topic is outside her scope of work. The interest is conjured by the fact that the challenges in CCL implementation led teachers to err on this issue impacting their professionalism, and also putting their livelihoods in danger. In the past 7 years, the observation by the researcher was that, in schools where a teacher is tempted to risk the use of corporal punishment, the CCL exists as a document but not a policy that informs the grooming of positive behaviour in learners and as punitive measures where necessary. In 2017 the Mpumalanga Education Department (MED) issued circular number 77 of 2017 that directed schools to put in place Merit and demerit systems. These systems are meant to create a framework that is unique to each school to implement the CCL provisions. The provisions are meant to direct response mostly to the acknowledgement of good behaviour for positive reinforcement and the use of punitive measures only where necessary. On receipt of the circular principals made teachers sign a concern form acknowledging that they are aware that they must not administer corporal punishment. this is a response that was so widespread in my district and beyond, it was unlikely that this practice was coincidental. This does not show ignorance, but the unwillingness of leadership to correctly interpret and implement prescripts, which might be perceived as cutting corners and taking the easy route as opposed to managing change.

The fact that the implementation of CCL is not part of the researcher’s work Key Performance Area (KPA) has in the past and during the research process took the urge off to correct but afforded patience to develop. Furthermore, the hope is that the generation of scientific data about this phenomenon will contribute valid and reliable data generation to hopefully assist policy implementation.

3.2 DATA COLLECTING PROCEDURE

3.2.1 THE SAMPLE

“Sampling is the process of selecting or searching for situations, context and/or participants who provide rich data of the phenomenon of interest. In qualitative research, you sample deliberately, not at
random,” Moser et al (2018:10). In this study, all levels of leadership in a school were selected for inclusivity and depth of information. A collective case study, where 3 schools were selected to supersede the interest of an individual case and to deepen the insight of the researcher about the topic that was studied Fouche (2011).

The research participants consist of:

1. The 3 schools represent 3 types of schools, namely Secondary, primary, and combined schools.
   
   This is a representation of schools where principals confirm that educators know they are not supposed to administer corporal punishment, but the school has no discipline system in place.

2. A principal
   
   A principal is an ex-officio member of the SGB as a legal representative of the HOD, the departmental accounting officer at the provincial office, and an adviser. Also, the leader of the SMT is the implementing structure of school policies.

3. SGB Member
   
   Represent the school governors that are legally mandated to ensure the crafting and implementation of disciplinary policy in schools.

4. Deputy principal (DP)
   
   The second is in charge after the principal, who is mandated to ensure quality curriculum delivery where a conducive environment for teaching and learning is essential.

5. Department Head (DH)
   
   Is responsible for quality curriculum delivery and supports educators in creating a conducive environment for teaching and learning.

6. A teacher with less than 5 years of experience
   
   Is responsible for creating a conducive learning environment through classroom management while assisting management to maintain discipline through ground duties in the school and coaching newly appointed teachers where they need assistance.

7. A teacher with more than 5 years of experience
   
   Is responsible for creating a conducive learning environment through classroom management while assisting management to maintain discipline through ground duties in the school.

Below is a diagrammatical representation of my case sites and participants (per site):

**Table 1** A table representation of interview participants per school

NB. The names used are pseudonyms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Kusile Primary School</th>
<th>Inkanyezi Combined School</th>
<th>Hlakahle Secondary School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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3.2.2 DATA GENERATION METHODS

An important aspect of qualitative research is that the interviewer understands the meaning of the findings by essentially being present to involve him or herself in the day-to-day activities of the participants. However, that has proved to be a difficult and health risk during the COVID-19 pandemic. Video-conferencing which can involve a choice of Skype, Zoom, Microsoft teams and others can be a choice for conducting interviews that have a face-to-face feel Torrentira (2020). Microsoft Teams is a practical alternative for this project as the principals of the selected school committed to providing computers for interviews.

According to McMillan & Schumacher (2010), methods refer to data gathering techniques in a research study. There are different methods for gathering data available to qualitative researchers like interviews, observations, questionnaires, and document reviews, to name a few (Creswell, 2009; McMillan et al., 2010). The study used three methods to generate data, observation, semi-structured interviews, and document review. These are used to generate understanding about their own and others’ interpretation and implementation of CCL in their different leadership capacities.

3.2.3 DOCUMENT REVIEW

Saunders et al. (2016) observe that the researcher considers the primary data as a priority and important to answer their research questions, documented data that is collected for other reasons for the research provides additional and different knowledge that assists interpretation and conclusions, it helps answer partial answers obtained during the research inquiry. This is secondary data. In a school situation attendance registers for both learners and staff, period registers incident book, school safety committee minutes, SGB minutes, SMT minutes, and CCL policy documents are sourced to scan the environment and for data analyses. These documents are used to shed light on the managing of learner discipline in the participating school, these documents are reviewed before the first interview commenced to gain an understanding of the current disciplinary model of the school and impact and reference for data analyses.
3.2.4 UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

Unstructured interviews have the benefit of allowing the researcher to probe deeper, hence, they are sometimes called in-depth interviews as they tend to engage with the units of analysis to generate real and crucial information about the personal experiences and perspectives of participants Bihu (2020).

Appointments are made with all three schools; the researcher arrives at each school at 07h45 to allow time to review documents. An appointment from 7h45 to 14h30 is secured with the school where the researcher from 7h45 to 8h30 reviews school documents that are relevant for the research and from 8h30 to 14h30 the interaction with participants at different times. In line with conducting helpful, hopeful, and respectful research during Covid-19, Covid-19 health protocols are observed according to UKZN 2020 regulations. The researcher takes notes in each interview and uses a high-quality voice recorder as a supplement for accurate data collection.

The interviews start at 08h30 with the principals, followed by the SGB member and the principal then arranges other teachers. The educator’s availability determines who will be interviewed at a particular time when it is not possible and arrangements are made to exchange the class attendance of educators. The interviews are done between 08h30 to 14h30 in each school because the interview took 39 minutes for the longest and the shortest is 29 minutes long with one exception that lasted 53 minutes.

A face-to-face interview might last between 30 and 90 minutes, the interviewer used follow-up questions to seek clarity and probe more information while taking care that there is not too much leading as the topic of interest seeks to explore the participant’s knowledge and understanding of statutory processes Moser and Korstjens (2018). To guide and ensure relevance and coverage of content a pilot test which can be in a form of a preliminary interview is held and it assisted in identifying gaps in my questions that were corrected before actual interviews Moser et al. (2018).

Bihu (2020) views an unstructured interview as an unfolding process with three stages where the interviewer seeks to understand the contextual experience of the participant on the subject of interest, followed by the factual knowledge and lastly their understanding and ability to make meaning and capacity to reflect and use knowledge to build a desirable outcome. The study’s first set of questions requires the participant to reflect on their experience of the CCL advocacy campaign to understand how each leadership level view the process. The second set tested the critical understanding of the CCL development and implementation processes and lastly how do they understand and measure the impact thereof and what do they think should be done to build a better future.

3.3 DATA ANALYSIS
3.3.1 Data Analysis process

The first step taken by the researcher is to read the notes taken during the interview and thereafter transcribe the interview recordings at the end of each appointment day. Four of the 18 participants were called telephonically by the researcher to verify the information and clarify their understanding. After all three schools’ interviews recording is immediately transcribed and the transcript is compared with the notes that are taken during the interview. The notes and transcripts are read and reread interchangeably with listening to the recording to familiarise oneself with the data. This is done to ensure that I fully immerse my mind in all the data. The data is then categorised and coded while making the distinction between semantic and latent meaning in the data. The distinction takes into consideration the feelings and emotions in the manner that words are used to assist the researcher to interpret the data. This makes it possible for the researcher to recognise and extract themes from the data. Nine themes were initially extracted, and the researcher reviewed and merge others producing six main themes. The six main themes that were extracted from the data were further synthesised to measure their potential to respond to the research questions and objectives.

3.3.2 Defined themes

The collected data is analysed and the main six extracted thems are namely:

1. Understanding the development, advocacy, and implementation of CCL as a process
2. Understanding of own and others' roles
3. Awareness of the scope of operation of each stakeholder in CCL processes
4. Participant’s perceptions of what the CCL used for in the school
5. Knowledge of the value systems by the school community
6. Inconsistent responses in describing procedures in the same school

These themes will be described and discussed in chapters 4 and 5 of this study.

3.4 VALIDITY
Moser et al. (2018) assert that the researcher must ensure validity by that interpretation is connected to the research aims and objectives. They caution against reducing qualitative inquiry to steps and checklists. The researcher after identifying themes finds semantic and latent meaning, develops themes, links them back to the literature and determines the level at which they answer research questions and generate new information. Chapter 4 of this study discusses the findings and makes meaning of the data, then in chapter 5 recommendations are derived from the discussion which seeks to highlight the generation of new information.

