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This study was undertaken in order to determine the effectiveness of the administrative and leadership roles of secondary school principals in the Durban South Region, and to investigate the challenges that are encountered by principals as secondary school administrators and leaders.

The research highlights a distinction and overlap between administration and leadership. It examines the role of a principal as an administrator and leader in different areas of operation in the school, such as curricula and teaching.

With regard to administration, the research investigates the role of a principal in areas such as planning, organising and control. It points out how the role of a principal as a leader interacts with her/his administrative role. Regarding leadership, the study reviews literature on the principal’s role, in areas such as vision building and policy formulation, as well as teaching and curriculum management. The study demonstrates that principalship entails the application of conceptual, technical and human relations skills. It shows how these skills are interwoven in both school administration and leadership.

From the review of literature on school administration and leadership, the study provides a comprehensive exposition of what principalship entails, especially as far as curricula management, visioning and strategy formulation, is concerned.
Against this background, the study evaluates the role of the principals in secondary schools in the Durban South Region of Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa.

On the basis of empirical work, the study makes recommendations regarding the role of principals. The recommendations made are a contribution towards transforming schools and leading them in a process which can truly enhance teacher effectiveness and create a culture which can foster the education of learners.
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CHAPTER 1

1. Orientation to the study

1.1 Introduction

The kind of changes that are taking place in schools are fundamental and have pertinent implications for administration. Hoyle et al (1986:143) argue that "changes which impact on schools are not always understood by those responsible for school administration such as, principals, deputy principals and superintendents." This possibility raises questions about the effectiveness of schools' administration currently. Our understanding of the nature of administration has also evolved. The earliest concept centered around the action model. Administrators were regarded as those who took charge of activities and accomplished tasks. The concept of evolving nature of administration has had an effect on the morale of teaching, dissatisfaction with salary levels, uncertainties about security, the terms and conditions of services. These have become issues that challenge the principals' administration in schools.

The task of an educational leader like a principal in South Africa and elsewhere has undergone a radical change. In the light of the democratic nature of the new educational policy, the role of an educational leader, especially the principal, has changed significantly. While, prior to 1994, the year during which the new dispensation came to effect, the principal was mainly the implementer of the Departmental policies, he is now an administrator, a leader as well as an agent of change. Education in South Africa has undergone unprecedented change. The introduction of policies such as the South African Schools Act, Act No, 84 of 1996, guidelines on transforming education such as those contained in the National Task Team Report, on transforming education, place the role of
a principal in a central position in the process of effective school management. At the same time principals themselves personally experience these very problems regarding their own careers and future development.

Traditionally the educational administrator was a principal and the task of the principal was of limited complexity. With the view to the complexity of the principal’s task, de Wet (1981:143) argues that the educational leader required a professional training and experience only to manage a school. But as a result of the increasing complexity of the school as an organisation, the educational leader is subjected to changing demands especially in respect of his administrative tasks. According to Jones (1988:42) the traditional view of principalship as benevolent and autocratic master has been drastically modified to incorporate both the concept of the principal as a manager and as a leading professional. Jones further argues that in the pressure of accelerating administrative innovation to which schools are now subjected, it is essential not only to ensure adequate preparation for change but also retain staff confidence and to foresee as far as possible the probable consequences of any changes which are under consideration. In contrast to the traditional view of principalship, the researcher assumes that ideally, in the secondary school of today it is neither possible nor desirable for the principal to provide personally a leadership for the whole school. Today the task of administration should be shared with a whole team of people; a more complicated but in the end a more realistic and healthy way of working.

A number of researchers have pointed out the significant role which principals play to contribute to successful schools. According to Hersey (1982:178), people who spend a lot of time in educational systems are frequently asked why schools are so different. More often than not, the answer is “leadership”. In support of Hersey’s concept, Harbison and Myer (1959:15) argue that, the tone of an organisation is usually sounded by its top executive (principal) and the success of the organisation may well depend on whether the principal
infuses the whole hierarchy with energy and vision or whether, through neglect, he allows the school as an organisation to stagnate. An organizational formal leader is in a better position to set the tone of the school because of his/her broad authority to execute the school mission. Jones (1988:8) maintains that principals have, for better or worse, a particular significant influence on the effectiveness of their schools. The points just made seem to point out that the principal is, to a large extent responsible for devising and maintaining his school as a formal organisation and so, in a more revealing way his/her school becomes the expression of his/her authority.

According to Musaazi (1982: 24), administration is an integral part of any organisation. It is crucial for maintaining and expanding the effectiveness and productivity of complex institutions like schools, colleges and other institutions. Musaazi further maintains that the survival of organisations like schools is dependent largely on the quality of the administrative service available. Sergiovanni’s view (1987: 3) of administration is that a lot of the success of administrative actions depends on the interpretations that principals make as they translate theoretical understandings into practical decisions and behaviours. Sergiovanni regards actions by the principals, school goals, limited available resources and the necessity for working with other people such as teachers, parents and students as the essential elements of administration. When principals are successful in matching their actions with goals they are considered to be efficient.

Although administration is an indispensable component of all institutions and organisations, at no other time in this country has there been as awesome a challenge to school administration personnel as there is now. Principals now need to work with School Governing Bodies and teacher unions. Principals also need to manage these structures. External groups such as unions and politicians aspire to influence the content or structure of educational administration; they also aspire to achieve a redistribution of educational
resources. Since the quality of secondary school’s education has increasingly been questioned and the overspending in education by local governments is being challenged, the need for accountability has arisen and the performance of schools is increasingly subjected to public comment. Increased attempts to administer and control schooling have included the establishment of governing bodies in all public schools. One of the roles of principals is to work with these structures. The principal’s traditional freedom to manage is increasingly constrained by a movement towards decentralisation of responsibilities particularly on the question of finance and staffing and by agreement negotiated between the department of education and the teacher unions.

This study largely evaluates the role of principals as administrators with special reference to the Durban South Region secondary schools. In addition this study examines the principals’ leadership roles in the administration of their schools.

1.2 The purpose of this study

According to Kruger (1993:241) South African education is in the process of change and adaptation, and in order to understand the present position of education one should remember that the provision for education is taking place at a time when the present extent of change is far greater than that of the past.

Against this background the purpose of this study is to investigate the variety of problems and challenges that are encountered by principals as school administrators, and to determine the effectiveness of the administrative process by principals in schools in the Durban South Region. The study also seeks to determine the extent to which principals and other administrators personnel perform their leadership roles and whether and how they contribute to the attainment of educational goals in secondary schools.
Finally the study seeks to establish the capacity of school managers to cope with administration and to examine the issues they experience in their administrative roles. It is the contention of the author that a study of the administrative process as well as issues facing administrative personnel at schools, in the Durban South Region, may offer helpful recommendations concerning the improvement of school administration in the area concerned.

It is the contention of the researcher that, a study of the administrative process as well as issues facing administrative personnel at schools in the Durban South Region, may offer helpful recommendations concerning the improvement of school administration.

1.3 Statement of a problem

The principal’s job has seldom been without problems. As mentioned above, our society is a changing one and changes affect administration. As the South African system of education is in the process of transformation, the principal has major administrative challenges and problems.

Principals, in their role of administering schools, need to manage and lead students and educators, so that schools achieve their main purpose, namely to be viable institutions of learning.

Yet, as administrators, principals seem to experience many problems. They appear to face challenges regarding guiding and enabling educators to teach learners, to learn. The concern over the culture of teaching and learning testifies to the issue. Furthermore the culture of efficient and effective administration is not the norm. Failure to keep school records, to manage changes, to engage appropriately in participative management and leadership eludes
a number of principals. The call to retrain principals as recommended in the principals’
responses to the open-ended questionnaire in chapter 4 of the study, testifies to deficiencies
which their administration reflects.

In view of the above observation the researcher wants to assume that unless the above
problems, challenges and misconceptions are investigated, addressed and recommendations
are made, school administration will remain a problem to the school principal and his
management team, staff, parents and students.

1.4 Motivation for the study

As stated above, the South African system of education is undergoing rapid transformation.
The recent departmental documents such as South African Schools Act, Act No. 84 of 1996
and Labour Relations Act, Act No. 66 of 1995 have all brought about change in the
principal’s role as an administrator. While policy documents have a pivotal role to play in
educational transformation, the process of administration at micro, meso and macro levels
is significant to effect policy.

In the first section of this chapter, the investigator referred to a number of policy documents
which are meant to transform education. The researcher noted that in spite of such important
policy documents on educational transformation, many principals seem to continue to
manage their schools as they had always done and have in some cases introduced little or no
changes to transform them. Thusi (1993:3) as cited by Ndlovu (1997), contends that any
degree of success during this turbulent era cannot be achieved only on the basis of the
administrative and professional duties, as laid down by the Department of education and
culture, but that principals have to take the initiative and be innovative and flexible enough
to deal with the situation, as it presents itself. To do so, knowledge and skills on
In the researcher’s view, principals still face a series of challenges in terms of responding to the types of administration and leadership suggested in policy documents which guide the new education system. This indicates a massive challenge to which principals of secondary schools should commit themselves. These observations have inspired the researcher to study the administrative process and evaluate the role of principals’ administration and leadership in the secondary schools in the Durban South Region.

1.5 Definitions of terms

For purposes of this study, the following terms will be defined:

1.5.1 Administration

According to Sergiovanni (1987:6) administration can be broadly defined as a process of working with and through others to accomplish school goals effectively. Castetter (1987:10) argues that educational administration should be viewed as a social process: This process may be examined from three points of view.

- Structurally, administration is seen as the hierarchy of subordinate relationships within the social system.
- Functionally, this hierarchy of relationships is the focus for allocating and integrating roles and functions in order to achieve the goals of the system.
- Operationally, administration takes effect in situations involving person interaction.

Gabela (1991:10) emphasizes Sergiovanni’s view that administration is the process of working with and through other people to accomplish organisational goals. Like Castetter (1981:10) and Sergiovanni (1987:6), Owens (1991:18) also defines administration as working with and through other people, individually and in groups, to achieve organisational
goals. Owens further states that, in terms of administrative practice, then, we need to know which are the best and most effective ways of working with and through other people.

Following the study done by Van der Westhuizen (1991:34), and Musaazi (1982:42), define administration as a social process concurred with maintaining, stimulating, controlling and unifying formally and informally, the organized human and material energy within a unified system designed to accomplish predetermined educational objectives.

From the above definitions one would assume that administration cannot be executed without the participation of other people within the institution or outside school. It is through others that principals perform their work. In seeking to improve and maintain the school, according to Sergiovanni (1987:6), principals are dependent on others. Teachers and parents, for example, are keys to successful schooling and must be regarded as such by the principals.

For purposes of this study the terms management and administration will be used interchangeably. According to Hersey (1982:178) the terms “manager” and “administrator” are practically synonymous. This connotation is supported by Van der Westhuizen (1991:38) who argues that “administration” is an umbrella term which refers to the structural and functional aspects of an education system. Reynders states that the Latin word “administratio” means both “Administration” and “management” and in the historical development of administration and management there has been no essential difference. In reality they refer to the same activity. Gabela (1991: 10) argues that management is often used as a synonym of administration. In certain usage, management identifies a special group of people whose job is to direct efforts towards common objectives through the activities of the other people. From these definitions it is clear that management is synonymous with administration.
activities of the other people. From these definitions it is clear that management is synonymous with administration.

One other concept that, in the researcher’s view overlaps with administration, is leadership. The researcher defines this concept as part of the background of this study.

1.5.2 Leadership

According to Hersey (1982: 179), most contemporary leadership theorists tend to treat leadership as an influence-process directed at either an individual or a group. They also argue that the leader essentially fills the gap in-between subordinate desires and abilities on one hand and organisational goals and requirements on the other.

Cawood and Gibbon (1981: 35) expand on this theme by differentiating between successful leadership and effective leadership. Successful leadership is the ability to get others to behave as the manager intended. The job gets done and the manager’s needs are satisfied, but those of the other people are ignored. Effective leadership, on the other hand, results in the administrator’s intentions being realised as well as bringing satisfaction to the needs of the employees.

According to Mussazi (1982: 53) leadership is concerned with the implementation of those policies and decisions which assist in directing the activities of an organisation towards its specified goals. Thus leadership is the process of influencing the activities and the behaviour of an individual or a group in an effort towards goal achievement in a given situation. This concept is supported by Van der Westhuizen (1991: 187) who maintains that leadership should be seen as a process of working with other people to identify and achieve common goals in a meaningful way.
with administration, management and authority and has been defined in terms of individual behaviour and influence over other people, interaction patterns, role relationships and the occupation of an administrative position.

Despite the variety of definitions, two features of leadership stand out. These are that leadership like administration is a group phenomenon involving the interaction between two or more persons. The other is that leadership involves a process of influencing followers.

1.5.3 School

The organisational structure of a school is established in order to discharge the expectations, norms and values and duties of the society it serves, as well as to realise the professional goals of the teachers and positive needs of learners involved. Dennison and Shenton (1987) define school as an organisation which is primarily concerned with the interactions between its members, that is, teachers, pupils, office staff, the department of education and other partners. These interactions produce a social climate which is peculiar to each school. The climate of a school is determined by the way in which the principal and his/her staff work among themselves and how they establish relations with pupils and parents. Work within a particular school is arranged into units, classes and departments by the school management team which organises and defines relationships between them.

Stone (1992: 21) looks at the school as a sub-unit of a larger organisation and this sets the principal in the middle of a structure which includes the department of education and culture, teachers, parents, children, maintenance staff and office staff. Teachers are a group of people the principal interacts or should interact with most of the time at school, while teachers interact directly with children. In an organisational sense, Stone (1992: 21) argues that the school is one section of the larger organisation and the principal is leader of this
section. The teachers are the professionals who fulfil the technical role, that is, teaching. The students are the clients and students' learning is the output.

The role of the school, as an organisation, is facilitated by the administrative and leadership roles of principals, among other players.

1.6 Assumptions underlying the study

This study speculates that the administration of schools by principals in the Durban South Region is not supportive to the achievement of professional needs of educators. The study further points out that lack of training of principals in administration and management seem to contribute to lack of administrative and leadership skills.

1.7 Method of study

The following methods will be used in this study: literature review on the role of principals as administrators and leaders. The survey, and in particular, questionnaires will be employed to collect data.

1.8 Layout of the study

The study is planned as follows:

Chapter 1: is an orientation chapter to the problem of study.