3.5 ETHICAL ISSUES

Creswell (2018) asserts that the researcher has a responsibility to protect the participants to build a positive repertoire that will benefit the research process and build integrity. The administrative requirements are fulfilled by the researcher.

An application for the gatekeeper’s concern is made to the Mpumalanga Department of Education seeking allowance to research the three schools which are located in Volksrust circuits under Gert Sibande district in Mpumalanga province and it was granted.

Ethical clearance from the Humanities and Social Science Research Ethics Committee (HSSREC) is acquired through the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN). After the granting of the ethical clearance, letters are written to school principals as the relevant gatekeepers at the school level, requesting permission to research schools that are under their supervision. It is after receiving the principal’s confirmation in writing that letters are written to the participants concerning participation. The letters explain in detail the purpose of the study while requesting them to participate in the study. A consent section is signed agreeing to participate and to the use of a tape recorder. The researcher explains that they are not pressured to be part of the study and could withdraw at any time in the process should they feel, they cannot carry on.

3.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

A sincere effort is made to be inclusive of the main categories of schools and all leadership levels in the school to ensure the richness of data. However, the sample size of 3 schools and 18 participants hinders generalisation. The research site is in a remote location where the internet connection is not consistently strong. The face-to-face interview happens under Covid-19 protocols where time to interact with each participant is limited to the minimum recommended of 30 minutes for an interview. More time to interact and engage is desirable as all but one went beyond the limited time with more questions posed by many participants after recoding was stopped.
CHAPTER SUMMARY

Chapter 3 described the suitability of Qualitative research design and methodology to respond to the research questions of the study. The actual details and account of how data collecting and data analysis procedures and strategies were utilised to achieve the study objectives were outlined and described. The philosophy and interpretive paradigm where the study is located were discussed as to how the researcher’s approach to the study. The nature of qualitative research design and case study as the methodology that was used is explained. Purposive sampling, snowballing and convenience sampling utilised are indicated as the sampling method used in the study. Document analysis and semi-structured interviews are done and described as the data generation methods employed in the study. The involvement of the researcher, timing and process of data collecting and analysis strategies used in data are described. This chapter also explains how data validity is ensured, how ethical issues are handled, limitations of the is acknowledged.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter will present and discuss the findings that were generated through the use of semi-structured interviews between the researcher and the participants. To preserve the meaning and feelings of participants the italic font will be used and participants’ voices will be in the form of verbatim quotes where necessary. Thematic analysis is employed to present findings, it is the process of identifying patterns or themes within qualitative data. Data analysis is much more than simply summarising the data; a good thematic analysis recognises the two levels of analysing data, which are semantic and latent. The latter allows the researcher to identify or examine the underlying ideas, assumptions, and conceptualisations to make meaning of the data Moria & Dundalk (2017). Before the themes are discussed, a short description of the data collection and profiling of each participating school and participants is presented. The description and profiling of research participants are meant to help the reader to understand the context from which the data was generated.

4.2 DATA COLLECTION

A focus group exercise was done in a school in the Wakkerstroom circuit. The school was not part of the schools selected for data collection as the principal moved and the acting principal could manage research logistics and another school was chosen to replace it. This was done to test the relevancy of the questions, as to what extent are they able to generate the data that is like to answer research questions and objectives. A district official working with the Representative Council for Learners, Principal, Departmental Head, and an educator took part in the exercise. Valuable insight was given to the researcher in terms of the process of developing and implementing of CCL. The operation of a Disciplinary Committee was clarified in line with the provision by SASA to the researcher. The committee is a non-static structure that is selected to deal with a particular case and dissolved after the case is resolved, it works as a tribunal.

The data was collected for three schools in the Volksrust circuit. Ensuring safety protocols of covid-19 to minimise transmission a virtual meeting was arranged with the schools. Due to the length of engagement and unstable internet connections as the schools are in semi-rural areas, the first two interviews had disruptions. We, therefore, rearrange face-to-face meetings with strict safety measures. This was successfully done as the interviews involved the researcher and one participant at a time. The last educators in the two last schools were interviewed over the phone due to time constraints, as interviews went on to the school’s knock-off time, and the educator was using common transport (lift club).
4.3 DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

In this section, findings will be presented and discussed through themes that emerged from the responses of questions that stem from research objectives. These questions were posed to determine participants' knowledge and understanding of the discipline process, their roles concerning other people's roles and understanding of the organisation as a whole in managing and building positive behaviour of learners. Of interest is the collective organisational or systemic understanding of the process. The themes emerged from the data are presented as follows:

1. **Understanding the development, advocacy, and implementation of CCL as a process**
2. **Understanding of own and others roles**
3. **Awareness of scope of operation of each stakeholder in CCL processes**
4. **Participant’s perceptions of what the CCL used for in the school**
5. **Knowledge of the value systems by the school community**
6. **Inconsistent responses in describing procedures in the same school**

These themes explored the level of understanding and implementation at the same time they were able to determine the level of ownership and involvement by participants. The openness and inclusiveness of the system to allow the contribution of all leaders at their respective position was observed. The level of probing by the researcher is managed to avoid filling in gaps in the process for the respondent.

PROFILING OF SCHOOLS AND PARTICIPANTS

To ensure that confidentiality is maintained, pseudo names will be used to identify schools and positions will be used to quote participants. This study seeks to explore leadership acumen as displayed in the implementation of CCL positions that will be useful to the reader.

Interviewed Participants per school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School governing body member</td>
<td>SGB</td>
<td>It can be an educator/parent/ non-teaching staff representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SMT member and Ex-officio of SGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>SMT Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Head</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>SMT Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator or Teacher</td>
<td>EdA</td>
<td>An educator with one up to 5 years of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator or Teacher</td>
<td>EdB</td>
<td>An educator with more than 5 years of experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Inkanyezi is a combined school, which starts from grade R to 12. According to South African School Act 84 of 1996, only grade 8 to 12 learners can participate in the democratically elected Representative Council of Learners (RCL) and must be represented in an SGB (Republic of South Africa). It is the*
only school in the semi-rural community; hence community members and parents take a keen interest in the school. It is in the positive trajectory toward better management systems, the request to participate in this study was welcomed as it was seen as a learning opportunity by the management.

It has a staff complement of 37 educators and 1371 learners. The overall learner pass rate is 63% and 81% grade12 pass rate for 2020.

Participants

Table 3 Inkanyezi* Participant profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Name</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISGB</td>
<td>3 Terms</td>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>26 years</td>
<td>Senior manager (SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior Manager (SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDH</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Manager (STM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEdA</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Class Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEdB</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Class manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hlalakahle** is a Secondary school starting from grades 8 to12. The school is located in a location near a small town called Amersfoort in Gert Sibande District in Mpumalanga Province.

Despite having secured an appointment, on my arrival, there was an SMT meeting held. The principal who was supposed to coordinate participants for me and three of my participants were in the meeting. This offered an opportunity for me to observe the environment, the only loss that was suffered from the delay was that the last participant could not take part because most teachers are commuting using common transport, however, an arrangement was made that the researcher can call to conduct the interview later in the afternoon.

On entering the school building, an old and tattered A4 page of the Department of Education vision and mission statement that was pasted at the entrance of the administration block caught my attention. The school’s vision and mission statement were not in sight as per requirement. While the meeting continued, the teachers were walking to class at different times, each taking chalk from the administrator’s office, the last one strolled in after 20 minutes after the period commencement. Few learners were running from class to class. It was only after 45 minutes that the SMT meeting was adjourned. The SGB participant in the study is a teacher component member.

It has a staff complement of 41 educators and 1330 learners. The overall learner pass rate is 86% and 72.2% grade12 pass rate for the Department of Basic Education (2021) The grade 12 performance is varying every year, going into underperformance and performance forth and backwards.
Table 4 Hlalakhe* participant profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSGB</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Term</td>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>Senior manager (SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Senior Manager (SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDH</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>Manager (SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEdA</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Class Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEdB</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>Class manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kusile Primary** is a primary school starting from grade R to 7, according to South African School Act 84 of 1996, only grade 8 to 12 learners can participate and be represented in an SGB (Republic of South Africa). The school has a prefect system that is in contradiction with the stated act as it includes learners in a lower grade in their discipline system. The atmosphere does resemble that of a learning school, learners and teachers are in class on time. The SGB participant in the study is a teacher component member.

It has a staff compliment of 36 educators and 1112 learners. The overall learner pass rate is 67%.