Chapter 2: presents a brief literature review on the administrative process in relation to leadership and management.
Chapter 3: focuses on research design, and data collection.

Chapter 4: presents the analysis and interpretation of data.

Chapter 5: is the final chapter which discusses the important findings of research which will form a base on which recommendations will be made.

1.9 Conclusion

In this chapter the problem to be investigated was introduced and described by the researcher. He further highlighted key concepts and provided a layout of the investigation. The researcher briefly mentioned the method of study for conducting research. The next chapter reviews literature on administration and leadership, especially with regard to the school.
CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE PRINCIPAL’S ROLE

Introduction

In Chapter One administration was defined as a process of working with and through other people. It was also pointed out that administration and leadership overlap. Indeed, Roe (1961:2), argues that administration is a process which directs the efforts of individuals within an organisation towards some common goal through leadership, co-ordination and control. As part of the organisation, school administration consists of key personnel, such as principals, deputy principals and heads of departments who are given responsibilities for school leadership, co-ordination and control.

Before outlining various roles which are said to be of integral importance in educational administration, the researcher deems it important at this stage to mention that administration involves a number of other tasks and processes, such as planning, organising, delegating, supervising and evaluating. These tasks will be dealt with under the theme on key administrative tasks. The chapter will review literature on the principal’s role as an administrator and a leader, and indicate how these roles overlap.

2.1 The principal’s administrative role at school
The principal as an administrator carries a wide range of responsibilities and his role demands an array of abilities. Cave and Wilkinson (1990: 12) echo this conception when they maintain that the principal holds the ultimate accountability for all the work of the school which includes a wide range of specialist activities. The principal is unlikely to be a specialist in all the subjects yet has to be able to encourage, guide and monitor the teaching in all areas of the curriculum. Principals need to be clear about various processes, some of which are to be discussed below. In addition it appears that principals need to be knowledgeable about finances, public relations, personnel management, and labour relations.

From the above concepts, it would be assumed that one of the principal’s major administrative roles is to ensure that the school as a whole realises the challenges it faces and that all staff members work as a team to meet these challenges.

In mapping out the principal’s administrative activities, Sergiovanni (1987: 7) maintains that several administrative theorists have identified key administrative tasks and key administrative processes. Researchers such as Mussazi (1982: 37), Roe (1961:2), Keith and Girling (1991: 14) refer to administration as a set of functions which, among others include: planning, organising, delegating, evaluating, supervising, leading and controlling. In addition to these tasks, Mussazi (1982: 169), further maintains that as an administrator, the school principal has a responsibility of seeing to it that the established procedures and structures help the school achieve its objectives and goals. His duty as an administrator is also to maintain the school and ensure that it functions smoothly. He co-ordinates and regulates the tasks of the entire school system.

To illustrate the challenge which the needs in the Provincial Education Department pose, reference will be made to student population. In his view of student population Gabela
(1991:4) argues that the growth of the population and changes in social life-style has given rise to the demand for greater educational opportunities. This demand coincides with over-crowded classrooms, employment of unqualified teaching personnel, high pupil-teacher ratio and high rates of failure and dropout among pupils and students. To make matters worse many KwaZulu-Natal schools lack the most basic furniture and the few that have laboratories and libraries have virtually no stocks. Thembela (1980:5) writes about this state of affairs and points out that, educational development faces financial constraints where the problem is that of getting greater and better educational facilities out of meagre available resources. The shortcomings referred to above are still in existence and they emphasise the need for effective and efficient administration to ensure the optimal use of limited financial, human and material resources.

The education system in KwaZulu-Natal, which is one of the provinces in South Africa, is undergoing transformation. The reform will have an impact on the way schools are managed. Prior to 1994 KwaZulu-Natal province had five educational departments, but these have been incorporated into one department, the Department of Education and Culture. Its needs and challenges are greater and more complex, thus posing a challenge for school administration. Swelling school populations, great expansion in educational services, the need for curriculum development, inadequate resources, the need for the construction of new classrooms and the management and supervision of an enlarged teaching body, are all factors which pose enormous challenges for school administration.

Recalling the research done by Neagley and Evans (1970), Cassim(1982: 9) maintains that classroom educators should form an integral part of the administrative process. They must have opportunities to participate in the evaluation of instruction programme, curriculum development and the general analysis of their own teaching-learning situations. Gabela (1991: 12), supports this view when he states that administration in
relation to teaching and learning is what school administrators, educators, officers and all who work directly with them do to make the efforts of teachers and learners easier, and more efficient. In this sense administration is concerned with stimulating and giving direction to teaching and learning, and therefore education. This implies that effective school administration may be achieved through enhancement and recognition of professional efficiency of the educators.

Clearly, the role of a principal as administrator overlaps with her/his role as a supervisor of effective teaching. The principal’s role in supervising effective teaching is discussed later in the section on his/her instructional leadership. In the next section the researcher reviews literature on the key administrative functions.

2.1.1 Key administrative functions

It has already been mentioned above that administrators perform various tasks. Below is a critical review of literature on what appears to be key administrative tasks and processes.

2.1.1.1 Planning

Keith and Girling (1991: 153) argue that the fundamental activity that occurs in any well managed organisation is planning. This is the activity that translates ideas into actions. Planning according to Musaazi (1982: 119) and Marx, (1981: 211), is a rational process of preparing and reflecting on a set of decisions for future actions directed at achieving goals and objectives by optional means. Caldwell (1983: 2) on the other hand views planning as a continuous process in administration which links goal-setting, policy making and long term planning, budgeting and evaluating in a manner which spans all
levels of the organisation. Gabela (1991: 47) refers to planning as the activity involved in foretelling the future and preparing for it. The view that planning is future directed, goal and objective focussed is also echoed by Allen (1964:109), who maintains that planning is the work a manager does to master the future, and through careful planning, set objectives are realised. Fayol (1949: 43), appears to support Gabela and Allen when he defines planning as an act of forecasting and preparing for the future. Without adequate planning the performance of educational administrators will be impaired and the implementation of educational activities will be hampered.

According to the above definitions planning is future and goal oriented. It involves a definition of goals and objectives. It is a process of orienting the institution towards the achievement of set goals. In schools, principals and educators set out in advance, the activities that would bring about the attainment of intended school goals. These activities include shared decision-making, clarification of school objectives and the establishment of school policies that will help the school management to realise its goals. Planning is an exercise for both school and class personnel. Educators work out a plan of the things that need to be done and the means and methods of doing them to accomplish the set purpose. It would appear that the development of a school plan helps schools to co-ordinate their activities as they pursue their aims and values. According to Sergiovanni (1978 :303 ), the educational administrator, in engaging in planning, attempts to answer the questions: Who does what, with whom, by what means, over what period and in order to accomplish what purpose?

The importance of planning

According to Koontz and O’Donnell(1964:79); Marx (1981: 215), the importance of effective planning is as follows:
It is the starting point of the management action.

Planning is the means of establishing whether the school is still moving in the direction of set objectives.

It causes one to think ahead and provides time for reflection.

It helps towards the pursuit and achievement of set objectives.

It provides the opportunity to consider alternative plans.

It can lead to better utilisation of people and resources.

It reduces the chances of overlapping.

It provides direction to those concerned and leads to team effort, and better cooperation and better co-ordination.

In addition to the advantages stated above, Gabela (1991:50) has this to say about the importance of planning: Gabela (1991: 50): it provides an educational administrator, be it a school principal, district superintendent, director or secretary with reference points upon which to fix the course of organisational behaviour. Planning thus provides the administrator with a map and direction with which to guide and lead the organization.

The next administrative function to be discussed is organising.

2.1.1.2 Organising

After an educational administrator has completed his planning he has to put it into practice. This can only occur successfully if the principal, management and staff organise school activities together. If in organising and planning administrative tasks, the principal recognises and implements educators’ inputs, it is likely that teaching and learning is done according to agreed upon procedures as educators will own the plan and work with commitment and competence. This conception is confirmed by Koontz and O’Donnell
(1964: 214) who state that organising is a process by which managers can bring order out of chaos, remove conflicts between people over responsibility and establish an environment suitable for teamwork. From this view, one would assume that successful organising consists of the principle that tasks should be carried out effectively by all the members of the institution to ensure effective teaching. Sergiovanni (1987: 317), appears to be in agreement with this conception when he argues that organising leads to the empowerment of educators and the feeling of empowerment among educators contributes to ownership and increased commitment and motivation to work.

Schools are expected, for example, to have a curriculum in place, to set goals and objectives and to organise themselves for general effectiveness and success. Allen (1964: 173) confirms this notion when he maintains that organising is that management task which is performed to initiate planning and to establish connections with various activities of the institution so that goals may be realised and attained effectively.

Marx (1981: 235) gives a broader description of organising by stating that organising is the management task which deals with arranging activities and resources of the institution by allotting duties, responsibilities and authority to people and the determination of the relationship between them to promote collaboration and to achieve the objectives of the institution as effectively as possible. This implies that in a school, organising as a management task subdivides various tasks and activities and allots them to specific people so that educative and effective teaching may be realised in an orderly manner.

What needs to be said at this point is that the theory of organising consists of the principle that tasks should be carried out effectively by other people to ensure that effective teaching takes place within an institution. Gabela (1991: 51), has this to say about this view: when an educational administrator performs the function of organising, he is
typically concerned with defining and arranging in some systematic way people’s functions, activities, and resources. In practice organising is a component of planning, but it has something extra to it. According to Cloete (1980: 77), organising and creating organisational structure extend much further than merely arranging individuals and groups to obtain effective teaching. After various people have been grouped to create organisation structure, various tasks have yet to be executed.

According to Van der Westhuizen (1991: 164), to be able to organise, a structure of authority should be created. The creation of an organisational structure, as stated by Van der Westhuizen, is also one the principal’s administrative functions which helps the principal with his administrative role by ensuring that the delegated tasks are carried out effectively. Reynders (1977: 156), concurs with Van der Westhuizen’s view of the organisational structure. He argues that the purpose of establishing an organisational structure is to ensure that there is no overlapping and duplication of work; but to ensure that tasks are logically grouped; that people are utilised according to their abilities in the execution of certain duties and to get an overall picture of the field in which the organisation operates.

Advantages of organising

Marx (1981: 239), refers to the following as the advantages of good organising:

- It promotes team spirit and group morale
- Activities are clearly defined and each person knows what she/he and others should do.
- It prevents overlapping of activities
- It facilitates effective internal communication.
- Guiding is easier.
• There is a system for getting work done
• Achieving goals is improved because an easily controllable structure has been created

Organising and creating organisational structures extend much further than merely arranging individuals and groups to obtain effective teaching. For instance, after educators have been grouped to create an organisational structure various tasks have yet to be executed. This is brought about by delegation of some duties and authority by the administrator to his subordinates. Below is a discussion on the principal’s role in delegating duties, responsibilities and authority within his or her institution.

2.1.1.3 Delegating

According to Schreuder, du Toit, Roesch and Shar (1993: 27), delegating is a centuries old act of management. It may be regarded as the act executed by somebody in leadership position to entrust duties, responsibilities and authority to other people. Its purpose is meaningful division of work to enable it to be performed more effectively and set objectives to be fulfilled. Van der Westhuizen (1991:172), supports the views of Schreuder, et al when he defines delegating as the task carried out by an educational administrator in entrusting duties and responsibilities to his subordinates and to divide the work meaningfully to ensure its effective execution by making people responsible for the achievement of organisational objectives. Musaazi’s view (1982: 106), is in line with that of the above theorists, although stated differently. He maintains that delegating is a process of dividing up your total work and giving part of it to your subordinates.

Delegation according to Musaazi (1982: 107), and Van der Westhuizen(1991:173), involves elements such as:
• Giving part of ones work to his subordinates.
• Giving the subordinates the necessary authority to execute their duties.
• Setting up control mechanisms to ensure that work is done according to predetermined standards.

It may happen that most tasks are totally delegated, but responsibility and authority may only be partially delegated. Marx (1981:179), in this regard, argues that the accountability of the school administrator to his superintendent cannot be delegated to the subordinates.

Arguing about delegation, Van der Westhuizen (1991:175) and Schreuder et al (1993:27), maintain that an educational leader does not always have time to execute all administrative tasks effectively. He must delegate some of his tasks to his staff members. This does not only reduce his volume of work, but also allows ample time to pay attention to his or her other priority duties such as planning, curriculum development, teamwork and others.

John (1980:65), in viewing delegation, maintains that effective delegating and job satisfaction are closely related. John further argues that managers who complain that 'nowadays it is difficult to find responsible subordinates who can be confidently trusted to get on with the job' are usually guilty of failing to delegate effectively and of creating a situation within the institution in which subordinates cannot hope to get any satisfaction.

According to Marx (1981:174) Musaazi; (1982:107); Schreuder, et al (1993:31) the most important benefit of delegating is that:
• It reduces the school administrator’s load. It thus enables him to devote his time to other duties which demand his attention within the organisation.
The amount of work to be done by the administrator is greatly reduced and in this way delegating increases effectiveness.

Delegating enables the principal to plan and use time economically.

Delegating helps to extend activities since more people become involved and more work can be done.

Delegating also serves as a means of preventing overlapping.

It provides an opportunity for greater work satisfaction which in turn leads to increased motivation and high morale.

By delegating more effective control may be exercised.

From the above conceptions, the researcher concludes that delegation is essential because one person cannot do everything alone. It enables the school administrator to distribute his authority. The distribution of authority, argues Musaazi (1982:107), is a deliberate plan according to which the administrator makes his authority effective and influential through full utilisation of his staff talents. Delegation raises the problem of accountability. John (1980:72), maintains that although the person who delegates must not seek to retain control of that sphere by personal intervention, the administrator remains responsible and accountable for the conduct and outcomes of all delegated fields of activities.

2.1.1.4 Evaluating

Morphet, Jones, Reller (1982:73), argue that the effectiveness of an organisation is enhanced when provision is made for evaluating not only the products of the organisation but also the organisation itself. According to Keith and Girling (1991:214), all educators recognise that evaluation is endemic to the educational process. Furthermore Keith, et al, also maintain that in a school situation educators are concerned with
evaluating students while principals are concerned with evaluating teaching and non-teaching staff.