Table 5 Kusile* participant profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSGB</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Term</td>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>Senior manager (SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>Senior Manager (SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDH</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Manager (STM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEdA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Class Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEdB</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Class manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3 RESEARCH FINDINGS: THEMATIC DATA PRESENTATION**

The nucleus of this study is to explore each participant’s understanding of the prescripts guiding the implementation of CCL, and how their role and others' roles individually or cooperatively impact learner behaviour management at the different leadership levels within the school community. Moira et al. (2017) warns against simply organising and summarising the data without interpreting and making sense of it, he says, this is a common pitfall caused by using the main interview questions as themes. However, Terry et al. (2017) recognise that themes can partly be identified before the full data is analysed, determined by the existing theory and reflected in interview questions. in such instances, it is
recommended that interview questions form themes. This research seeks to explore participants’ understanding of processes, the first three themes lean more toward semantic analysis followed by themes that venture to more latent analysis.

The data presentation was arranged in themes that developed from the data by coding from the responses of participants. The questions of the research were based on the following research objectives key areas: development, advocacy and implementation of the Code of conduct for Learners (CCL), understanding of roles, communication as well as the school’s value system.

The themes that developed are from the interview:

4.3.1 UNDERSTANDING THE DEVELOPMENT, ADVOCACY AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CCL AS A PROCESS

SASA provides that the Code of Conduct for Learners (CCL) must be formulated by the School Governing Body in consultation with learners, parents, educators and non-educators and, such stakeholders must be consulted annually when the CCL is reviewed or amendments made. Government (1998). For a successful consultation and effective implementation, a common or shared understanding of procedure and processes is required from all stakeholders and role-players.

- The SGB as governors of schools are policymakers, and the principal of the school is the ex-officio member. Therefore, the process of drafting and consulting all stakeholders must be led by the SGB guided by the principal.
- School stakeholders must participate in advocacy are SGB, SMT, LRC, Teachers and non-teaching staff as the authors of the document at the beginning of each year.
- The guidelines provide that CCL must be reviewed annually in consultation with the same stakeholders.

To explore the understanding of processes, thematic data analysis will be expressed by 1. each school and 2. leadership levels. A tabular representation of this theme’s findings is used to provide a holistic view and present participants’ responses alongside each other and facilitate discussion of theme 1. A whole school view and cross-school view can be determined.

On questions that dealt with processes the following were responses per school to present understanding within a school community:

4.3.1a Inkanyezi* interview responses
Each of the six participants at Inkanyezi* school reflects a knowledge gap on the development, advocacy and implementation processes and procedures of the CCL in a school. As displayed by their inconsistency in response to the same questions.

On the question posed about the development process of the CCL, each participant understands the processes at the level of their operation. IP sees the process initiated by herself as the principal instead of the SGB, while ISGB has the involvement of RCL as a point of departure although the SGB and other stakeholders are involved. On the other hand, the IDP and the IDH understand the process as starting from the SMT level where they are operating. The two teachers with their varying experiences also understand it from the classroom level where they operate as being learner-centred.

The responses given suggest a lack of common understanding of the implementation process, which raises the question as to whether these stakeholders understand the CCL at the same wavelength for effective implementation. The hesitant manner of response by IEdB, who has more than five years of teaching experience can easily be viewed as an admission of detachment from activities that are outside the class or non-compliant with the school:

“Though I’m not quite sure... I remember that the principal started the process and gradually involved the SGB then ultimately involved us, teachers, to make amendments and be aware”. (IedB: The teacher with +5 working experience)

IP displays a silo mentality in her approach to the development processes of the CCL by not tapping on the legislative mandate of the SGB to initiate the development process as well as the teachers’ knowledge of SASA directives. The educator’s understanding is only of the internal processes, they know that the SGB is involved but are not sure of the extent thereof. Nevertheless, the picture that is painted by responses depicts inconsistencies in the systems of the school.

The success of the advocacy as the cornerstone of the CCL implementation depends on the participants’ displaying the clarity of purpose. The responses of all participants defy the clarity of purpose in that, the IP sees the DC as central to advocacy, while the DC is a non-permanent arbitrary structure that plays no role in advocacy. This misunderstanding filters down from the IP as the principal through the IDP, the DH right to the recently appointed educator which questions the advocacy in the implementation process.

On the question of who are the target groups for the advocacy campaign and the one about which platforms are used for advocacy, six different responses were elicited from the six responses of the same school. IP is the only one who mentions the DC and Life orientation teachers as a platform, ISGB as the representative of the parents didn’t mention her constituency while IDP mentioned the RCL who are supposed to be part of the advocates and that they move from class to class to advocate. The
spectrum of responses by participants in the same school raises the question of whether the advocacy is done in the school.

IP and IDPs’ response was that the CCL is reviewed in a three-year interval, while others said it is annually one teacher could not even remember CCL being reviewed, he thoughtfully said “I’m not sure, it has been a long since it has been reviewed”. (IedB: The teacher with +5 working experience)

I then probed IP further about whether the CCL was reviewed .without pointing out the source of information, I was given attendance registers as proof that it was done during the orientation of teachers, IedB acknowledged that taking place, however, raised a concern that during such engagement there is no space to review and amend hence he didn’t regard that as a review. This is in line with Lumadi’s (2020) findings that stakeholders do not understand the turnaround disciplinary plan. When the strategic reasoning behind activities is understood by a few, others may not feel it concerns them.

4.3.1b Hlalakahle* Interview responses

At Hlalakahle, on my arrival, the SMT was locked in a meeting for 40 minutes. This time-lapse resulted in one participant falling on a time slot beyond school hours. The interview could not be held as the participant was using a lift club, a telephone interview was arranged with the participant. The time during the SMT meeting was used fruitfully by the researcher as it presented an opportunity to observe issues of discipline in the school.

The response on the advocacy of the CCL HP as the principal was the only one who mentioned the involvement of the support staff, HP and HSGB mention the involvement of the SGB roles and other respondece understood the process at the level of their operation, SMT members do not recognise the involvement of the SGB, while educators do not acknowledge both the SMT and SGBs’involvement.

The questions of the communication channel for lodging grievances and the adopted disciplinary procedure it is understood differently, the grievance and disciplinary processes both seek to resolve the same kind of problems but for each respondent, it involves different people. To educators, it involves RCL, educator and DH to the HP and HDP the DC that is supposed to be the tribunal is seen as the first response. RCL and TLO are mentioned as people who receive grievances and yet are not involved in the disciplinary procedure, according to this version, resolving challenges can be a lengthy and complicated process. The grievance and disciplinary procedure determine how everyone in the school community responds to behaviour that has the potential to destabilise harmony and disturb the quality of teaching and learning. if it is understood and implemented differently in the same institution, the possibility to reach a consensus is diminished. The picture painted by the responses may suggest that in the absence of the principal, how discipline is managed depends on who is acting. In all schools the DC
is not used as a tribunal as provided by the Guidelines for developing CCL, it is a standing committee that can even be involved in the development of CCL. HDH’s response to the question about reports suggests that only serious cases that are dealt with by DC are recorded: this can mean minor offences that are repeatedly committed which should escalate to serious offences are not captured, not documenting will be a loophole in the process.

The understanding and uniformity of grievance channels and disciplinary procedures ensure fairness and trust in the school. A school, by its nature of complexity, needs stability for learners to follow rules Clarke (2007).

Mestry (2017) asserts that instructional management includes a clear vision that must be shared by all. Mabaso (2019) as well, reflected that in one school, some teachers knew and apply the code of conduct, while others heard about it but were not sure what it contains. Inconsistent information may render the process ineffective.

4.3.1c Kusile* Interview responses

On the question of the process of developing the CCL at Kusile* school, KP the principal put the Prefect system and DC at the apex of the disciplinary process. The prefect system has no place in the guidelines for CCL development and the DC is provided as a temporary tribunal option to deal with serious cases, not a standing committee. This is further reflected by KSGB response as he begins the process by engaging learners, instead of the SGB consulting every stakeholder. KDP is the righthand man of the principal, however, is not sure how the CCL process unfolds, he responded by saying “I can’t tell for sure; it should be in a form of a meeting”. (KDP: Deputy principal of Kusile* school).

When probed about the number of meetings held to develop the CCL, he said one meeting is held.

All three schools were found wanting as they responded differently to the advocacy and implementation question, these policy development and advocacy are core processes to ensure the effective implementation of any policy. Imperatively, advocacy for a policy is intended to garner support for that particular policy, that being the case the advocates need to portray an understanding of processes. In Hlalakahle* school the responses about the advocacy followed a similar trend observed at Inkanyezi school. An observation in education policy implementation across the world is that there are serious questions about the degree to which advocacy activities and networks convey ideas intended, Lamm et al. (2018), this might be the challenge in these schools. However, Lubienski (2018) argues that effective advocacy among other strategies needs compelling narratives that demand attention be developed by advocates. This may be possible where the leaders understand the processes and roles they must play in the implementation.
On the question of Disciplinary procedure and the use of class rules, KSGB and KDP talk of merits and demerits which are by design part of disciplinary systems. However, KDH, states categorically that merits and demerit are still under discussion and not yet implemented. KDP and KEdA think the CCL is reviewed quarterly, KP is the only one who responded statutory correct by saying it is reviewed annually and others say after 3 years. This continuum of responses glaringly reflects systemic disjuncture in the disciplinary process in the school.