Evaluation is the task, according to Reynders (1977: 132), which has as its purpose the identification of the merits and deficiencies, and is an integrative part of a control task. The quality and functionality of the institution are measured by means of evaluation. In his view of evaluation, Gorton (1976:62), maintains that evaluation indicates group product or programme to determine strong or weak points. Gorton further postulates that evaluation also pre-supposes monitoring the progress made with regard to goals and objectives, and also entails the correction of actions which have deviated from the mutually agreed upon goals. De Wet (1981:89) and Van der Westhuizen (1991:221), appear to be supportive of Gorton’s view when they state that, evaluation is a useful means of determining whether a person has carried out his given task and whether a person is helping to achieve set objectives. Evaluation also helps to determine whether a specific person with his unique qualities and specific talents may be of the best service. Dewey (1958 : 308 ), has this to say about evaluation : evaluation broadly conceived involves judgement of teaching and learning in a particular situation. Of interest in judgmental evaluation are particular educators and students, specific teaching situations and events, and understandings and meanings emerging from teaching.

From the views stated above, it is evident that evaluation is a complex process. However Keith and Girling (1991:245 ), argue that schools generally devote too little time and attention on defining, structuring and supporting effective evaluation procedures. Given the complexity of the teaching and learning process, the information regarding the performance of educators and learners should be of utmost importance. Also of importance is the support by educators for the evaluation of performance within the institution.. Keith and Girling also maintain that another key aspect of this part of
research is that school wide evaluation is an important task of the school management team. Gabela (1991:59), citing research conducted by (Robbins, 1980), regards evaluation as an act of examining individual activities, group activities, programme or results in order to ascertain strengths and weaknesses, successes and failures. Secondly evaluation lays a stress on effectiveness.

At this point, the researcher assumes that there is great importance attached to evaluation when the focus of management is learning and teaching and the goal is the highest possible quality for every student in the school. Evaluating of activities merges with supervision.

2.1.1.5 Supervising

When the focus of supervision is on teaching and learning, evaluation is an unavoidable process. That is to say evaluation cannot be separated from supervision Sergiovanni (1987:151). Supervision is a broad process and this is evidenced by various definitions: According to Beare et al (1989 : 157) the Oxford English Dictionary defines to supervise as meaning to “oversee”, or have the oversight of or superintend the performance of work by other people. In supporting this view, Smyth (1984: 2), argue that in a school where concern for excellence is a driving force, supervision is a process of work with and through others to achieve quality education for all students. From Sergiovanni’s point of view, supervision is a set of responsibilities and activities designed to promote instructional improvement in schools. Cassim’s view of supervision (1982 : 32), seems to be in line with that of Sergiovanni. He maintains that supervision is an area of administration that is concerned with the development of the curriculum and the improvement of the teaching and learning process. Both educators and supervisors have a common responsibility for continuous improvement of instruction and need to acquire
an overall understanding of the problems and needs of the school.

Musaazi (1982: 32), believes that supervision involves day to day relationships between the principal, the community and his subordinates, that is, educators and learners. Musaazi further maintains that supervision involves training, directing, motivating, coordinating, discipline and the adjustment of plans whenever need arises. For example the principal guides the actions of his staff and students by informing them during morning assembly of what is to be done on that day or during the whole week. He also guides his educators in the staff meetings, while the educator guides and influences learners in the classroom. Elaborating on the school administrator's role on staff supervision, Glatter, Preedy, Riches and Masterton (1988: 14), argue that the principal's supervision of staff is more acceptable when it could be regarded by both the principal and staff as an opportunity for providing professional guidance and development.

According to Cassim (1982: 35), principals as supervisors need to address the following areas:

- The adequacy of the curriculum.
- The success and failure of pupils.
- Learning difficulties experienced in the classroom.
- Physical conditions affecting the instruction programme.
- Treatment of individual differences and problems.
- The serving of supplies and the outcome of instruction.

Obviously the above areas involve evaluation and by identifying the above areas for supervision, as stated by Cassim, the principal should be in a position to stimulate professional growth and select supervisory techniques appropriate for particular needs. According to Jacobson et al. (1973: 138) all educators need some type of supervision in all educational institutions. All educators also need some assistance and encouragement
in reaching the highest level of professional development.

Sergiovanni (1987:149), stresses that successful schools are characterised by a diversified programme of supervision that is accepted by management and staff as a natural life of the school. In such schools principals and educators are clear as to the purposes of the supervisory programme and share responsibility for its implementation. From this conception, supervision is not viewed as something done to educators but as a process in which educators participate as partners. Sergiovanni further maintains that in successful schools the emphasis is on understanding and improving teaching and learning and not on sorting out or grading educators.

Clearly a principal’s role as a supervisor not only entails evaluation, but it is also an important part of administration. The section on the principal’s role as an administrator is to be concluded by looking at two other administrative roles. These are decision making and communication.

2.1.1.6 Decision making

The ability to make proper decisions is vital to the successful performance of a school principal and his management staff. Arguing about decision making, Gorton and Snowden (1993:3) maintain that decision making is ‘the heart of the executive activity’. The empowerment of educators by giving them more responsibilities over such issues as curriculum adoption, staff development, formulation of school policies, work evaluation and other tasks, calls for proper decision making under different conditions for the school administrator. Schreuder et al (1993:70), concur with Gorton and Snowden when they regard decision making as an exclusive responsibility of the principal. Although all people make decisions within the organisation, the administrator (principal) makes
decisions which affect the decisions and actions of others. They further state that, in teaching, for example, decisions may stretch further and influence the lives of learners, the parental community and the future adult community of which learners form part. In view of this conception decision making in education may not take place in a casual manner.

Simons (1950), views decision making as fundamentally an administration process. He points out that all people in an organisation specialise in the kinds of decisions they make and the amount of time devoted to decision making. In this respect teachers, for example, make decisions which determine, to a greater extent the impact of their teaching on the learner. Other education officers who have less teaching responsibilities spend more time on making decisions of a different kind to those made by the principals, inspectors, educational planners, directors or secretaries. Indeed, a large body of literature both within and out of education, focuses on decision making as a vital element which pervades the entire process of administration.

Decision making is regarded by many researchers as one of the most important tasks of management actions. It plays a determinative role in both school and classroom management. Before a decision is taken, an educational leader diagnoses the situation and then explore the various ways of acting (Lipham and Hoeh 1974:150). Robbins (1980:64), and Marx (1981:125), define decision making as a thought process which is carried consciously to direct the achievement of goals. Marx and Robbins, further stress that decision making could be regarded as a process of consciously choosing the most suitable way of acting to solve or handle a particular situation once the various alternatives and possibilities have been considered for the achievement of the desired goal.
Morphet, Jones and Reller (1982:65), argue that every organisation must make provision for decision making. Decisions made must be concerned with what goals, purposes, objectives, policies and programmes will be acceptable to the members of the institution as legitimate. According to Robbins (1980:65), De Wet (1981:51), and Gorton (1980:230), decision making involves the following steps:

- Determine and formulate the problem.
- Analyse and evaluate the problem.
- Identify different solutions or alternatives.
- Choose the best solution or alternative.
- Ensure that the decision is acceptable to the members concerned.
- Implement the decision.
- Evaluate the decision and the results.

It should be remembered that the above model is only a guide line for decision making. What may appear to be a problem for one educational administrator may not be the same for another administrator. However, Gorton and Snowden (1993:7), support the above model when they stress that decision making is a process influenced by values and information whereby a perceived problem is explicitly defined, alternatives and solutions are posed and weighed and a choice made that is subsequently implemented and evaluated. They further maintain that this approach increases the autonomy of the school staff as they participate in making decisions on institutional problems.

 Obviously decision making plays a central part in the management of schools. Situation which the principals face, will vary greatly and decision have often to be made in difficult circumstances (Wilkinson and Cave 1987:103). According to Gorton et al (1993:11), the key factor in the acceptance of the principal’s decision is not a self perceived legitimacy but the perception of others in regard to the administrator’s legitimacy as a decision
maker. Gorton et al further state that in securing the acceptance of the decision, the principal need to understand the perceptions of educators, parents and students regarding the administrator's legitimacy as a decision maker.

The researcher now takes a close look at the school administrator's role in communication.

2.1.1.7 The administrator's role in communication.

Once planning, organising and delegating of duties have been done, one of the main functions of the administrator is that of communicating with various individuals and groups. Thus the school administrator should be an active speaker when, for example, making announcements at the assembly when communicating with staff and parents individually, or at meetings, and when counseling on students.

This conception is supported by Musaazi (1982:178), who maintains that "the school principal can communicate with staff in a number of ways:

- He can use staff notices, which are items of information or instruction that come from his office.
- He can communicate with his staff during meetings of heads of departments.
- Staff meetings are one of the most important ways through which the principal can communicate with his staff on school management and teaching. Such meetings also provide an opportunity for teaching as a group exchanges ideas among themselves and consequently and try to improve staff relations".

The word, communication according to Schreuder et al (1993: 45), Schesinger and Whitmore (1985:61), is derived from the latin word “Comminico” which means “partaken
or shared" or "to make known" Whitmore et al also maintain that communication is a two way process, comprising not only the sending or conveying information between two or more people, but usually there is a response from the recipient. It is from the response that the communicator can judge the effect of his message.

The world we live in is basically a world of people who act, interact and react. Most of our actions and reactions involve communication which is intended for conveying and sharing information, instruction, advice, feelings, opinions and facts from one person to another or to a group of people. Good communication stimulates interest and motivation of those to whom it is directed such as staff, learners, parents and the community members. Communication permits every process of school life (Gorton et al 1993:33). Gorton also maintain that the school administrator, be it a superintendent, or a principal who occupies a key position in the organisational hierarchy, in that position, there is a need to communicate with a wide variety of people and in a number of different ways about specific problems and issues.

According to Arnold and Feldman (1988:154), the ability to communicate effectively is critical to the administrator’s success. All important functions of the principal depend upon the effective communication among administrative staff and the subordinates. In order to motivate educators, Arnold and Feldman further argue that principals need to involve their staff members in setting school goals and instruct them how to perform their duties correctly. On the other hand, on making institutional decisions, the principal needs to elicit information from educators within the institution, and from the parents and students and then clearly communicate the ultimate decisions back to the subordinates. Whitmore et al (1985:63), seems to support the view of Arnold and Feldman when they argue that an administrator like a principal has communication as his tool for motivating, organising, reprimanding and advising students, educators and
parents. Musaazi (1982:51), shares the same view as Arnold and Feldman. He stresses that the primary administrative functions include informing, instructing or directing someone, evaluating someone, guiding and influencing another person's thought or behaviour towards organisational goals. This is achieved through the establishment of a proper channels of communication.

Badenhorst et al (1987:43) maintain that communication plays an important part in the life of the organisation like a school. Lack of communication about what is going on causes a lot of problems within an organisation and affects administration of a school. Whitmore et al (1985:63), argue that some principals do not bother to consult their educators when making decisions. He believes that communication and consultation result in good human relationships. Schreuder et al (1993:49), Lovell and Wiles (1983:90), Robbins (1980:356), point out that the school principal can communicate in various ways. The principal must establish clearly defined levels of communication and procedures. He must also educate his educators, parents and students in the need for communication so that it becomes second nature. This view is supported by Whitmore (1985:63), who emphasises that communication must be promoted and practised by all staff members and eventually it will become natural to observe the school communication principles and channels.

Ways of communicating.

According to Arnold and Feldman (1988:156), there are two types of communication: channels that each institution should establish, formal communication channels and informal communication channels. According to Bester (1970:77), communication is the interaction between the principal and staff and a way of exerting influence of a major importance.
Formal communication channels

These channels indicate to whom employees should communicate their concerns, problems and questions. If these channels are not open, subordinates are often hesitant to communicate with the principal. In some cases subordinates feel that the principal is not interested in their problems and more often principals do not have sufficient information to help educators and children with their problems or accurate information to make proper decision.

In order to communicate formally, Whitmore (1985:65), argues that the principal must hold meetings where people communicate face to face with their immediate superiors. Whitmore also stated that educators want to be informed by their superior rather than learn from other officials such as the Deputy Principals and Head of Departments, especially if it is someone in lower position in the administration hierarchy. At meetings subordinates have an opportunity of asking questions and receiving factual answers not the rumour from the grapevine.

According to Badenhorst et al (1987:50), the hierarchy within an organisation determines its formal communication. The school principal, for instance, delegates some of his tasks and powers to the Head of Departments, Standard or Grade Heads, who in turn, issue instructions to educators under their control. What educators must remember, according to Badenhorst et al, is that, unless otherwise instructed they must discuss their concerns and problems through the formal channels of communications. This implies that an educator should, for example, not speak with the principal direct on matters that concern his subjects prior to having informed a head of department. The educator must attempt to solve his problems with the head of department prior to referring it to senior
management. If it cannot be solved at that level of administration then both the teachers and the head of departments should communicate their matter with the principal.

**Informal communication networks**

In addition to formal channels of communication, there should be informal communication networks often called "grapevine" by Arnold and Feldman (1988:157), while Badenhorst (1987:51), calls them "bush telegraph." Arnold and Feldman argue that, informal network is often used by top management to make official announcements, unofficial evaluation of work done during, for example, weekly standing meetings and intentional leaks of upcoming meetings. School management, especially the school principal receives and sends more information through grapevine.

According to Arnold and Feldman (1988:157), in every organization there are informal communication networks as well as formal communication channels. Contrary to the normal use for which an informal channel of communication network may be established, it may often be used by employees to bypass the normal channel of communication or to pass along personal information gossip or rumours. In view of this notion, Badenhorst (1987:51), warns that although the informal communication cannot and should not be eliminated every member of the organization should be careful not to help spread stories especially negative ones. Teachers should also realize that the principal can and does acquire information by means of casual conversation. This warning is supported by Arnold and Feldman who argue that, every manager has to find a delicate balance between being inundated with information and being shut out from it. The manager also has to find the fine line between hearing too many trivial complaints from too many subordinates and being ill informed about major problems.
From the above discussion the researcher assumes that, with proper and effective communication the organization is able to attain its goals. Also key to the principal’s success is the ability to communicate effectively because all important school organizational functions depend upon the effective communication among management and their subordinates. In understanding the importance of communication in administration, one would consider the variety of roles that must be fulfilled by the principal as cited by, Griffin (1987:489), for instance, the administrator’s routine roles, such as meetings, telephone calls and correspondence all clearly involve communication. Griffin also refers to managerial roles such as: interaction with supervisors, peers, and others outside the organisation; the decisional roles; the informational roles which obviously involve communication. These roles focus specifically on acquiring and disseminating information.