The Guidelines for the Consideration of Governing Bodies as part of SASA Republic of South Africa (1996) provides grounds for uniformity in all schools in South Africa. As the name guidelines, it provides some level of autonomy as even if schools can exist in the same community circumstances are unique and visions differ. Still, a learner who is moving from a primary school to a secondary school, whether it is locally or in any part of the country must be able to adapt.

Clarke (2017) the creation of a conducive environment for teaching and learning through appropriate discipline systems should be intentional. A system can have a long-lasting impact on how a person responds to discipline or adapt in the future.

The interview was enlightening for the principals of the different schools, they volunteered their feedback to the researcher at the end of the interview sessions. The principal of Inkanyezi* had an eye-opening experience to realise that while she thought she was doing both the induction of newly appointed teachers and review of the CCL, teachers only saw it as only the induction, not the review of the CCL as there was no opportunity for amendment. Such that at the end she expressed the need for the school to work on the issues reflected even before the researcher gives the feedback. The principal of Hlakahle* was conscience-stricken when she realised, she did not know the vision and mission of her school, however, appreciated and saw the exercise as empowerment as it gave her an idea of how to incorporate the mission and vision into the school’s day to day operations. The principal of Kusile* said to the researcher “whether you pass this research or not, we need you to come back to assist us, we need development”. While it was an eye-opening experience for participants to draw inferences on how the implementation of CCL starting with the effective use of class rules and school motto can achieve the school vision and mission, they realised the importance of working together at different levels to cultivate positive learner behaviour. The expression by participants especially principals, that there is a lot to be done in the aspect of learner discipline, meant the was some shift in how they perceive their world.

Cloutier and Ravasi (2021) assets that to amplify the trustworthiness of the data a researcher may above providing transparency to the empirical grounding of one’s assertions but also take full advantage to triangulate their data across sources. The following questions explore the understanding of school governors and management at implementation across the three schools.
The following analyses present the level of understanding based on position levels across the three schools. 3 Principals and 3 SGB members:

4.3.1d Principals and SGB members' interview responses

The question about the communication channel for grievances and the discipline procedures as responded to by all principals were vastly different even though all schools are guided by the same prescripts. IP’s description was according to guidelines as it starts from the teacher, Departmental Head, principal and SGB. According to KP the channel for grievances rests with the prefects and HP has different channels in one school, her response was:

“It will depend on the kind of grievance. Some will start with Class reps, RCL, TLO principal, others will start with the class teacher, Departmental Head, DC and the principal”. (HP: the Principal of Hlalakahle* school)

All three schools do not have a support structure to deal with the aftermath of unbecoming behaviour which is the restorative justice principle underlying CCL considerations. In all three schools, class rules were successfully used to determine deviation in learner behaviour, however, no school used it as day to day acknowledgement for good behaviour. If and when it is used it is at the end of the year to recognise the ten best-behaved learners.

All principals mentioned the DC which is supposed to be a tribunal type of a structure in the early steps of the disciplinary procedure. DC is a temporary provision for SGB to deal with complex behavioural cases that could not be resolved by normal procedure. The overall responses by school governors and heads of schools who are ex-officio in the SGB do not mirror the script from which all should be reading. KP and KSGB put learners at the front of the disciplinary process, which is not aligned with the guidelines. The knowledge of rules by learners through rote learning seems common in all participating schools. The acknowledgement of good behaviour by the whole school, where it happens, happens once at the end of the year. The principals felt this research is an eye-opener and stated that the questionnaire will serve as their resource to review the implementation of discipline processes even before the research report come back.

4.3.1e Deputy principals and DH interview responses

Deputy Principals and Departmental Heads are the second layer of school managers and the support for the principal to run the school daily.

KDP mentions prefects and IDP RCL on the grievance channel when the provision involves them only in the development of CCL and excludes them in implementation as they cannot be in confrontation with other learners and do not have the skills to discipline other learners. Across all the schools, DPs
and DHs understand the channel at their level of operation which is teachers and learners and does not know when the SGB is involved though some mention the parent.

HDP’s response on how class rules are used was:

“They are used to ensure that learners act the same”. *(HDP: Hlalakahle* Deputy Principal)*

This statement reflects a sentiment that class rules are widely used to ensure learners act predictably to reduce bad behaviour. Most educators sited that when a learner act contrary to the rule, they are sent to read the rule, and there is no discussion about the learner’s action.

These managers from the same school articulate the discipline procedure differently even wider across different schools. These differences may explain why transition and adaptation for learners from one school to another are often difficult.

KDH said they are still thinking about the merit and demerit system, which is not consistent with KDP response on the question of the disciplinary procedure. Schools know that there should be a system that acknowledges good behaviour, but it is not implemented or where it is implemented, it's not across the school.

The knowledge gaps are glaringly apparent as the DPs and DHs were trying hard to remember and articulate the disciplinary process that should be informing their daily response to misbehaviour. HDH asked me to stop the recording as they needed to recollect their thoughts, the researcher had to assure that they only need to say what they know and reassure the confidentiality and that they represent a population. HDH felt emotionally drained after the interview and said “I didn’t realise the interview was this serious like a test. However, she pointed out that the questions were only a test for what they should be doing on daily basis.

Every school has a motto that is embedded in its emblem, unfortunately, no one can readily remember the main school value which should be their mantra.

The role of the parent as consistently explained by participants, seem to be that of a passive consumer of the end product of the process instead of initiators, as the SGB supposedly are leaders of the process representing the views of the parents in the development and review of the CCL. KEdA complained that parents come to school to defend the learner instead of assisting them to help the learner and ISGB stated that parents come to school when the learner is suspended or about to be suspended. Segalo and Rambuda (2018), assets that there is a looming disconnection between what parents and what teachers say, which enables parents to abscond from their responsibilities to teachers.

### 4.3.2 Understanding of own and others’ roles
All the principals understand the process of CCL development as their responsibility, to ensure that SGB, teacher, parents and learners are aware of the code of conduct, they see themselves and by others as the centre that holds the implementation of the CCL, while as per guidelines the leading role is the responsibility of the SGB. KP stated that in the process of drafting the CCL, he uses the teacher component (representative) in the SGB because the other SGB members are illiterate. IP stated that her role is to ensure that SMT, SGB, Educators and learners understand their roles. These views from principals displace the SGB from being accountable for discipline. The guidelines give the SGBs authority to drive the process so that they take ownership to account for discipline in schools, principal are resource persons who should guide and ensure that all all-legal provisions are adhered to.

The Disciplinary Committee (DC), like its namesake deals with serious disciplinary cases, it is a small team whose membership depends on the case at hand, Government (1998). However, in the three schools, it is a standing structure representative of all structures in the school, according to KDH, the DC drafts the school rules with the educator. This encourages the educators to relegate even the solving of the easiest case. KP expresses frustration that educators need development as they are not involved in disciplining learners.

When asked about their roles, educators’ understanding of their roles is at the class level, in generating and monitoring the implementation of class rules. Mostly monitoring means making the learner read the rules or refer the case to the next level to solve. Most managers, in articulating the CCL development process, locate the DC as involved from the beginning of the process. This conflict is observed in Kusile. KP, KDP and KSGB’s response when they were asked who else in their opinion should be involved in the process, they all stated educators. These responses mean currently the teachers they are leading are not involved and they as leaders wish they were involved. KP said

“teachers need development”, (KP: Principal of Kusile* school)

this is a primary school whose disciplinary process in contradiction to the guidelines, put learners at the centre as prefects. This setting may be sending a contrary message to teachers that there is no place for them.

The understanding of the demarcation in terms of scope of operation by each stakeholder is a blur. IDP states that he reads, and explains the CCL to the learners, when asked what is the role of the principal and other SMT members,

he says “they do the same as me”. (IDP: Deputy principal of Inkanyezi* school)

There seem to be no understanding of individual roles. This same pattern is observed in all schools among SGB and SMT in the advocacy and implementation stage. When everyone sees every role as theirs, might suggest there is no clear demarcation of roles, in such situations everybody’s business can easily become nobody’s business.
According to Chatwani & Chatwani (2018), Distributed leadership is not individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization or something is done to or for others, but activities that enable people to interact as they affect relationships. Distributed leadership challenges the openness to the boundaries of leadership as it facilitates a range of expertise that is distributed across all participants, from the highest to the lowest.