Having briefly discussed the principal’s administrative role, in the next section, the researcher discusses the relationship and the overlap between administration and leadership in a school situation.

2.2 The overlap between administration and leadership

The concept of leadership in education is as important as that of educational administration and instructional leadership. It has been said that “The organisation without effective leadership is in trouble”. In his view of leadership, Gorton et al (1936 : 67), argue that “most administrators recognise that providing leadership is a major expectation for their role. But what constitutes leadership? And how does the administrator exercise leadership? In response to these questions, Gorton maintains that literally hundreds of studies have been conducted on leadership, yet, although these studies have provided some insights into the subject of leadership, the concept of
leadership remains an elusive one.” It appears as though it is rather difficult to analyse leadership as a separate and distinct concept from administration, although some researches attempt to identify differences between the two. A few theorists on leadership and management alluded to below, make an attempt to look at the relationship between leadership and administration.

Educational leadership is viewed by a variety of researchers as encompassing almost all aspects of schooling that impact on learning and teaching. These include: clarifying goals and purpose, maintaining order, establishing a supportive climate, motivating teachers to work, establishing communication channels, and providing materials needed for instruction. In support of these theories Stogdill (1990), defines leadership as those activities engaged in by an individual or members of a group which contribute significantly to the development and maintenance of role structures and goal direction, necessary for effective group performance. Stogdill’s definition emphasizes that leadership needs to be limited to one individual, such as the school administrator, and that the focus of leadership activities should be on increasing the performance effectiveness of the group. More recently, the issue of empowerment has had an impact upon the way leadership is defined. According to Taylor and Rosenbanch (1989 : 207), leadership involves assisting everyone working with the organisation to collectively gain control over resources for the common good.

In discussing leadership effectiveness, Hersey (1982 : 106), attempts to distinguish between administration and leadership. He maintains that, leadership is a broader concept than administration. Administration is thought of as a special kind of leadership in which the accomplishment of organisational goals is paramount. Hersey also maintains that any time that you are attempting to influence the behaviour of someone else you are engaging in leadership; your leadership behaviour is directed towards
accomplishing organisational goals. Stogdill (1948), views administration as involving those activities engaged in by an individual or members of a group which contributes significantly to the development and maintenance of role structure and goal direction necessary for group performance. On the other hand Stogdill’s definition of leadership emphasises that leadership needs to be limited to one individual such as the school administrator”. He believes that the focus of leadership activities should be on increasing performance effectiveness of the group. In contrast to Stogdill’s concept of leadership being limited to one individual such as the school principal, Jacobson et al (1973 : 133) argue that one of the common misconceptions concerning leadership is that a status position such as principalship automatically ensures leadership existence. It is true that a certain amount of prestige attaches to the principal by virtue of his office. Persons employed in a school system are inclined to accept leadership from the principal, but in the climate of today’s society, teachers are not ready to follow unless the ‘leadership’ is present. Obviously, principals may not expect loyalty, and strict followership unless they exercise appropriate leadership.

In his study on leadership, Liphan (1991) makes an important distinction between the administrators and the leader. He defines the administrators as the individual who utilises existing structure or procedures to achieve an organisational goal or objective. He goes on to say the administrator is concerned primarily width maintaining, rather than changing established structures, procedures, or goals. Thus an administrator, according to Lipham, must be viewed as a stabilising force. In contrast to the administrator, the leader as stated by Lipham, is concerned with initiating changes in established structures, procedures or goals, he is a ‘disrupter’ of the existing state of affairs. Leadership to Lipham “is the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing organisational goals and objectives. Consequently an administrator can be a leader by attempting to introduce change, but is not a leader just because the individual occupies what has been
referred to as a "leadership position". It is not the position that determines whether someone is a leader but it is the nature of behaviour that the individual demonstrates while occupying an administrative or leadership position.

However, Lipham also acknowledges that the administrator who adopts the role of leader only, will be unable to spend all of the time on leadership as adequate attention must also be devoted to administering the school. There is considerable doubt whether an organisation can successfully maintain itself if the administrator spends all or most of the time in initiating new procedures or goals. Nevertheless, it is equally clear that organisational improvement may suffer if the administrator spends all the time maintaining the status quo. In this regard Gorton (1993: 68), argues that if the organisation is to improve its effectiveness and reach new heights, the administrator must initiate changes, procedures and organisational goals. If these changes achieve the desired ends, one would assume that not only has the administrator attempted to exercise leadership but has also succeeded in exercising effective leadership, which seems to be needed more than ever in education.

Further to Gortons’ definition of leadership, Owens (1991: 134), postulates that leadership occurs in some kind of a group and the leadership functions in relation to the members of the group. This implies that there is no leadership without a group to be led. Initially, it may seem obvious that the leader of a group is the individual incumbent in an official position such as the school principal or superintendent. In an educational organisation like a school, leadership is synonymous with the official position. Thus poor leadership is frequently levelled on the school principal or superintendent.

In support of this conception Roe (1961: 5), argues that the principal may be a person with outstanding leadership ability, have state or national recognition as an educational
scholar, and yet if the business management details of the school are ineptly administered, the general public will consider him a poor administrator, and his opportunities for showing the splendid educational leadership, of which he is capable will be diminished. This implies that confidence or lack of confidence in the administrator too often starts with confidence or lack of confidence in his managerial ability in the business and service areas of the school.

In spite of the difference of opinions with regard to the relationship between leadership and administration, some researchers argue that leadership and administration are somewhat closely related and linked. According to Kimborough and Nunnery (1983: 329), studies made on leadership make no distinction between leadership and administration. These studies, instead provide valuable ideas which are assumed to be common in these concepts:

- Administration is a broader concept than leadership, that is, administration encompasses other activities such as maintenance tasks.
- Leadership in organisations and groups is not restricted to those who hold status positions.
- Leadership as a process refers to a person behaving in such a way as to influence the subordinates to seek willingly the achievement of group and organisational goals and objectives.

Roe (1961), appears to concur with the above concept on administration and leadership. He argues that administration as a process, directs the efforts of individuals within an organisation towards some common goal through leadership, coordination, and control. As part of the organisation, the administration consists of key personnel and assistants who are given responsibility for this leadership, coordination, and control.
Sergiovanni (1987: 7) also supports Kimborough and Nunnery (1983), when he maintains that the distinctions between administration and leadership are useful for theorists and help to clarify various activities and behaviour of school administrators. For practical purposes, however, both administrative and leadership styles must be considered as necessary aspects of educational administration.

Roe (1961), emphasises that administration can be considered in both broad and narrow terms. In broad terms, administration determines overall aims for which the group is to strive and establishes broad policies under which it is to operate. In the narrow sense, administration may be responsible for only a limited part of the total school organisation and operate completely according to policies established at a higher level in the hierarchy. Because of the many activities involved in administration and because administration means different things to different people, it has been difficult to establish a clear cut difference between administration and leadership.

Although literature on school administration has long emphasised that one of the major responsibilities of the school administrator is to provide leadership, this emphasis has taken on new urgency in recent years. The school administrator is cited as a pivotal figure in bringing about needed school reform and improvement. While some may doubt whether all or many school administrators possess the necessary qualities for leadership, there is a general agreement that administrative leadership is needed if the schools are to improve significantly. In confirming this theory, Gorton et al (1993: 68), maintain that whether the focus is on defining a clear school purpose and mission, developing a definite set of staff expectations for improved students learning, providing an orderly school environment where serious learning can take place, some type of leadership contribution by the school administrator would seem necessary.
From the above discussion it is clear that leadership like administration is inseparable from the organisation and group goals and needs. For leadership to be successful whether at management level or at all organisational levels, there has to be an effective administrator.

Deducing from the conceptions stated above, the researcher would assume that successful leadership and administration within a school organisation are directed towards the improvement of teaching and learning for learners. Although assuming an active role in school administration and improvement, the principal, must give attention to enabling others to function more effectively within the institution.

Sergiovanni (1987 : 6), views administration as a process of working with and through others to accomplish school goals effectively. Action by the principal, setting of school goals, development of limited resources and working with other people such as learners, educators, parents and superintendents are the essential elements of this definitions.

According to Geneen (1984 : 105), principals must manage and at the same time lead. Geneen further maintains that administration involves the marshalling of financial and other resources, the planning and implementing of structures, and the providing of actions, arrangements, and activities needed for the school to reach its school improvement goals. Administration is the means to get to point B from point A. Leadership on the other hand is concerned with an issue such as, Why go to Point B anyway? What school improvement goals are worth pursuing? How can arrangements be reached among the faculty and among school constituencies regarding these goals? What levels of motivation and commitment are needed for people to work together energetically on school improvement? Leadership without management can lead to mere rhetoric and disappointment. Management without leadership rarely results in sustained
development in teaching and learning practices.

2.3 Leadership and principalship

The role of a principal as a leader has been highlighted in different contexts. Musaazi (1982: 168), believes that the school principal is a major ingredient for school effectiveness. He is the educational leader whose major responsibility is to guide teachers to provide the best possible education for the children. This theory is supported by Stone (1991: 2), who see the principal as the key person in determining the quality of education for the children, by providing an environment for educators, students, teaching and learning within the school. Stone (1992: 4) also view the principal’s leadership role as involving interaction with teachers, parents and superordinates. The quality of these interactions according to Stone has a significant impact on the overall effectiveness of the principal’s leadership, the result of which is manifested in outcomes such as educators’ satisfaction and student achievement.

According to van der Westhuizen (1991: 1), during the past few decades the task of the school principal has undergone a radical change. Traditionally the principal, as an educational leader, was merely the “head teacher” and his task was of a limited challenge. But as a result of increasing complexity of the school as an organisation, the educational leader is subjected to the ever-changing demands especially in respect of his management and leadership tasks. In his view of leadership, Rebore (1974: 118), argues that whereas the principal’s task used to be focussed mainly on teaching, it has now changed to a more management directed task.

According to Moolman (1978: 88), the expansion of the educational leader’s challenges are also experienced in matters pertaining to manpower, teacher militancy, utilisation of
time and administration, finances and others. These factors afford further hardships to the principal as an educational leader. Moolman also maintains that account will have to be taken in not so far a future of the demands made by the rapid changes in the South African systems of education, increasing stress and the expansion of objectives during the current period. Some consideration must be given too to the demands of principalship in a changing society.

In view of the above challenges, the educational leader can no longer be expected to perform his duties in a hit-or-miss fashion. In this regard Cawood (1973:6), argues that there is an urgent need for educational leaders to receive both academic and professional training in educational management. Cawood's concept accords well with that of Buckley (1985:27), who states that a principal needs certain basic knowledge and skills preferably before taking appointment of principalship.

The section below reviews literature on some important leadership considerations.

Research conducted by Beare, Caldwell and Milican (1989:103), on leadership suggests two dimensions of leadership behaviour. These dimensions concern are for accomplishing of organisational tasks and a concern for relationship among people in the organisation. Powell's view of leadership behaviour (1988:152), accords well with the above discussion when he suggests that many studies of leadership have concluded that managers vary in two critical types of leader behaviour: initiating structure and considerations. Research conducted by Halpin (Gorton et al 1993:68) on leadership behaviour, also identify two sets of behaviour which were found to be associated with successful leaders. These are initiating structures and consideration.

These two areas of leadership are reviewed below.
Initiating structure

According to Powell (1988: 153), initiating structure refers to the extent to which the administrator initiates activity in the group, organises it and defines the way work is to be done. This type of leadership includes behaviours such as insisting on standards and deadlines and deciding in detail what will be done by subordinates and how it will be done. For example, Powell argues that a newly appointed principal will establish and develop a description of the function of each department member. He will formulate departmental and individual goals and assignments. He also gives details on how projects should be conducted. He may thus be high on initiating structure behaviour.

Research conducted by Halpin (Gorton et al. 1993: 68), on leadership behaviour, in which he also identified initiating structure and consideration, Halpin states that initiating structure refers to the leader's behaviour in delineating the relationship between the leader and the members of the work group and in endeavouring to establish well-defined patterns of organisation, channels of communication, and methods of procedures. Like Powell's view, Halpin argues that the leader who assumes this leadership role will attempt to define the behaviour expected from each member of the organisation and will emphasise the importance of "getting the job done".

Franseith (1961: 61) however warns against over emphasis on structure and task by some educational administrators. He argues that overvaluing tasks, encourages people to conform to patterns of job requirements and execution dictated by bosses.

The next dimension of leadership to be reviewed is consideration for people
Consideration for people

Consideration sometimes referred to as people-oriented behaviour, according to Halpin (Gorton et al 1993:69), involves the expression of mutual trust, friendship, respect and warmth between the group and the leader. The administrator who assumes this leadership role will attempt to develop a positive and satisfying relationship between leader and followers and will try to promote a spirit of co-operation among the different members of the group being led. This type of leadership has also been referred to by Getzel and Guba as ideographic leadership, in that it stresses the personal and emotional needs of the members of the group. Franseth’s idea (1961:62) accords well with that of Halpin. Franseth maintains that people oriented principals appraise their subordinates, encourage and examine the extent to which their educators become more self actualising, more self-directing, more creative and more co-operative in working towards individual as well as mutually accepted goals. They encourage educators to exert initiating structures and to share ideas and responsibilities. These leaders make contact easily, they seek and develop channels for free communication. They are not defensive and they can accept opinions from others even though what is said how it is said may be hostile.

Musaazi (1982:58), believes that concern for people appears to be one of the most important supervisory qualities. Much as teachers depend on the principal for a number of things, he also relies on them for the accomplishment of organisational tasks. The principal therefore depends upon every teacher at every level for the success of the pupils and for school effectiveness. Musaazi (1982), refers to this as a "shared official relationship".

From the above exposition one would argue that the leader on one hand is expected to provide proper guidance, motivation and help to his staff while on the other hand he must
expect quality work from his staff. If the leader lacks the initiative and originality of thought to give necessary guidance and leadership, the organisation he leads cannot achieve its goals. In the same vein if the staff lacks a sense of duty, the organisation will fail to achieve its objectives. It must, however, be remembered that in order to establish this cooperation from staff, there must be friendship, mutual trust and respect in the relationship between the principal and his subordinates as well as focus on tasks. A neglect of other structures or relationships affects a principal's leadership. Indeed Gorton et al (1993:69) have this to say, if an administrator emphasises the initiation of structure in order to facilitate organisational achievement, but neglects the needs of a group for consideration, co-operation in achieving the goals of the organisation cannot be attained. If, on the other hand, an administrator stresses the consideration dimension, but pays insufficient attention to the initiation of structure needed to promote organisational achievement, the administrator may succeed in meeting a group’s needs for maintenance but may fail to meet fully, the organisation’s needs for achievement. Halpin’s concept of leadership stresses that the administrator who wishes to be a leader must engage in both types of behaviour.

2.4 Group and organizational leadership

The above views on leadership pertain to leadership of individuals, groups and organizations. However in the next section, leadership literature is reviewed with special regard to groups.

According to Gorton et al (1993:72), a leader will need to recognise and influence his/her various groups that are associated with the school. In some of these cases, the leader will be interacting with groups such as administration staff, different departments and others. The principal as a leader may also be active as an advisor for the school
governing body, students councils and parents or teacher councils. In this view Owens (1991:134), postulates that leadership occurs in some kind of a group, and the leader functions in relationship to the members of the group.

This view warrants the leader to pay attention to group dynamics. Van der Westhuizen (1991:299), stresses the necessity for the knowledge of group dynamics by the principal for successful educational leadership. This enables him to deal with staff problems and to establish relations among his staff. Gorton et al (1993:72), concurs with Van der Westhuizen when they state that in order to be an effective leader, the school administrator must possess knowledge and skills utilising group dynamics.

Following the studies conducted by Cartwright and Zander (1960), on group dynamics, Hersey and Blanchard (1988: 93), state that group objectives fall into two categories, these being: the maintenance or strengthening of human relationships and the achievement of specific group goals. These two, human relationships and the achievement of specific group goals are similar to consideration for people and facilitating task achievement.

Hersey and Blanchard further state that according to Cartwright and Zander, the type of behaviour involved in goal achievement involves the following examples: the leader initiates action, keeps members attention on the goal, clarifies the issue and develops a procedural plan. On the other hand in group maintenance the leader keeps interpersonal relations pleasant, arbitrates disputes, gives encouragement, stimulates self-direction and increases interdependence among members.

2.5 Leadership and goals
One of the most important tasks of an administrator and one that attracts the attention of most people, according to Bolton (1980: 53), is determining organisational and group goals, which determine the standard against which comparisons can be made.

Jacobson et al (1973: 194), contends that the first step to be taken by organisational administrators, especially in a school situation, is to involve staff in a rigorous examination of their beliefs about the purposes of education in a democratic society, the nature of learning, the nature of students and the community. Then collectively the administrator and staff must determine their beliefs, goals and objectives. Jacobson also argues that when staff members take their time to analyse their educational goals carefully and determine how best they can be accomplished, the prospects for improved education is greatly increased.

Gorton et al (1993: 75), supports Jacobson's contention when they state that in order to arrive at a common group goal the administrator should try to involve his staff members in the development of the organisational goals. This implies that group involvement is the preferred approach to goal establishment. Presumably if an administrator does not involve his group, he will be tempted to force or direct members to adopt particular goals. In support of this view, Coch and French Gorton et al (1993: 75), found in their classic study, that the best way to get members of a group to accept new goals is for the administrator to use the process of persuasion and group involvement. Their study suggests that the administrator's most effective approach to developing a common goal is to involve staff members in the creation and adoption of the organisational goal. The administrator must also use influence rather than power or authority in working with his staff.

People co-operate more effectively if they can communicate with one another. In
order to gain the co-operation of his staff the principal must clearly define the organisational goals. In setting organisational goals, he must consider group goals and views. Alfonso et al (1981:105), see leadership as a group process which stems from the group interaction, out of which group goals seeking behaviour emerges. This is supported by Cartwright and Zander (1960) who maintain that leadership consists of such actions by the group members, as those which aid in setting goals, moving the group towards the goals, improving the quality of interaction among group members, building the cohesiveness of the group and making resources available to the group. In support of the above concepts Musaazi (1982:39), states that school administrators must know that each staff member brings his social and material goals and needs to the school. The survival and the effectiveness of the schools administered by the principals, largely depend on their ability to satisfy the staff needs and goals. Musaazi (1982:39), further maintains that the attainment of school goals may be difficult, if not impossible, if the principal habitually ignores the opinions and feelings of the educators, as well as those of learners, on matters that affect them.

From the above exposition one would realise that goals set by the leader in co-operation with the group and decisions made in consultation with the group are more effective than decisions made by the administrator and then imposed on the group. We have so far defined leadership as the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts towards goals with and through people. Therefore a leader must be concerned about tasks and human relationships. Although schools that function effectively have a special kind of leadership as a factor that contributes to their success, educational leaders and educators in these schools also have vision which guides them to achieve set goals. In the section below the researcher attempts to look at vision as one of the aspects that contribute to the effectiveness of school leadership.
2.6 Leadership and vision

Goals without a framework which underpins them have limited utility. Jenkins (1991:36), argues that one of the hallmarks of successful leaders is the ability to create and sustain a vision for the future. Authors such as Starratt (1986), Senge (1990) and Jenkins (1991), regard a vision as an essential component of an institution. This must be shared by all the members of the institution. Goals are often set to give expression to a vision.

Senge has suggested that the ability to develop a shared vision will become one of the key disciplines of the learning organisations. Central to this will be realising of individual aspirations and visions. Furthermore, Senge feels that visions that are truly shared take time to emerge. They grow as a by-product of interactions of individual visions. Experience suggests that visions that are genuinely shared require ongoing conversation where individuals not only free to express their dreams, but learn how to listen to each others’ dreams. Out of this listening, new insights into what is possible, gradually emerge.

In support of the concept of a shared vision, Starratt (1986), emphasises that the shared vision must pervade day-to-day activities if the principal’s leadership is to be effective. One facet of this theory, according to Starratt, is that ‘the leader articulates vision in such compelling ways that it becomes the shared vision of the leader’s colleagues, and it illuminates their ordinary activities with dramatic significance.

According to Schreuder et al (1993: 6), recently there has been increasing emphasis on the effectiveness of the school, and research has shown that in effective schools’
educational leaders have a clear vision of what they want to achieve and how they want to go about it. They also know which values they want to instil in the pupils, educators and parents. Furthermore the principals of these schools are able to convey their vision to the personnel and pupils. In their study of vision and leadership, Beare et al (1989 : 107), maintain that outstanding leaders have a vision for their organisations. Their vision is communicated in a way that secures commitment among members of the school community. Barth (1990: 148), contends that vision is one’s own overall conception of what the administrator wants the organisation to stand for, what its primary mission is, what its basic core values are and above all how the vision maker fits into the ground plan. Barth further stipulates that there is nothing so conspicuously missing in the effort to improve schools as the continuous engagement of educators and principals in constructing visions. For instance, Barth observes that educators do not meet to contemplate what constitutes desirable leadership, what children should learn and what the teaching profession might become.

According to Bernis and Nanus (1985 : 89), leaders do not have to coerce people to pay attention to the vision; but they should so communicate their vision that subordinates become intent on what they are doing that they draw others in. In order to move and develop the school from where it is to where the principal wants it to be, it is necessary to convey what the vision is.

A vision is necessary because it gives staff members a belief in the future of the organisation. In supporting this concept Jenkins (1991 : 38), emphasises that vision is a credible and attractive future for the organisation which provides the all important bridge from the present to the future of the organisation. Jenkins further maintains that vision also captures the distinctiveness of the organisation by reflecting its qualities, culture, its past and present achievements and its future aspirations. It reflects the core
purpose and goals of the organisation. Jenkins' view of vision is in accord with that of Schreuder et al (1993: 6), who argue that the principal’s vision for his school is in fact his vision for the future, which comprises educational goals and the means to achieve them. Schreuder et al further maintains that a vision helps the principal to extend his scope beyond every event in the school. In a sense the principal’s vision is the campus used to determine and monitor the direction in which the school must move.

Whitaker (1993: 115), says that a vital part of the administrative process is the ability to project the mind forward into the future to visualise what intended results would look like. The greater the detail that can be supplied to this envisioning of end-results and outcomes, the clearer the paths towards achieving them will be. This conception is supported by Wilson and Corcoran (1988: 76), who maintain that successful secondary schools which have been in a position to define a clear vision are able to use their vision to make their choices and guide their actions, establish clear identity and build staff commitment to a common mission.

As mentioned earlier on, a vision cannot be imposed. Jenkins (1991), confirms this notion when he states that vision has to be owned by all stakeholders; he further argues that vision can only be successfully created if it grows out of the needs of the entire organisation and can be owned by all organisational members. This implies that all organisational members have to be involved in creating a sense of direction for the school. Barth (1990:163), states that once a vision has been articulated and owned by management, staff, learners and parents, it leads to good human relations within the institution. Barth also argues that in many schools where vision is ambiguous or non-
existent, personal relationships tend to be adversarial. In schools where good relations occur a clear vision may be easier to establish. This will enable the principal to transform the adversarial relations into co-operative and collegial relationships.

In the following section attention will be given briefly to the role of principals, both as leaders and administrators in creating school culture and climate.

2.7 The principal’s role in contributing to school culture and climate

In differentiating between culture and climate, Owens (1991: 171), maintains that culture refers to shared philosophies, ideologies, values, assumptions, beliefs, expectations, attitudes and norms while climate refers to the perceptions people have in the organisations and beliefs. In short, according to Owens culture refers to “the way we do things here.

The notion of culture as the “way we do things here”, is also cited by Spinks and Caldwell (1991: 68). They emphasise that one does not search and then find a culture of the school but one experiences it in ordinary day-to-day activities. Spinks and Caldwell also maintain that we do things in our schools because we have particular values and beliefs about what ought to be done. These are referred to as the intangible foundations of culture.

Climate on the other hand as defined by Letwin and Stringer (1985: 5), refers to the perceived subjective effects of the formal system, the informal style of managers and
other important environmental factors on the attitudes, beliefs, values and motivation of the people who work in a particular organisation. Van der Westhuizen (1991: 630), believes that "climate refers to the prevailing and normative circumstances which set the tone of the school.

Schreuder et al (1993: 20), have this to say about school climate: climate is the unique atmosphere prevailing in school. The school climate is in fact the result of interaction between the principal, teachers, pupils and parents. Close co-operation between these groups in the interest of the pupils' education leads to a better climate. They also emphasise that "a school climate also results from the extent to which the principal and members of the leadership team fulfil their tasks as educational leaders.

The implication one realise from the information given above by Schreuder et al on climate, is that the principal as a leader should establish a positive school climate as this will encourage educators, pupils and parents to contribute positively to the activities and the general well being of the school. Presumably this will lead to higher standards of work and greater success within the school.

In comparing culture and climate, Owens (1991: 175), further argues that the culture of an organisation exerts a powerful influence on the development of climate. Inasmuch as climate of an organisation influences the way participants perceive and make sense of events within the organisation, it is clear that culture also has influence on the attitude and feelings of the participants.
Principals as leaders initiate and facilitate the performance of activities in the context of culture and climate. Part of their role involve contributing to the establishment of an appropriate culture and climate. A brief attention will be given to the role of principals as contributors to school culture and climate.

Leadership activities associated with the cultural development, involve establishment of school purposes and mission, socialising new members to the school, articulating school beliefs, traditions and explaining how things are done with the school. Sergeovanni (1987: 59), is of the view that cultural life in schools is a constructed reality and school principals should play a key role in building this reality. Sergeovanni further argues that culture governs what is of worth for the school staff. This includes values, beliefs, shared meanings of parents, students and teachers and how the members should think, feel and behave. It is the researcher’s submission that all schools and organisations have their cultures created by the participants within the school or organisation. In a school situation the researcher would assume that the principal should establish the culture and climate that promotes and sustains success. Establishing and creating culture does not just happen instead it should involve extensive negotiations between principals and educators.

The implication here is that the educational leaders should be aware of the powerful and positive meaning of the school culture. Principals should not only establish their own appropriate culture with definite guidelines for active participation of all school participants, they must ensure that school culture allows for personal initiative of participants and not suppress creativity.
Although the principal is confronted with a variety of tasks and functions, one other role of a principal relates to facilitating teaching. Jacobson (1973: 135) contends that the principal’s most important function is the improvement of instructional programme within the school. In the next section attention is given to the principal’s role as the instructional leader.

2.8 The principal’s role as an instructional leader

According to Jenkins (1991: 85), effective schools have a focus on learning and teaching and the ability of a school leader to offer strong instructional leadership is a key factor in ensuring academic effectiveness.

In his focus on instructional leadership Sergeovanni (1987: 7), contends that instructional leadership activities, student relationships and professional development activities should be the principal’s highest priority.

It is important to note that there is an overlap between a principal’s role as an administrative manager, a leader and that of an instructional leader. However Morphet et al (1982: 301) state that surveys conducted in 1977 show that principals regard instructional leadership as their primary function and one on which they would like to spend more time. Yet principals tend to devote relatively little time as they seem to use more time on management activities. Morphet et al however argue that no matter how busy principals may be with administrative functions, he or she is still regarded generally as executives in the line organisation. As the principal is in the
forefront in the scene of action, he/she is responsible for the development and implementation of the instructional programme.

It is thus imperative that the principal plans the school instructional programme in accordance with the stated and implied aims of a democratic country. For instance the National Education Department and the Provincial Department of Education and Culture stipulate that there should be more teaching of science, technical and commercial subjects. This makes it necessary for secondary school principals to rearrange and develop the school curriculum that will cater for the subjects as stipulated by the departmental circulars.

Sergiovanni (1987:122), suggests that learning and teaching must be the focus of leadership activities in an institution. Given also the importance of the extent to which leadership roles are shared and the extent to which leadership is broadly exercised, Sergiovanni argues that it is clear the school where excellence is the goal, will seek a model for instructional leadership which will have this focus and which can shape the role of a number of educators in addition to the principal. Drawing from research on school and teacher effectiveness, Duke (1987:66), proposed a vision of instructional leadership. He suggests that instructional leadership should involve two interrelated areas of activity, that is, the fostering of teaching and the capacity to deal successfully with certain key situations such as supervision, development, teacher evaluation, and instructional management and support.