In a community where each person has a summary of the vision, it may be difficult to pull together in a particular direction. Learners must learn at the primary level to focus on the shared vision and use it to guide their behaviour and cultivate a sense of belonging.

### 4.3.3 Awareness of the scope of operation of each stakeholder in CCL processes

In Hlalakahle the communication channel for learner grievances is explained differently by each participant. For others it takes the school management route, though different steps are mentioned, it takes the RCL route for others it starts from the teacher to the disciplinary committee. HP understands the channel as starting with the RCL, to the class teacher then management. When he talks about the disciplinary procedure, he states that the teacher can call the parent to the school and his frustration is that teachers do not give parents accurate time, when the teacher is not in class. The parent will come to school and wait for a teacher or a teacher must leave a class unattended to attend to the parent. The grievance channels have different role players from the disciplinary procedure, which makes it easy for everyone to confuse roles.

Considerations for CCL provide for the formation of a disciplinary committee (DC) to resolve particular cases, its membership depends on the type of a case, it is a tribunal by nature and the provision is specific to it being small in size as to not intimidate Government (1998). It is appointed by the SGB to solve those cases that are referred to the SGB.

To make a few examples of unconstitutional ways the DC is used in schools, HDP, HDH and HEdB mentioned it as part of the grievance communication channel and part of the disciplinary procedure even before the case is referred to the principal. HDP and HDH mention the DC as part of the CCL advocacy campaign.

ISGB complained that “the challenge is that some parents do not respond but only to come when the learner must be suspended to defend their child”. (ISGB: SGB member of Inkanyezi school.)

The same sentiment is shared by KEdB. HEdB thought that parents should be involved from the beginning. These said by participants from all three schools are admission statements that though almost everyone says parents are involved in the development of CCL, in reality, it is not the case.
The SGB’s constituency is the parents, however, there is no mention of consultation on the inception or review of the CCL. The DC seem to take on the responsibilities of several stakeholders in the process and this makes it seem that people are relegating their responsibilities.

Senge et al. (2012) argue that schools become successful when people see each other’s value, regardless of the position the other hold. That recognition will enable each to do best where they are positioned.

4.3.4 Participant’s perceptions of how the CCL is implemented in the school

The CCL must be developed such that it “set a standard of moral behaviour for learners and equip them with the expertise, knowledge and skills they would be expected to display as worthy and responsible citizens. It must promote the civic responsibilities of the school and it must develop leadership capacity in learners. The main focus of the Code of Conduct must be positive discipline; it must not be punitive and punishment oriented but facilitate constructive learning”, Government (1998). This is a performance indicator against which learner behaviour should be measured and form the basis of the CCL review process. It must mostly seek to enforce positive behaviour, rather than accentuate negative behaviour.

When asked about each participant’s scope of responsibility in the disciplinary procedure, participants shared a similar understanding across all leadership levels, which mostly is to deal with problems.

“if there is a challenge that could not be solved at school, we are called to intervene”, P1 said, “I must understand the causes of the problem and create parental involvement”. (HSGB: SGB member of Hlalakahle school)

HDP stated that the SMT receive reports from RCL when there are challenges and then issues a verbal warning and HSGB said they call the RCL when there are challenges. The ‘black book’ (as it is called in Inkanyezi) or incident book has a record of those who do wrong and it is kept for future reference in all 3 schools. On the question of how both parties are supported after the case is closed, it is in serious cases like rape, where other departments are involved where support is involved. Most participants were frank to say it is not done, a few cases that are mentioned it is when the wrongdoer is reminded of the rules they are contravened.

It took most participants a considerable amount of time to think and others asked for elaboration on the question of how are class rules used to acknowledge good behaviour. On the other hand, it was easier to respond to how class rules are used to measure bad behaviour. HP stated that learners are given certificates and sometimes sweets by teachers. Certificates are given during the award ceremony at the end of the year, the giving of sweets depends on the initiation and affordability of the teacher. HSGB mentioned that educators give sweets, though according to South African Council for Educators
they are not supposed to. This might mean this practice is not embraced by all. There was a contradiction where IDH said the school is still thinking of a reward system while KDP and KDH said points are deducted and a learner's privilege of participating in sport is taken or a few minutes from their break is deducted, the point system is an element of merit and demerit system. However, the reward system recognises only the top ten at the end of the year. There is a wide spectrum of responsive measures in behavioural correction, most of it leans toward negative rather than positive reinforcement. The fact that it’s a very wide selection, becomes inconsistent and therefore lacks impact and each implementor is doing their version, there is no support.

Mabaso (2019) argues that managing disciplinary measures with learners is difficult in some schools because of the lack of a uniform practice among teachers and further suggests that all stakeholders must be included in the development of rules that will promote positive behaviour. The disciplinary system can embrace either positive or negative reinforcement how learners respond depends on the posture of the system. Applied Behaviour Analysis theorists observed that, if the behaviour is regarded as important by that particular community, the one who analyses; which is the doer, will aim to improve. Behavioural change is likely to happen only because it will make an impact on someone significant, Porter & Porter, (2020).

4.3.5 Knowledge of the value systems by the school community

As mentioned in chapter 2 the Vision and mission of the school embrace the Constitution and Bill of rights which are the fundamentals of the guidelines for CCL. Therefore, implementation of the code of conduct devoid of knowledge of the aforementioned documents give ground for infringement of rights.

In responding to the question about the values that underpin the vision and mission there was a struggle with most participants. HP, by show of hands, requested that the audio recording stops and asked for clarity on the question, then came back and said:

"As you have said that this process will also capacitate us. Let me not say much on this so that I don’t speak lies" (HP: Principal of Hlalakahle school)

HSGB said the value is learning because when there is learning there is no fighting. HDP took some time to think then the response was learner performance and attitude. He explained the value of attitude and then added respect for laws as one of the values. HDH also hesitantly said they look at democracy and dignity then HEdA after seeking an explanation of the question said education and HEdB said the value is education.

In response to the question asking about the vision and mission of the school, HP once more requested that the audio recording be paused. She went to the notice board looking for something, apparently did
not see anything and motioned the researcher by hand to skip the question. HSGB and EdA honestly said he doesn’t remember, HDP after some thought said:

“To develop the full potential of a learner into a full citizen” (HDP: Deputy principal of Hlalakahl*e) and HDH said, “to ensure learners are taught for better results” (HDH: departmental head of Hlalakahl*e school)

The next question was about the main value that upholds the class rules. Again HP asked that the recording be stopped for clarity. The response was that as the principal, during class visits the learners are taught the importance of long-term goals and why they come to school.

The response of all participants in Hlalakahl*e was consistent with the researcher’s initial observation on entering the school. In the foyer, there was a dirty tattered A4 page of the National department’s vision and mission statement. This sight reflected how detached the school is from any vision and mission in the department and that there was no vision and mission adapted to their needs and either adopted by the school. The struggle to respond and the different responses clearly said there is no shared vision in the school.

Generally, in the other two schools, there was a clear struggle of recollection of the vision and mission with everyone giving different values. However, in two schools some participants could distinguish between the mission statement and value, though responses differed. In Inkanyezi, IP, IDP, IDH and IEdA responded that respect was the value underpinning their class rules. In Kusile excellence in teaching as a mission statement and respect as a value was mentioned by KDP, KDH and KEdA. Also, KP3 mentioned excellence, performance and independence as part of the mission but couldn’t recollect the other part, this raises the question of what vision is shared in the organisation.

Cambron-McCabe et al. (2012) suggest that learning is personal and yet social, the knowledge people have in a social setting determines and at the same time deepens connections. When people within a community learn together, they can move in the same direction and grow together. The understanding that building teams from individuals takes time and work, Senge et.al (2012), and should be inclusive of every stakeholder as everyone is important Clarke (2007). Senge et al. (2012) impress that building connections in a school begins by recognising each other and seeing the value that each brings. According to Shaked et al. (2017) organisations that learn together create opportunities for their success.

4.3.6 Inconsistent responses in describing procedures in the same school
In all the three participating schools, individual participant explains processes differently. In some instances, the researcher observed that they start the process in different stages depending on their positions as it has been observed that the extent of knowledge depends on the position a participant is at. It, however, raises questions when some statements dispute activities that the whole school was supposed to be part of or at the extreme describe one procedure in five different ways. The researcher
made follow-ups before living the school and later by telephone conversation, still taking care that people’s anonymity is secured.

On the question of when is the CCL reviewed IEdB responded by saying

“I’m not sure, it has been long since it has been reviewed”. (IEdB: Educator * school with more than 5 years experience )

The principal verified by showing an invitation and attendance register of the new educator’s induction program. On verifying with IEdB explained that the program serves to orientate new educators, there is no opportunity to review and propose changes. This is a challenge of communication where the school community should understand the performance indicators of the programs. IP thought it a strategic move to cover two programs in one while to some it does not serve the purpose of both. On the questions of how the school use each case as an opportunity to grow and how are the parties involved supported, there were disparities in knowledge management.

Guidelines provide for an opportunity for all involved in a misunderstanding or fight to reconcile to ensure that harmony is restored. IP explain a pastoral care program where some educators held sessions with affected learners when IDP stated that nothing is done to support both parties after an incident. IP and IDP are working together at a strategic level on following up with IDP should have remembered such an elaborate program.

RJ ensures minimum disturbances in the community, as such the whole must come together to repair the harm Winn et al. (2019). It aligns with African culture and focuses on community building. Louw et al. (2016). For effectiveness inclusion of all stakeholders is crucial.

HP, HSGB and HDH on the question of CCL review that it is done annually, HDP stated that

“It is changed after three years with the SGB term of office and reviews done in-between when needed”. (HDP: Deputy principal of Hlalakahle*)

and HEdB does not remember a review. Again, on the question of how information is used to improve discipline HP explained how stakeholders are engaged while HDP boldly said

“We do not make reference to the past wrong, it is treated confidentially”. (HDP: Deputy principal of Hlalakahle*)

HDH, HEdA and HEdB have no recollection of stakeholder who addresses learners to encourage adherence to CCL, HP, HSGB and HDP elaborate on how outside stakeholders come to school and address learners, especially pre-covid-19 era. Here also the observation that certain information is known by those high in position cannot hold as HP and HDP work in one office level.
KP explained the process of developing the CCL as an outsourced process where an educator from another school is hired to assist with the process. KDP said

“I can’t tell for sure, it should be in a form of a meeting”. (KDP: Deputy principal of Kusile* school)

When asked how many meetings he responded, one meeting. responded to the question by saying that SGB and teachers meet with Grade 7 learners to develop CCL. All the processes explain a process that is taking place in the same school. The CCL review according to KP happens yearly, according to KDP and KDH it is done after 3 years and KSGB and KEdA understand that is done quarterly. On the question of how class rules are used to determine bad and acknowledge good behaviour, KDP said the merit and demerit system is used where points are deducted in the case of bad behaviour and tickets are sent to parents at the end of the year, KDH said minutes are taken from a learner’s break as punishment and stated that the school is still discussing the merit and demerit system.

The picture that is painted by the analysis of this theme might tempt the reader to question the validity and reliability of the participant’s responses in the whole study, which by no means is the case. This validates the essence of the rationale to undertake the study as the assumption was that discipline challenges persist because the provisions of measures are not understood by all parties that must be involved. It reflects the leadership challenge of most principals.

TSA (2016), Observed that principals are challenged in the area of teamwork, but SMT members do not understand how workload is allocated. School leaders need to ensure that role-players within the school have an understanding of the school operations. Shaked and Schechter (2017) agree with Senge et al. (2012) that school leaders must see the big picture of the education systems to influence or learn from it and allow deep learning by every role player. It is through deep learning interactions that deep connections which create better organisations are made.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Semi-structured interviews were mainly used to collect data, two participants were interviewed over the phone due to time constraints. Documents were reviewed to verify school activities. Six themes were developed as data was analysed in chapter 5. Findings that are consistent with the findings and conclusions in the literature review were linked. The theoretical framework that underpins the study and discipline systems explain in chapter 2 were used to clarify and shed light on findings. Chapter Five is the summary of the study, accentuating the main findings that will flow to the discussion.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter starts by presenting the summary to connect the chapters of the whole study followed by a discussion of the findings.

5.2 Summary of the study

The study endeavoured to explore the implementation of the CCL in three schools, a primary, combined and a Secondary school in Volksrust Circuit. Chapter one presented an introduction and background of the study and also a rationale for the study was given. The study aimed at exploring how leadership roles at different levels and positions interacted in the implementation of their mandates concerning CCL to achieve the vision and mission of the school. The understanding of the development, advocacy and implementation of the policy by each leader was tested. The understanding of the response mechanism to learner behaviour and use thereof was explored. The extent to which a shared vision existed was measured. The five critical questions that underpinned the study were: Development, advocacy and implementation of CCL. Management of cases and information. Internal and external stakeholder involvement. Roles, interactions and connections. Vision and mission. Chapter two presents a legislative and literature review. Discipline systems and theoretical framework: Systems thinking and Learning teams as the main Theories that underpin the study.

Chapter three presented the research design and methodology used in the study. This study employed a qualitative approach. Within the qualitative approach, a case study methodology was used. The interpretive paradigm was seen as relevant to this study because it holds the view that there are many truths. Exploring how managers or leaders at different levels perceive the CCL processes. Semi-structured interviews were used as a method of generating data. There were 18 participants, three SGB members, three principals, three Deputy Principals, three Departmental Heads, three educators with 5 years or less experience and three educators with more than 5 years of experience. Thematic analysis was used to interpret the data, 6 themes were developed from the data. Ethical issues were adhered to. The permission to conduct research was secured from gatekeepers. Consents from the participants were also secured.

Chapter four presented a discussion and analysis of the findings based on the data generated from the participants through semi-structured interviews. Systems thinking and Learning teams were infused in the discussion of the findings. The literature review from chapter two was interlinked in the discussion of the findings. In chapter four themes developed from the data, namely: Understanding the development, advocacy and implementation of CCL as a process, understanding of own and others’ roles, Awareness of the scope of operation of each stakeholder in CCL processes, Participant’s
perceptions of what the CCL I used for in the school, Knowledge of the value systems by the school community and Inconsistent responses in describing procedures in the same school.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS
Six themes were developed from the study data. The themes are listed as follows:

➢ Understanding the development, advocacy and implementation of CCL as a process
➢ Understanding of own and others’ roles
➢ Awareness of the scope of operation of each stakeholder in CCL processes
➢ Participant’s Perceptions of the implementation of the CCL in the school,
➢ Knowledge of the value systems by the school community
➢ Inconsistent responses in describing procedures in the same school.

The above-listed themes were identified from a body of data that seeks to answer the five research questions which are:

1. How is the advocacy for the duly adopted Code of Conduct for Learners done in the schools?
2. Do stakeholders take part as legally prescribed in the development/ review, adoption, and advocacy of the Code of Conduct for learners in every school?
3. Are the School governing body (SGB) and Representative Council of Learners (RCL), School Management Team (SMT) members aware of their roles to ensure learner discipline?
4. How are the behavioural reports collated and used to improve the school environment?
5. Does the school have a Merit and Demerit system that is inclusive?

The discussion below intends to respond to the research questions based on the insight from the thematic analysis of the research data. The legislative and theoretical framework and literature review from chapter 2 will be used to give an in-depth understanding of the analysis.

DEVELOPMENT, ADVOCACY AND IMPLEMENTATION AS A LEGISLATED ACTIVITY AT THE BEGINNING OF EACH SCHOOL YEAR
The Guidelines for the Consideration of Governing Bodies in Adopting a Code of Conduct for Learners as provided is a provision by the SASA, this makes it a legal matter that must be adhered to according to the stipulated guidelines Republic of South Africa (1998). It is therefore a great concern that participants in all three schools have different views on how and by whom the development, advocacy and implementation of the CCL are done at their school. Some misunderstand that the drafting and distribution of CCL is a complete advocacy activity. This finding is in line with Lumadi’s (2020) who found that teachers, students, SGBs and community members are not equally represented in the design of turnaround disciplinary procedures. One DP was not even sure if advocacy happens in the school, it might be because the principal refers to it to be an outsourced activity to train prefects that only involves prefects. The confusion deepens when he suggests that the meeting might be taking place on an all-
stakeholder inclusive meeting. In all schools, participants can mention those who participate in the campaign but do not know what are their roles each in the development, advocacy and implementation of CCL. This was expressed by Magaba (2018) who noted that most teachers felt that in the new dispensation, there is too much confusion, contradiction, and frustration about what disciplinary practices are, and what teachers are expected to do. Advocacy of CCL is an opportunity to introduce new learners and new teachers to the accepted rules of interaction in the school, yet it doesn’t seem anyone knows for sure how this activity unfolds.

Most SGB member knows what the SGB and SMT do, but are not much concerned with teacher activities, while most teachers are not even aware that the SGB is involved. Parents who everyone expects to play a vital role in the discipline of their children are only involved in listening if and when it is explained and signing the copy that they must keep for reference in an eventuality. Spillane (2005) views distributed leadership as leadership that is distributed at different levels where interactions recognise influence from multiple sources and levels. Chatwani et al. (2018) argue that a leader who plays a different role can be best supported and is effective, in agreement Lu (2018) asserts that a principal who is the sole provider of leadership in a school loses the potential contributions of others. Senge (2012) uses an analogy of an African greeting “Sawubona” which means “I see you”, this he says is the recognition by the leadership of the skills and potential of those they lead. In response the greeted will say “ngiyaphila” meaning “I am alive” and have something to give, he further explains that the recognition by others can stimulate contributions. SGBs as governors and Principals as accounting officers in these schools are not seen to be forging environments that a conducive to collaboration in their schools.