In line with Duke’s thinking, is Goodlad’s view on the role of the principal’s view in
instructional leadership. Goodlad (1978:89), has indicated a viewpoint that principals have tended to delegate wrong tasks to their subordinates. Goodlad argues that principals may delegate management functions, they can also demand proper administration of the instructional programme to their management team and staff, but they cannot delegate their responsibilities of leadership in the organisation of instructional and educational administration. Morphet (1982:333), suggests that principals must not only be knowledgeable and proficient in matters of curriculum and instruction but must also develop a comprehensive educational plan for their schools and provide teachers with support, encouragement and the necessary sources.

Although instructional leadership has been widely accepted by the administrators, Gorton (1991:87), argues that one of the problems of instructional leadership is that people define the role in different ways thereby creating confusion for the administrators. Some believe that for the principal to function as an instructional leader he must participate in classroom supervision. Compounding the problem is the fact that principals are frequently encouraged to be instructional leaders and yet they may not be perceived by educators as possessing the subject matter expertise necessary for them to improve their instructional functions.

Be that as it may, the role of a principal as instructional leader receives support from many researchers

Hall and Hord (1982:42), concur with Gorton's view. They stress that if educational programmes for students are to improve principals must take the lead in providing
educators with the instructional leadership they need. Cotton and Savard (1980), who studied various documents on the principal’s role as instructional leader, support the views stated above. They found that the principal’s instructional leadership had a significant influence on students achievement. The actual behaviour that contributed to effective instructional leadership were described by Cotton and Savard as:

- frequent observation and/or participation in classroom instruction:
- communicating clearly to staff what is expected of them as facilitators of the instructional program;
- making decision about the instructional program;
- co-ordinating the instructional program;
- being actively involved in planning and evaluating the instructional program; and
- having and communicating high standards/expectations for the instructional program.

On the question of attending to the administrative aspect of school and that of the instructional leader, Fege (1980), takes the view that the success of the principal as an instructional leader is largely dependent on the ability of the principal to distinguish between the routines of management and the goals of instructional leadership and improvement. Cotton and Savard (1980), support this view, for they found that principals who are effective instructional leaders are also effective administrators.

Inspite of the mixed viewpoints about the principal’s instructional and administrative
roles, Sergeovanni (1987: 201) believes that certain expectations need to be accepted by educators before the principal’s instructional role takes its course. For example, the principal’s instructional role needs to be considered as an accepted and normal part of the life of the school. When this is the case, it is understood that the principal as an instructional leader has a right and responsibility to be part of all teaching that takes place in the school. He is therefore an instructional partner to every teacher in every classroom and for every learning and teaching situation.

Cuban (1988: 70), supports Sergeovanni’s view when he contends that beyond the familiar obligation to work with teachers, the principals’ instructional role takes on a broader view. Through shaping the mission of the school, establishing a climate within the school that communicates the seriousness of purpose and a respect for all staff members, the principal invests a personal curriculum of improvements for the school community and teachers. In brief the school community becomes a principal’s classroom. Teaching for the principal will involve persuading teachers, students, parents and administration staff to learn the curriculum that the principal created.

Literature on the principal’s instructional leadership role also alludes to functions which form part of the principal’s instructional role. This conception is explained by Gorton et al (1991: 88), who maintain that principalship is ‘leadership’ and any activities in which the principal engages to improve instructional programs within the institution can be referred to as instructional activities. For example, Gorton believes that activities such as classroom observation, co-ordination of the curriculum and monitoring students’ progress are some of the activities in which school administrators
are expected to participate as instructional leaders.

From the above discussion it is clear that school principals are both educational and instructional leaders. Being instructional leaders, the question is thus, not whether they will be involved in the curriculum development for the school, but how they will be involved. It is further assumed that in attempting to improve the instructional programme, administrators must be knowledgeable in the areas of administrative behaviour, that is, they must be able to work with educators in tasks such as planning, evaluating, controlling and decision making.

2.8.1 The principal’s role in controlling

Coupled with instructional leadership and as part of administration and leadership in general, is control.

According to Allen (1964: 324), control is the work a manager does to assess and regulate work in progress and completed work. Work control is manager’s means of checking up. Although good planning and organising are necessary, there is no guarantee that they will be implemented effectively. Therefore control which is subsequent to the key leaders’ tasks should be executed to ensure that planned and organised tasks receive proper attention.

This management function is very important for the educational leader’s good relationship with his staff and for monitoring of task performance. Presumably,
without this, teaching would hardly be effective. De Wet (1981: 86) has this to say about work control. He argues that control affects teaching, but teachers also have a supervisory and control task to perform in connection with their pupils. Positive control and supervision do not necessary mean to find fault or to punish. Its sole purpose is to ensure efficiency throughout the school, and to encourage and improve teaching and learning.

From the views expressed by various researchers above, one would assume that the presence of control of instruction has a positive impact on the effectiveness of teaching. Alfonso (1981:39), states that supervisors promote better decision making by involving teachers and that through supervisory efforts, curriculum study and articulation of the school's programme are better accomplished.

The discussion below is concerned with curriculum management which is another important aspect of the principal's instructional leadership role.

2.8.2 The principal's role in curriculum management

The discussion undertaken in the preceding paragraphs has attempted to clarify the significance of the principal's instructional development and his role in supervising effective teaching. However both these roles are related to the curriculum development which is the next section to be discussed.

(Morphet et al 1982 : 334), says that it is assumed that all activity in the area of
curriculum and instruction, on any level of the school district, is aimed towards an ultimate impact on classroom instruction and student learning. Otherwise, all such activity becomes essentially meaningless in the context of the basic function of public school education. Beare, Coldwell and Millican (1989: 43), have almost the same view as that of Morphet et al of what school curriculum entails. They suggest that curriculum provides a relatively detailed specification of intended learning experience, with details, for example, of what will be learned how it will be learned and when it will be learned.

According to Sergiovanni (1987: 118), the actual structure of educational activities the nature of learning outcomes and patterns of teacher-student influence, are the three major components of the school curriculum. They compose the dimension that should be taken into account in curriculum planning and programme administration and evaluation.

The efficiency of a teacher’s management work may also be determined by the school curriculum. This assumption is confirmed by (Badenhost et al 1987: 81), when they say that the amount of subject matter that has to be covered each academic year has an influence on the rate of instruction and learning in a school. If the subject matter bears significance for both the teacher and the pupils, the teacher will be more prepared for instruction and the pupils more prepared for learning.

In this period of declining student achievement, wavering public confidence in schools and demands for financial accountability, principals should provide essential strategies
for curriculum development, implementation and evaluation. Little (1990: 184), points out that much curriculum construction and plans for implementation are decided outside the scope of the classroom educator who is expected to interpret and implement the curriculum. Little feels that the principal can no longer stand by on curriculum issues because it has been shown that in schools where instructional leadership is most effective there is collaborative planning taking place.

Jenkins (1991: 92), supports Little’s and Dubin’s view of teacher involvement in curriculum planning. He says that those most directly concerned with the implementation process at the point of interaction with pupils should not merely be consulted but they should be empowered to make decisions about groupings and staff development. Cohen (1981), states that there is an improvement in instructional quality and teams are able to take on new ideas, innovative methods and revised teaching programmes more readily.

Ideally it might be stated that the working together of staff in matters concerning pupils and classroom management and the teaching process enables educators to bring curriculum improvement and improved instructional work. Team building in an organisation obviously increases the interaction, friendly support and interdependence of staff members. In support of this view, Wilson and Corcoran (1988 : 91), agree that in schools where teachers work as a team expectations of good performance are communicated to individuals by the team and teachers become impatient with those who do not perform well.
Notwithstanding the establishment of the teacher teams Jenkins (1991: 94), advises that a principal must play an interventionist role on some occasion as a school leader. He should help the staff in clarifying the philosophy of the curriculum, to monitor progress and to ensure that high standards are set for pupils.

Obviously, in order for principals to offer strong instructional leadership, they must be able to control and have a deep understanding of the practical and theoretical ideas contained in the school curriculum. They must have capacity to manage the curriculum, also be up to date with the latest curriculum development, and learning and teaching methods. This idea is confirmed by Leithwood and Montgomery (1985), who argue that an instructional leader will be unable to create a coherent learning philosophy unless s/he is aware of the latest thinking on curriculum in terms of curriculum framework, testing criteria, learning and teaching theories and practice (Jenkins 1991: 91).

From the above discussion the researcher would assume that since the curriculum is concerned with actual teaching and learning, it cannot be separated from supervision and staff development.

2.9 Conclusion

In the foregoing discussion, the researcher has reviewed literature on school administration with special reference to the principal’s role as an administrator, as an instructional leader and as a general leader within the school. This review has
attempted to locate the administrative process in a context of leadership, supervision of teaching and learning.

We have pointed out that school administration is a complex and interwoven activity. It is also an activity which involves the principal, governing council, parents, educators, learners and the community.

In addition, this review of literature has highlighted the significance of establishing a vision for administration and leadership and has put in perspective other roles of a principal in relation to a school vision.

In the chapter that follows, we shall proceed to consider the methods used to collect and analyse data.
CHAPTER 3

3. THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter attention is given to the research procedures and methods used in the study. This chapter discusses data collection, sampling of respondents and procedures used in the administration and processing of questionnaires. It also describes how data was analysed.

In Chapter Two a literature review was conducted on the principals' administrative, leadership and instructional roles. The literature which is reviewed in chapter two lays a foundation for the evaluative analysis of the principal's administrative and leadership behaviors.

3.2 Aim of the study restated

In this study the researcher evaluated the perceptions held by the educators and principals with regards to the role of principals as a school administrators and leaders in the Durban South Region. The study also examined the way in which the educators perceive the principal's administrative and leadership style.

3.3 The research methodology

It can be generally stated that reliable knowledge about education can be derived from the application of various research methods. However, the method used for this study is descriptive research. In justifying the use of descriptive research in educational data
collection, Best (1970), contends that descriptive research is concerned with the conditions or relationships that exist; practices that prevail; points of view, or attitudes that are held; processes that are going on; effects that are being felt, or trends that are developing. At times descriptive research is concerned with how, what exists is related to some events that have influenced or affected a present condition or event.

Sax (1981:18); and Ary et al (1972:286), support the use of descriptive research to determine the nature of a situation. They point out that descriptive research helps identify the extent of a problem and how serious and widespread it is. Descriptive research studies are also designed to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena. These studies are usually directed towards determining the nature of the situation as it exists at the time of the study.

Ideally, before much progress can be made in any field, research must possess descriptions of the phenomena and the objectives with which the researcher works. Van Dalen (1981:285) states that the objectives of the descriptive research include solving problems about children, school administration, and curriculum, and determining the nature of the prevailing conditions, practices and attitudes - seeking accurate descriptions of activities, processes and persons.

In discussing research, Sax (1979:16), believes that "research can or should provide the knowledge needed to contribute to educational reforms and improvements." According to Cohen and Manion (1989: 42), research is conceived as "the process of arriving at dependable solutions to problems through the planned and systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of data". These conceptions form part of the basis upon which the researcher was prompted to conduct this study in educational administration. The diverse challenges that confront principals and other educational administrators not only in Kwazulu...
Natal but also in other provinces, need to be researched and examined in order to arrive at proposed solutions and contributions that can help educational administrators to handle educational problems.

Since this study attempted to examine the attitudes and perceptions of educators, and principals on the various administrative roles of secondary school principals, the researcher deemed it necessary to use a descriptive research design.

According to Borg (1981:130) in education most descriptive research can be roughly classified as either survey research or observational research. Survey research, as further stated by Borg, typically employs questionnaires and interviews in order to determine the opinions, attitudes, preferences, and perceptions of the persons of interest to the researcher. Van Dalen further states that surveys are used to collect detailed descriptions of the existing phenomena with the intent of employing data to justify the current conditions and practices or to make more intelligent plans for improving them. In confirming Van Dalen's view, Cohen and Manion (1989:97), point out that the survey is the most commonly used descriptive method in educational research. Surveys gather data at a particular point in time with an intention of describing the nature of existing conditions or by identifying standards against which existing conditions can be compared or determining the relationships that exist between specific events. This method entails correlation analysis, questionnaires and interviews, as well as direct observation. Among these tools, the researcher has decided to use questionnaires as a means of collecting data.

The researcher has described the characteristics and advantages of using descriptive research. The instrument to be used as data source is a combination of closed-ended and open-ended questionnaires.
3.4 The research instrument

3.4.1 The questionnaire as research instrument

In this study the researcher used the questionnaire as a research instrument. One of the ways of collecting data is by asking questions. In supporting the use of this instrument, Mbatha (1992:146), contends that the use of questionnaire has some advantages over other methods of collecting data; for example, a questionnaire is more efficient in that it requires less time, is less expensive and permits collection of data from a larger sample. Ary, et al (1972:196) also justify the use of questionnaire as a research instrument when they point out that the questionnaire method is less time consuming, as much of the same information may be written by a large number of the population at the same time. They further argue that as compared to interviewing the written questionnaire is typically more efficient and practical and allows for the use of a larger sample. And it is widely employed in educational research.

Walker (1985:91), is also supportive of this concept. He states that a questionnaire offers considerable advantages in administration and enables the researcher to collect from large numbers of people simultaneously.

In stressing the importance of using a questionnaire instrument in research, Sibaya (1992:71), views a questionnaire as, not just a list of questions or a form to be filled out, but it is essentially a scientific instrument for measurements and collection of particular kinds of data. The questionnaire, Sibiya further argues, "serves two major purposes: Firstly it translates the research objectives into specific questions, the answer to which will provide the data necessary to test the hypotheses or to explore the area set by the research objectives. The second purpose of the questionnaire is to motivate the respondent to communicate the
required information.

3.4.2 Rationale for using the questionnaire instrument

Having identified the significance of using a questionnaire, as articulated by various researchers in the above section, the researcher found the use of a questionnaire method to be more appropriate for collecting data for this particular study. It appears that this method still continues to be the best available instrument for obtaining information from a widely spread sampling population. This concept is confirmed by Gabela (1991: 193), who states that the questionnaire is considered to be appropriate for school principals and circuit inspectors, since the study entails the description of existing conditions and practices by way of collecting data from subjects beyond the reach of the investigator. Emphasizing this point, Chukwuemeka (1982: 96), submits that, the use of questionnaire, as a research instrument, permits wide coverage at minimum expense and it affords wide geographic coverage and reaches persons who are difficult to contact. The point of wider coverage was an essential part of this study as data was to be obtained from principals and educators throughout Durban South Region.

The researcher chose the questionnaire instrument with the stated advantages in mind.

3.5 The construction of questionnaires

According to Tuckman (1978: 196), questionnaires are used by researchers to convert into data the information directly given by a person and this approach makes it possible to measure what a person knows (knowledge or information), what a person likes or dislikes (values and preferences), and what a person thinks (attitudes and beliefs). So that for our study the collected data was used to determine respondents perceptions of the principals' role
in administration and leadership.

3.5.1 Design and layout of the questionnaire

According to Sibaya (1992: 82), a good questionnaire design is the culmination of a long process of planning and thought. Planning in this study ideally requires the researcher to be aware of specific goals and objectives of research when formulating questions. Verma et al (1981: 78), support this notion when they argue that the selection of a particular experimental design should be based on the purposes of the study and should clearly state how subjects are to be chosen and should also state the type of statistical analysis to be used for analysing data.

In considering a well constructed questionnaire design, Ary et al (1972: 171), argue that in order to promote increased returns of the questionnaires and positive response from the respondents, the questionnaire should be kept as brief as possible so that it takes a minimum of the respondent's time. In emphasizing the point of attracting response from the respondents, Mbatha (1992: 148), argues that it is important for the researcher to produce a design and layout of the questionnaire which could easily attract high levels of response. Mbatha's view is confirmed by Cohen and Manion (1989: 111). They maintain that the appearance of the questionnaire is vitally important. Towards layout, the researcher ensured that the questionnaire was not long and had an attractive design.

Further, Cohen and Manion highlight the importance of clarity of wording and simplicity of design are also essential in attracting cooperative response from the respondents. Clear instructions should guide the respondent- 'put a tick', for example, invites participation, whereas complicated instructions and complex procedures intimidate respondents.
The researcher considered these factors in the construction and the selection of a questionnaire as a research instrument for this study.

### 3.5.2.1 Closed-ended questionnaire

Two types of questionnaires were considered for this study, namely: the closed-ended questionnaire or structured questionnaire and the open-ended questionnaire or unstructured questionnaire. The closed-ended or structured questionnaire requires that a respondent chooses a response on the given scale. For example, a structured response format would offer say five reasons and ask the respondent to choose one. Obviously, it typically curtails a range of possible responses by limiting the answer to a word or a phrase. In confirming this concept, Sibaya (1992 : 72), points out that responses to the subject are limited to the stated alternatives. These alternatives may simply be YES/NO or they may provide for various degrees of approval or agreement, or they may consist of a series of replies from which the respondent picks one as being closest to his/her position.

The researcher asked most questions in the closed ended or structured form and very few in the open ended or unstructured form, in both the principals' and the educators' questionnaires. To indicate their answers, the respondents circled the relevant item from the provided list.

The advantage of using closed ended questionnaire as cited by authors like Gall and Borg (1991 : 419); and Gabela (1991 : 196) is that the closed ended questionnaire does not only facilitate response but also makes data analysis very efficient and objective. Linda (1994 : 159), supports this view. He maintains that the closed ended form keeps the respondent's mind on the subject and facilitates tabulation and analysis. Mbatha (1992 : 148), also prefers the use of a closed ended questionnaire as it is easier and quicker to
3.5.2.2 The open-ended questionnaire

According to Tuckman (1978: 200), the unstructured response, perhaps more commonly called open-ended questionnaire, allows the subject to give his/her response in whatever form chosen. Sibaya's view of open-ended questionnaire (1992: 71) is that it is designed to permit a free response from the subject rather than one limited to stated alternatives. In this type the respondent is given the opportunity to answer in his/her own terms and in his/her own frame of reference.

Although most questions in the questionnaire were closed ended, the researcher realized that this study also requires open ended or unstructured questions in order to allow respondents to air their views openly on the study and make responses in their own words. In both sets of questionnaires the last three questions as stated earlier, are open ended. The use of unstructured or open ended questionnaire is justified by Ary et al (1972: 169), who submit that unstructured questionnaires are flexible and are usually planned to allow the respondents to go beyond simple responses to the questions asked and to reveal their views in any way they wish.

The use of open-ended questionnaire on the part of principals was meant to enable the principals to express their own opinions and attitudes towards their own administrative capacities and leadership roles. For educators, open-ended questionnaires were meant to enable them to express their views as to how they perceive the principals' administrative and leadership roles.
3.5.3 The characteristics of a good questionnaire

In constructing the questionnaire, the researcher had to consider the characteristics of a good questionnaire. This served as the basis for formulating a reliable research instrument for this study. According to Pillay (1998: 109); Cohen and Manion (1989: 106); and Isaach and Michael (1983: 134), the characteristics of a good questionnaire include the following:

- it should be clear, unambiguous and uniformly workable,
- its design must minimise errors from respondents,
- since people participate voluntarily a questionnaire must arouse their interest and encourage them to cooperatively give truthful answers,
- the researcher must avoid leading questions and those that evoke predictable response,
- also avoid questions that are threatening to the respondent
- the questionnaire must seek information which is not available from other resources, it must be as short as possible, but long enough to gather essential data,
- each question should deal with a single concept and should be workable as simply and straightforwardly as possible.

3.5.4 The advantages of a written questionnaire

Linda (1994: 161); Chukwuemeka (1982: 96); Dyer (1979:157); Sax (1979:244); and Pillay (1998: 111), point out that the questionnaire instrument has various advantages some of which are:

- it is the least expensive means of gathering data;
- it provides greater anonymity to the respondent. This can encourage respondents to be more willing to respond honestly and openly to the questions;
• it reaches many people in widely scattered areas quickly;
• the questionnaire is easier to administer;
• it is standardized and therefore the answers can be easily classified and analyzed;
• it permits the respondent sufficient time to consider the answers before responding;
• respondents may answer questions of a personal nature more willingly and frankly on a paper questionnaire than in a face to face situation with an interviewer;

3.5.5 Limitations of the questionnaire

Although a questionnaire instrument has advantages it also has some limitations as cited by a few researchers such as Ary et al (1972: 87). Some of these are the following:
• it is inflexible and may seem less adaptable;
• restrictions that are put on this type of interview increase their reliability but decrease their depth;
• questionnaires may not elicit a high completion rate as respondents may put questions aside and simply forget to complete and return them;
• there is a possibility of misinterpretation of questions by the respondents due to poor wording.

The researcher attempted to overcome the limitations of the questionnaire as stated above. To elicit the information in-depth, he asked both closed-ended and open-ended questions. To ensure clarity, questions were piloted and edited.
3.6 Population and sampling the study

This survey concentrates on the 179 secondary schools in the Durban South Region. For purposes of this study two sets of questionnaires were designed, one for the secondary school principals, and the other for the educators. From the list of 179 secondary schools every 4th school was selected, giving the researcher a sample of 45 schools. In addition to 45 schools, 10 more schools were added so that a total of 55 schools were sampled.

According to Sax (1979: 180), where populations are infinite and relatively inaccessible, researchers select samples from the population. Sax goes on to define a sample as a limited number of elements selected from a population to be representative of that population.

An effort was made to secure a representative sample from the region by selecting a sample of 55 secondary schools as indicated. Principals were selected from these secondary schools and the sample of educators was selected from each of the targeted secondary schools.

Below is a table of schools and districts that were used for sampling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>NO. OF SCHOOLS SAMPLED</th>
<th>NO. RESPONDED</th>
<th>% RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Durban South</td>
<td>Camperdown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Umbumbulu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Chatsworth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Pinetown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Umlazi North</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Umlazi South</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Procedure for processing and analysing data

The total return was 43 out of 55 secondary schools which represents 78% return from the principals and educators. The questionnaires consisted of close-ended questions and open-ended questions for both the principals and educators. The close-ended questionnaires were precoded using a five-point scale. For example, 5 was for strongly agree, 4 was for agree, 3 was for undecided, 2 was for disagree, and 1 was for strongly disagree.

The questionnaires were then prepared for computation. Data was categorised using frequencies and percentages. Open-ended questionnaires were analysed by identifying themes under which various responses fell.

3.8 Pilot study

According to Ary et al (1972:87), before preparing the research plan it may be helpful to try out the proposed procedures on a few subjects. This trial run, as stated by Ary et al or pilot study will help the researcher to decide whether the study is feasible and/or whether it is worthwhile or whether the study needs further refinement. Sibaya (1992:77), concurs with the above concept when he maintains that however accurate the researcher has been in wording his questions and in designing his questionnaire, he needs to try them out with respondents before launching into the final study sample. In support of the views expressed by Ary et al and Sibaya, Mthabela (1997:60), argues that once the questions to be included in the questionnaire or interview schedule have been written, the researcher is advised to try them out with a small sample similar to the respondents.

In view of the foregoing conceptions, a pilot study was conducted on both sets of questionnaires in order to identify weaknesses, deficiencies and needed improvements.
In conducting the pilot study the researcher randomly selected four principals and ten educators from Umlazi North and South Districts, and one principal and five educators from one of the secondary schools in the Umbumbulu District. Arrangements were made to familiarize the principals and the educators with the study, and they were assured of the anonymity of the whole exercise. It was however found that some educators, for example, in the Umbumbulu District were not comfortable to answer the questions and hand them over to the principal for submission to the researcher. The researcher then advised them to answer the questions and send their responses by post to the researcher. Those at Umlazi did not have a problem as the researcher collected the questionnaire from the respective institutions.

The responses from the pilot study population did not show many mistakes except a few ambiguities and language adjustments which were attended to. Some items were to be reworded especially those which most respondents did not attempt to respond to.

3.9  Permission for conducting research in various districts

After receiving permission from the Director for Provisioning in the Durban South Region, the researcher wrote to the six District Managers requesting permission to do research in their respective districts.

3.9.1 Questionnaires distribution to schools

The targeted time for the distribution of the questionnaires was during final examination time. During this time all principals collect grade twelve examination question papers from district offices. As secondary school principals and educators were the targeted population for this study, negotiations were made with circuit inspectors in charge of controlling examinations in various districts, to allow the researcher to address the principals during a
preview meeting before the examinations start.

After addressing the principals' meetings, the request to conduct research was accepted by principals as well. Principals were willing to respond to the questionnaires and to help in distributing questionnaires to their respective educators. The researcher distributed the questionnaires himself to schools in the neighbouring districts. Principals from these schools were requested to submit their responses and their educators' responses to their respective districts offices as agreed upon at the principals' meetings.

Durban South Region is very wide and it would be difficult to locate schools that had been targeted for research. To alleviate problems in finding schools, the researcher obtained a map of the location of schools in this region.

3.9.2 Problems with regard to questionnaires return

After a month following the distribution of questionnaires, very few principals and educators had returned their responses. The researcher then embarked on visiting neighbouring schools to collect the responses. Some respondents had not even started filling in the questionnaires. The researcher personally made appeals to educators and principals for completion of the questionnaires.

Notwithstanding the above problems, the data collected represented 78% of the targeted schools. This return was adequate to enable the researcher to continue with data analysis and make reasonable conclusion about the research findings.
3.10 Conclusion

This chapter has described the method, tools and procedures which were followed in executing research for this study. It also explained the rationale for the research tools used in collecting data. These tools were found to be capable of yielding the relevant research data. This chapter also described the instruments and procedures used for data analysis. The responses are analysed and interpreted in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4

Data analysis and interpretation

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this research was to investigate how educators perceived the principals' administrative and leadership capabilities in relation to their schools. It also aimed at analysing how principals perceived their own administrative and leadership abilities.

This chapter analyses and reports the results of the empirical investigation. First, the chapter analyses biographical data of the respondents. Thereafter, the analysis of educators' responses to the specific closed-ended questionnaires follows. Thirdly, the content analysis of the open-ended questionnaires for educators follows. Finally, responses from principals are analysed following the same pattern used for analysing data from educators.

4.2 Descriptive biographic statistics

4.2.1 Gender frequency of educators

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>44,9</td>
<td>44,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>55,1</td>
<td>55,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 indicates that 55,1% of 140 responses were females while 44,9%, 114 respondents were males. This frequency indicates that there maybe more women at secondary schools than males. The picture one withdraws from the above table is that the sample is representative in terms of gender of the nature of the sampled population. The picture
indicated by the above table confirms Chetty’s view (1998: 146) that teaching in South Africa is dominated numerically by women.

4.2.2 The age of educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23,2</td>
<td>23,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 49</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>53,5</td>
<td>53,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19,7</td>
<td>19,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>99,9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reflects that about one hundred and ninety-five (76,7 %) of the respondents’ ages ranged from below 30 years to about 50 years old, while fifty respondents (19,7 %) were between the ages of 51 and 60 years. The remaining nine respondents (3,5 %) were over sixty years of age.

The table above shows that most respondents’ ages are well spread with most educators ranging between 30 and 49 years. This is the stage at which people can be trained in school management and other skills. According to Whitaker (1994: 88), many organisations are recognising that in fast changing times it is more important to recruit staff with a high potential to learn and develop them with skills that may be superseded in the near future. Whitaker further argues that good organisations help employees to see that career development is not exclusively promotion focused but involves development within a post.

The researcher would assume that this age range which narrows as the ages advance, may be due to the Department of Education’s retrenchment package called Voluntary Severance Package (VSP). This caused most elderly and more experienced educators to leave the
teaching fraternity.

4.2.3 Academic qualifications of educators

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>9,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>11,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree courses</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27,2</td>
<td>27,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8,7</td>
<td>8,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16,1</td>
<td>16,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26,4</td>
<td>26,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates that twenty-four (9,4 %) of educators teach without a professional certificate. Twenty-nine (11,4 %) educators have a teachers diploma. Sixty-nine (27,2%) educators have diplomas and some degree courses. Twenty-two (8,7 %) educators have degrees while forty-one (16,1 %) have honours degrees. Sixty-seven (26,4 %) have Bachelor of Education degrees while two (0,8 %) educators have a Master of Education degrees.

The above table indicates that most educators' qualifications are concentrated in two categories, namely, educators with diploma and degree courses and the second category includes those with Bachelor of Education degrees. Of great concern for the department should be how to help institutions who at this stage still have unqualified educators among their staff. On average the educators are well qualified as most of them have degrees and senior professional qualifications. This should enable them to execute their duties effectively.
4.2.4 Teaching experience of educators

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that only forty-seven (18.5%) of educators have between one and four years of teaching experience. The majority of educators, 74.4%, have teaching experience of between 5 and 20 years. About sixteen educators (6.3%) have an experience which ranges between 21 and 30 years, and only two educators (0.8%) have experience that falls between 31 and 40 years.