PARTICIPATION OF STAKEHOLDERS IN THE DEVELOPMENT/ REVIEW

Each new term of SGB, which take place every three years should be marked with policy development activities to ensure that the governors are leading the school towards the intended directions, in the case of CCL, each year there should be a review session to measure the impact of the policy and allow each stakeholder to make changes where necessary Gorvenment (1998). The guidelines emphasise an inclusive consultation of all stakeholders: responses show that in one school some participants know it is reviewed quarterly others annually and others every three years, which creates doubts if it ever happens.

Responses by participants, like on the question of advocacy reflected different understanding. Participants do not know when CCL is reviewed. When an educator thinks it has been too long to remember when the CCL was reviewed and the principal is confident that it is done every year, it surely shows that a shared vision is none existent. If the performance indicators of planned activities are not spelt out to measure the impact thereof, it will be difficult to reflect on whether planned activities are
achieved or not. Fidan et al. (2017:12) define an organisation as an open social system whose survival in these contemporary and unpredictable environments crucially depends on the quality of interactions between all of its components. The shared vision must be well understood by all.

The knowledge across each school can be viewed along hierarchical lines, where SGBs and Principals know that the process starts at the SGB level, however from DP to educator participants know that SGB is consulted towards the end, even then it is to ensure that they understand the prescripts. This they reckon, SGB should understand so that they can explain it to parents especially when they must decide on cases.

Misbehaviour threatens order which is a necessary element in a conducive environment that is needed for educational activities to take place. Therefore, every party that has an interest in the outcome of these activities should know what to do in an invent the order is disturbed. Nitsch et al,. (2005) state that the effectiveness of a CCL is dependent on the degree to which the code violations can be appropriately weighed and sanctioned. The discussions above emphasise the importance of knowledge and corporate understanding, this must be an intentional objective in a school to ensure that the process leading toward resolving disturbances must be known by all. Unfortunately, the participants did not demonstrate an understanding of the same process. Charlotte et al,. (2020) argue learning teams produce collaborative efforts and corporate results as they allow on the job learning and support.

**AWARENESS OF OWN AND OTHERS ROLES BY STAKEHOLDERS IN CCL IMPLEMENTATION**

All the participating SGBs and Principals are aware that the SGB is involved, some DP and fewer educators know of the SGB involvement, and others did not demonstrate that awareness. One educator hesitantly explained how the process starts with the principal and it moves to the SMT and SGB. Most educators’ understanding of the processes is mainly at the class level where rules are formulated with the learners. It is no surprise when educators are frustrated by none involvement of parents in learner discipline. Chatwani et al,. (2018) assets that distributed leadership with the benefits of a positive social contract call for leaders who know how to follow and followers who know how to lead. The ability to play different roles allows those who are in higher positions to recognise strengths in their subordinates and afford them space to lead in those areas at the same time enabling those in lower positions to lead while understanding authority and accountability rests. Leadership that is a collective social process by interactions of multiple actors yield more results.

Participating principals see themselves as the drivers of the process because they have a better comprehension of policies. This may explain the reason for the minimal involvement of parents and also the educator’s oblivion of their involvement. The challenge still points to the lack of distributed leadership which Thien (2019) perceives as the kind that views leadership as a shared asset in the organisation where the expertise of the performer, people’s strengths and character makes them leaders.
Parents’ none participation in the inception may put them in the position of defence as they have no sense of ownership. When parents are considered illiterate, they may see themselves as useless and end up abdicating their parental duties, and not see themselves as those endowed with the authority and accountability of discipline in schools. Teachers complained that they are not well represented in discussions on disciplinary system development Lumadi (2020).

The Disciplinary Committee (DC) is used as the implementation structure of the CCL, some schools stretch it to replace the SGB in policymaking. If it is an all-stakeholder representative body, it has disadvantages for the disciplinary process. First and foremost, it will be intimidating for the learner. Secondly, the interest of the learner might be overridden by that of a stakeholder who has an interest in the case. i.e., where a chairperson is involved in the matter. It will be moral and prudent that the SGB appoints it to look at the needs of the particular matter.

In two schools, safety committees become part of the development and review of CCL. Safety committees use CCL as guidelines for their activities and are by no means policymakers, SGB should not be replaced.

Educators see themselves at the classroom level as those formulating the rules and refer to bad behaviour when reminded them has failed. On the other hand, principals and deputy principals see them as inadequately trained to do what they are supposed to do and that they need development. It does not seem as though each leader sees the value the other one has in doing what is expected of them. As the distribution leadership theorists propagate that leaders should allow everyone to show their leadership capabilities and allow them to lead in the different positions, in which they are placed. No exposure to leadership activities may limit the educator’s horizon. Li (2015) in his findings reflects that teachers are limited in their view of themselves as they do not see themselves as leaders and are not interested in a leadership position.

**INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION TO IMPROVE CCL**

The different mandates that are given to indifferent leaders at their levels to implement CCL make a school a complex organisation. In all the schools there are differences in how activities are viewed by all. If those in the school are not sure how and when advocacy is done, those who are joining the school might not receive the message and direction that CCL advocacy intends to give. Their understanding of the procedure to lodge complaints and that of the discipline system in the schools depends on the person’s position. These differing understandings are sure to render schools chaotic Senge et al. (2012) view the substance of school as a place where deep connections are made through deeply personal and inherently social interactions, connecting not only the intellect but people that form the visual part of the organisation.

Systems thinking discipline presumes that all parts of the system are to be equally considered, how it interacts and affect other parts is crucial to their performance. In a system, each part is connected
strategically to the next so that it can supply what is needed to enable the correct response from the other. In a school setting, the right amount of information must be given where it is due to inform the appropriate action.

An organisation must know what product they are producing and the quality thereof, this is usually spelt in the vision and mission of the organisation. This understanding further indicates expectations of how things and done. Two of the three school’s participants struggled to articulate the vision and mission statement, from the top management to the class manager who is the direct contact with the product. Every school has a badge with the school’s mantra as a footnote which should underpin their class rules to direct their behaviour. This was not known; different statements and values were given as answers. When there is no perfect picture from which to reflect on their actions, they may not know what is not acceptable, and no sensor for the system’s tolerant threshold. If the unacceptable happens, it will be difficult to restore the system as they wouldn’t know how it looks in its best condition.

Events that happen in an organisation, either motivate or demotivate people in one way or the other. If negative action is experienced, performers can be left with apprehension that may diminish trust or sense of security. After it has been resolved, communicating the positive information will help restore harmony. In most schools, no communication channel to connect and give feedback from top to bottom. In one school the DP says reports are treated confidentially while others say the principal gives reports during briefings. Principals are the only ones who know how the wrongdoer and victims are supported. The schools cannot enjoy the benefits of Restorative justice.

**POSITIVE BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

A is a structure comprised of physical and human resources, culture, values and beliefs that through the interaction produces an organizational learning culture which is defined as a set of norms and common values shared by every member of an organization Waruwu et al. (2020). In all the three participating schools one or two participants knew the vision and mission of the school. The principal or Hlalakahle* requested the recording to stop while she looked for a document with the vision and mission of the school which she couldn’t find. The probing question asked about the core of the learner motivation in the school. All schools have mantras that are in the school’s emblems and embroidered on the learners’ uniforms, however, very few participants could remember them. The school through intentional interactions produces an organizational learning culture which is defined as a set of norms and common values shared by every Waruwu et al. (2020). When the schools have no sense of value and direction it will be impossible to create a value system for learners, individually and corporately which means behaviour management becomes a pipe dream.

The development of class rules is not informed by values, they are therefore only used to reprimand when there is a deviation in actions, even the deviation can not measure the precise severity because the values are diverse or according to the individual class teacher. All participants could not respond to
the question that asked how the rules are used to recognise and acknowledge good behaviour, after a lengthy discussion they would remember that good behaviour is recognised at the award ceremony at the end of the year and some were honest to say the is no recognition for good behaviour. A great concern with that picture is that it is an exclusive club where only 10 learners per grade are acknowledged for good behaviour. Are not schools supposed to be institutions of learning where every learner inclusively has an opportunity to be counted for good behaviour, is a big question. In one school where they have started discussing the merit and demerit system, some are already using it in different ways while the DP understand that it is still under discussion. A partial implementation of a strategy that needs to be a measure of a certain variable has the potential to defeat the strategy before it begins. Such conflicting understanding gives rise to confusion. Magaba (2018) reflected in his findings that educators are confused as to what to do to implement disciplinary measures. Bal et al. (2018) argue that the search for a solution to behavioural problems in schools has largely been focused on individualistic and outcome-oriented studies at the expense of targeting systems. Terry et al. (2017) asserts that the creation of a conducive environment for teaching and learning through appropriate discipline systems is intentional, leaders should, therefore, set a tone of safe, orderly, clean space where acknowledgement of good work and behaviour is a key instrument to grooming citizenship this concurs with Duke et al. (1980) explain that operant behaviour is purposeful and voluntary as it is reinforced and encouraged by the reward that is received soon after performance.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

The study summary was done in this chapter. Observations that help to answer the research question were discussed. Discussions raised areas of recommendation at different levels in the Department of education, namely SGB, SMT, District and Province and National education Department DoE. Recommendations will be tabled in chapter 6.
CHAPTER 6

RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter endeavours to make recommendations about the study findings in chapter five and discussions.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES

➢ I argue for the use of the dominant language that is used in the community because findings reveal that principals are playing the leading role in implementing the ‘GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES IN ADOPTING A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR LEARNERS’ instead of the SGB. The lack of understanding due to the language barrier which is mistaken for illiteracy is a challenge. Because African languages that are representative of the South African community are regarded as official and have equal status, CCL should be written in the language understood by the majority of parents and be translated into the Language of Learning and Teaching (LOLT) of the school for consumption by all.

➢ I plead for a rigorous revival of the vision and mission statements that will inform the behaviour management systems of the schools they lead.

➢ I advocate for the use of the teacher development budget for Professional Learning Community (PLC) activities aimed at teacher development.

➢ I plead that the SGB and professional staff take part in leadership development activities together.

➢ I recommend that the DC and Safety Committees should be guided by CCL in applying disciplinary measures to ensure a safe environment for all, lest they become a referee and a player.

➢ I recommend that DC should be used as a tribunal and be elected when the is a need, guidelines must be used to advise the size each time.

➢ Participants viewed the parents’ involvement in the development and review process as recipients and consumers of the CCL, while they are the target group for advocacy.

➢ I argue that consultation of parents must be done at the beginning of the process for their meaningful contribution instead of the end for signature and passive consumption.

➢ I recommend that the SGB play an active role in the advocacy and review of CCL by all stakeholders.
RECOMMENDATIONS TO SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAMS

➢ I assert that SGBs play a leading role in the implementation of CCL.
➢ I plead that the vision and mission of the school be reviewed in schools and revived to be a lighthouse that directs the activities of the school. It must give meaning to the existence of the school. And also, that learners must understand and be driven by the mantra of the school.
➢ Operational plans must be outcome-based and reflect the performance indicator so that the participants know the aim of the activity.
➢ I assert that the principals should play an advisory role to the SGB to achieve parental involvement and that role-players be developed to know and be able to define their roles as leaders and know their scope of operation. Distributive Leadership in an environment of systemic thinking be considered for the implementation of CCL.
➢ I contend that educators, through Continuous Professional Teacher Development (CPTD) activities explore how to be more involved in disciplinary issues so that they do not only refer cases to SMT or DC. That SMT prioritises teacher development to empower them in issues of grooming good behaviour.
➢ I plead that the SGB and professional staff take part in leadership development activities together.
➢ I plead for a rigorous revival of the vision and mission statements that will inform the behaviour management systems of the schools they lead.
➢ I urge the teacher development program to be included in the year plan and be part of the school development plan.
➢ I argue for the CCL not to only be about managing bad behaviour; schools need to elevate the acknowledgement of good behaviour as it will highlight personality strengths than weaknesses.

RECOMMENDATION TO GERT SIBANDE DISTRICT AND MPUMALANGA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

➢ I plead for an output-based and outcome-based development program that has an evaluation and monitoring plan to be offered to school SGB, STM and educators.
➢ I argue for teacher development activities that will assist schools to develop practical CCL that speaks to their circumstances. As findings reveal that schools cannot connect the different pieces of legislation that guide the creation of a positive environment to groom positive learner behaviour.
➢ I plead for close monitoring and support of CCL implementation in schools.
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

➢ I contend for alignment of legislation that talks to the management of discipline and behaviour by SGB, SMT and Educators in a single document to minimise ambiguity and overlapping of responsibilities and functions.

➢ I assert that ‘Guidelines For The Consideration Of Governing Bodies In Adopting A Code Of Conduct For Learners’ should be revised to align the functions of the School Safety Committee, Quality Learning and Teaching Campaign which are all SGB subcommittees that seek to achieve the same result of a conducive teaching and learning environment.

➢ I argue that an elaborate clause other than the word tribunal should be added to the document to ensure the correct and standardised constitution and function of the committee. As a tribunal and correct size.

➢ I contend that the implementation of CCL is aligned and seen as the basis of the operation of DC, alternatives to corporal punishment and safety committee operations as opposed to seeing all these parts as stand-alone mechanisms to alleviate ill-discipline in schools.

➢ I recommend that there be a review and evaluation of committees, campaigns and functions that are mandated to manage and support learner management matters.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted in 3 different types of schools that are representative of South African quantile 1 to 3 schools. The data was qualitative a looked into the systems in the schools. I trust it will conjure interest in researchers to acquire further about the interpretation and understanding of policy implementation. The connection between CCL implementation and the success of Alternatives to corporal punishment can be investigated.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

A. Interview questions seek to explore the implementation and adherence to the following statutes:

1. The Guidelines for the Consideration of Governing Bodies in Adopting a Code of Conduct for Learners as provided

2. The Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) as stipulated in Education Policy Act (No.27) of 1996


B. They seek to answer research questions and respond to research objectives in a manner that contributes to Leadership, shared Visionary leadership, Learning organisations, Systemic thinking and the development of a Discipline system in a school.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>INTERVIEW QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To establish how advocacy of the duly adopted Code of Conduct for Learners is done in schools. | 1. What do you understand as your role in ensuring that learners are aware of the code of conduct?  
2. Who in the school participates in the advocacy of CCL?  
3. What are the roles of participants in the advocacy of the CCL for it to be effective?  
4. Who are the target groups of the advocacy campaign of the CCL?  
5. Which platforms are used in the school to promote awareness of the CCL?  
6. Do these platforms reach the intended recipients? | | |
| To investigate who is involved in the development/review, adoption and advocacy of the Code of Conduct for learners in every school? | 1. What is the process of developing the CCL?  
2. In your view, who should take part in the process for it to be a success?  
3. What is the role of each participant?  
4. What are the reviewal intervals of the CCL in your school? | | |
<p>| To explore whether the school governing body (SGB)/School Management | 1. What activities do you do to ensure the implementation of CCL in your school? | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>INTERVIEW QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team (SMT) members and Educators are aware of their roles to ensure learner discipline.</td>
<td>2. What is the scope of responsibility for each stakeholder in the implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Who do you think should be involved in ensuring learner discipline in the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What constitutes minor and serious offence in your school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. What is the communication channel for grievances for learners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. What is your scope of responsibility in the disciplinary procedure (according to your position, what are you allowed you do) to ensure discipline?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish how reports and information is used to influence decision making and strengthen/revive existing systems that maintain good behavioural standards.</td>
<td>1. What is the disciplinary procedure that is adopted by the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How are reports and records of the cases processed and communicated within the school community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How is the information of each case handled to improve discipline within the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What support is given to both parties involved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To observe the inclusivity of the Merit and Demerit System</td>
<td>1. What values underpin the vision and mission of the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How are class rules generated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How are class rules used to determine deviation in behaviour or acknowledgement of good behaviour?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. How does the school give feedback on adherence to class rules by the school community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. How does each stakeholder encourage adherence to class rules by learners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. What is the Vision and mission of your school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Which class rules uphold the main school values?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. If you view, what should be done to instil good values that represent the vision and mission of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I, **Dawn Nontuthuzelo Mngomezulu St No 209542791, Master of commerce Leadership studies**, at the Graduate School of Business and Leadership, of the University of KwaZulu Natal- Westville Campus. I invite you to participate in the study entitled:

**Investigating the Implementation of The Code of Conduct for Learners: A Case Study of Volksrust Circuit Schools.**

The aim of the research is to:

The research seeks to understand how the provisions and mandates on CCL are understood, implemented and how they impact the level of discipline in schools. It also aims to establish whether the stakeholders who by virtue of their position and mandate as leaders know their roles, responsibility and extent of their authority in creating an environment of teaching and learning in terms of their mandate as outlined in the following legislative pieces
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9. The use of reports and information in decision making and strengthen/revive existing systems that maintain good behavioural standards.
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- The researcher may call to find clarity on issues discussed to ensure best presentation of the participant’s view and understanding.

Yours Truly
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Date______________
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