The table above indicates that most educators have an average experience of between 5 and 20 years. The picture drawn by the table above shows that there are few elderly and more experienced educators in the Durban South Region.

4.3 The descriptive analysis of the school administrative process

The analysis in this category is based on educators’ responses to questions relevant to the study. These questions centred around how educators perceived the principals’ administrative and leadership roles with special focus on collaborative administration and educator involvement in the administrative tasks. Table 5 below focuses on the principals’ administrative role.
### 4.3.1 Educators’ view of principals’ administrative role

#### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative role</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Total and %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Principal and staff define goals and objectives</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Principal and staff plan school activities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Principal delegates administrative work to staff members</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Principal keeps his/her staff informed about policies and regulations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Principal and staff work out a plan of work distribution</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Principal recognises good teaching procedures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Principal consults with his/her staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Principal experiments with teachers’ suggestions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Principal effectively solves staff problems</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Principal involves educators in school management</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The principal and staff define school’s educational goals and objectives.

Table 5 shows that 59.5% of educators agreed with the above statement while 29.1% stated that their principals sometimes involve educators in defining school goals and objectives.
A small percentage, 11.4% of educators disagreed that the principal works in collaboration with educators in defining school goals and objectives. Jacobson et al (1973: 194), (cf- chapter 2) contend that the first step to be taken by organisational administrators, especially in a school situation, is that the administrator and staff must collectively determine their beliefs, goals and objectives.

It is a source of encouragement to learn that principals in the population studied, seem to involve their educators in goal setting. This may augur well for participative management.

2. The principal and staff work out the plan of school activities at the beginning of the year.

According to the research findings, 62.6% of respondents indicated that there is planning of school activities in their schools, in which educators are involved at the beginning of the year. Only 18.9% of educators indicated that their principals do not plan school activities together with them at the beginning of the year, while 18.5% indicated that planning of school activities at their schools involve them only at the principal’s preferred times.

De Roche (1981: 118) is of the opinion that developing plans for implementing a supervisory programme and evaluation for the school requires that the principal meets with all teachers early in the school year.

It is disconcerting to learn that there is still a significant percentage of principals who do not plan school activities with educators.
3. The principal delegates some of his/her administrative work to his/her staff members.

The response to the above statement indicates that 59,5% of educators agreed that their principals do delegate their administrative duties to staff members. A small percentage of 12,2% of educators disagreed that administrative duties in their schools are delegated to staff members, while 28,3% opted for the middle value. From these findings one would conclude that in many schools there is little or no opportunities given to staff to demonstrate their administrative skills and to learn more through practice about the administrative work.

The picture revealed by the graph shows clearly that many principals are hesitant to delegate administrative duties to their staff. According to Schreuder et al (1993: 28) hesitation or unwillingness to delegate is usually related to the conviction that the principal alone is able to perform the task and his way of doing is the right one or has a fear of being regarded as incompetent if delegated tasks are done well by others.

4. The principal keeps his/her staff informed about departmental policies and regulations.

From the research findings 56,7% of educators agreed with the statement that the principals keep their staff informed about departmental policies and regulations while 11,1% was in disagreement with the statement. Thirty-two-point-three percent stated that it is only at certain times that the staff is kept informed about the departmental policies and regulations by the principal. According to Chetty (1998: 161) if important policy documents are not discussed with those stakeholders who are expected to implement them, then the possibility arises that these policies may not be appropriately implemented because of lack of understanding.
The departmental policies provide practical guidelines and elucidate responsibilities to administrators and other role players. In view of the importance of the departmental policy documents and regulations, the researcher is concerned about so many principals’ (43.4%) neglect of exposing their staff to policies and regulations.

5. **The principal and staff work out a plan of work distribution.**

Research findings showed that 58.3% are in agreement with this statement while only 12.2% disagreed with the statement. 29.5% showed some uncertainty as they opted for the middle value where principals only sometimes involve educators in work distribution.

According to the table, many principals are reluctant to involve educators in the distribution of work. This is tantamount to unfair administrative practice. According to Van Der Westhuizen (1991: 294) every educational leader like all managers, has people as his chief resource. They are the primary raw material with which he works. Therefore, work distribution should of necessity be planned in concert with staff.

6. **The principal recognises good work teaching procedures**

Table 5 above shows that most of the educators agreed with the statement. This is in view of the fact that those that strongly agreed and those that agreed add up to 67.1%. Only 12.2% disagreed with the statement, while 23.6% revealed that it is only at times that the principal recognises good teaching. It is notable that 35.8% of educators stated that their principals do not recognise good teaching procedures. It is unfortunate that this happens, as recognition is an important need. Maslow (1967) rates the need for recognition as a motivator.
The researcher assumes that identifying and praising people for the job well done enhances good relations and productivity within the school. Mayo (1993) confirms this and refers to research which, in his view, confirms that groups of workers who felt themselves valued by management improved output compared with those who were resentful or suspicious of the management. As Dennison and Shenton (1987: 44) state, “for teachers there can be little doubt that achievement and recognition are substantive contributors to job satisfaction.”

7. The principal consults his staff

While 57,1% of educators agreed that the principal consults his staff, only 16,9% disagreed with the statement. 26% stated that it is only sometimes that the principals consult their staff. That as it may, 42,9% is almost half the targeted population that is not consulted when plans are made about work that affects them.

While in item 1, 59,5% of educators reported that they are part of setting goals and objectives with their school, from this item, it appears that consultation with teachers may not be consistent. The conclusion one would draw from this response is that principals have to work hard to ensure that they consult their staff in whatever they do. Without consultation, transformation, which is the main focus of the Department of Education today, cannot take place in schools where consultation with staff is prohibited. According to Hersey and Blauehard (1988: 415) consultative management has two immediate benefits, firstly, by enlisting the co-operation of you knowledgeable staff, you increase the likelihood that your decision will be correct. Secondly, by giving your followers a chance to contribute, you reinforce their motivation and help them identify more closely with the goals of the organisation.
8. The principal experiments with teachers’ suggestions.

Table 5 shows that 48.1% of educators agreed with the statement, while only 16.1% disagreed. However, a surprisingly high percentage 35.8% of educators opted for the middle value, while 16.1% of educators disagreed with the statement. But the high (number) percentage that responded with the view that principals sometimes experiment with teachers’ suggestions and those that disagreed give an impression that principals do not honour educators’ suggestions in most schools.

9. The principal solves staff problems.

The table shows that 46% of educators agreed with the statement. Only 18.9% of educators disagreed while a discouragingly high percentage 35% of educators stated that the principals do solve their problems sometimes. According to Hersey and Blauhard (1993: 262) effective managers are not only able to develop the readiness and independence of their people, they are also able to spot a problem and intervene early enough to turn the situation around.

10. The principal involves educators in school management.

The majority of educators 51.5% have indicated that they agree with the statement. These responses indicate that most principals do involve educators in managerial tasks. There is, however, a significant percentage (21.3%) of educators who were in disagreement with the statement while 27.2% indicated that their principals sometimes included them in managerial tasks.

It can be deduced from these responses that quite a number of principals need to change their management style. Barth (1990: 117) points out that although the principal is considered
to be the most visible and important school leader, if schools are to improve from within, school leadership and management must emanate from many sources, in interaction, which should include teachers, principals, parents and students. The researcher would assume that most educators can lead if given an opportunity to do so.

4.3.2 Educators' view of the principals’ leadership role.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP ROLE</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Leading in the school is democratic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7,9 %</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13,4 %</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29,5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Consultative decision making</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7,5 %</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10,6 %</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Goals and objectives mutually established by staff and principal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,1 %</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14,2 %</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27,6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Educators permitted to be innovative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,3 %</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9,1 %</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30,7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Principal promotes a sense of belonging</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,9 %</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9,8 %</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Principal encourages leadership by educators</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,7 %</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8,3 %</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21,3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Principal has achieved his status from educators</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,7 %</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18,5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Principal has established a climate conducive to effective teaching</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10,2 %</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8,7 %</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16,9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Well established communication channels</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,7 %</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10,2 %</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92
11. **Leading in our school is democratic.**

Table 6 shows that most educators 49.2% agreed that leadership at their schools was democratic. 29.5% opted for sometimes while 21.3% indicated that there is democratic leadership in their schools.

That about 50.8% of principals are seen by educators to execute democratic leadership is notable and commendable. Yet there is very high percentage who either believe the principals are not consistently democratic or undemocratic in their leadership. The latter picture raises the need to research how appropriate the different leadership styles are to various situations and to build capacity of principals necessary for exercising appropriate leadership.

12. **Decisions in this school are taken consultatively.**

Table 6 indicates that 44.9% was in agreement with the statement, while 18.1% revealed that in their schools decisions are taken consultatively. A figure of 37% indicated that their principals sometimes consult them before taking decisions. The percentage indicates that those that agreed and those that opted for sometimes is 55.1%. This reflects that during the time of educational transformation most principals are still unwilling to involve educators in the decision making process.

Although there is movement in the right direction in most schools, the high percentage 44.9% of those who disagreed is a clear indication that quite a number of principals make unilateral decisions in their schools. According to Dennison and Shenton (1987: 66) constraining all decision-making within the formal structure does not only produce a stultifying atmosphere in the school, but also exacerbate the worst aspects of interpersonal relations among the staff.
It thus appears that strategies are needed that would transform principals' leadership styles such that they realise the importance of taking decisions together with their educators.

13. Goals and objectives are mutually established by the principal and staff.

Table 6 indicates that most of the educators 55.1% agreed with the statement, while 17.3% disagreed with the statement. There is 27.6% of educators who stated that principals in their schools sometimes involve staff in establishing school goals. These findings are similar to 4.3.1 table 5 above, however, shows very high percentage, 17.3% of educators stated that most principals do not provide an opportunity for involving educators in establishing goals and objective of their schools.

In chapter 2 of this dissertation P 50, Jacobson (1973: 194) contends that, the first step to be taken by organisational administrators especially in a school situation, is to involve staff in a rigorous examination of beliefs about the purpose of education and then collectively determine the goals and objectives of the school.

14. The educators are permitted to be innovative.

From table 6 it is shown that 55.9% of educators agreed with the above statement. While 30.7% of educators stated that their principals allow them to be innovative, a 13.4% disagreed with the statement.

Alarmingly, a high percentage disagreed with the statement if one adds those that disagree with the educators who opted for sometimes 44.1% and this reflects the fact that most principals during this period resist transformation. It would seem that principals resist because they feel threatened by innovations. Whitaker (1993: 64), argues that a great deal
of stress within school staffs can be traced back to the insensitive and clumsy handling of innovation and change by principals and senior managers. Principals and managers who adopt a defensive tendency as opposition to new ideas may lead to a battle of wills and opinions. This is counter productive to the effectiveness of the school and to the human relations which are very vital for the success of the school. However, it would be useful to examine how some principals are perceived as not allowing educators to be innovative and what the nature, timing and scale of innovations teachers want.

Since principals have a responsibility to be accountable for fulfilling school goals and obligation to be inclusive in their management, they may only allow responsible and achievable innovations to happen.

15. The principal promotes a sense of belonging.

A remarkable percentage 62.2% of educators agreed with the statement. This finding reflects a positive effort by principals to inculcate a sense of belonging into their staff. While 24% of educators indicated that principals sometimes promote a sense of belonging, 13.7% disagreed with the statement. About 37.7% of educators appear to be in the dark as far as a sense of belonging is concerned. Although the majority perceive principals as promoting a sense of belonging, quite a number still has to work hard to establish a sense of belonging.

Some of the factors that enable the principal to promote the sense of belonging include, a well established human relations, properly established communication channels. Successful and effective schools also attract staff, the community and children to wish to identify themselves and belong to that school. This is confirmed by West (1985: 32) who maintains that school which appear successful, have no difficulty in attracting a following; for if success is contagious most people would surely like to be inculcated with it. Obviously
from this statement one would argue that no one takes pleasure in associating with failure or those who preach failure.

16. Our principal encourages leadership to emerge from educators.

Findings from table 6 indicated that 63.7% of educators agreed that principals encourage leadership to emerge from educators. A mere 15% of educators were in disagreement with the statement while 21.3% opted for sometimes principals do create opportunities for educators to participate in leadership tasks.

It is interesting that the majority of educators sampled, believe that many principals encourage leadership from them. However, in view of that educators themselves are leaders, it could be expected that more principals encourage leadership from educators. Owens (91: 134), point out that although it is common in schools and other educative organisations to speak as though the person in charge were a leader, and only leader, the fact is that a number of individuals may act as leaders in different departments at different times.

17. The principal has achieved his status through group acceptance and competence.

An encouragingly high percentage 61.8% of educators indicated that their principals have achieved their status. The 19.7% of educators indicated their disagreement with the statement while 18.5% of educators opted for the middle value.

Of great concern is the fact that the picture from the research findings indicates that some principals, 38.2%, may not be aware that position power alone is insufficient. The power gained through expertise and acceptance by followers is equally, if not more, important as part of status. If leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a
group in efforts towards goal attainment in a given situation, the interaction between followers and leaders, and acceptance by followers is critical. As Owens (1991: 135), puts it, "A leader is voluntarily granted power by the members of the group and they accept his or her influence and direction by shared agreement."

18. Our principal has established a school climate that is conducive to effective teaching.

It is encouraging to realise that 64,2 % of educators agreed with the statement. Only 18,9% of educators disagreed with the statement while 16,9 % stated that their principals do sometimes create a climate of effective teaching. This finding indicates a positive effort by principals to some schools to promote a culture of learning and teaching in their institutions. However 35,8 % is quite a big number that still lags behind in creating an atmosphere of effective teaching.

The climate that prevails in some schools, as according to research findings does not seem to be positive. This may have detrimental effect to the effective learning and teaching. A positive and pleasant climate in the school will encourage teachers, pupils and parents to become involved in and, contribute to school activities. According to Schreuder et al (1993: 22) a positive school climate not only encourages the teachers, pupils and parental community to participate actively, but also leads to increased productivity. Ideally, establishment of a positive climate leads to higher standards of work and greater success, which in turn causes educators, pupils and parents to take greater pride in their schools.
19. The principal has effectively established formal and informal channels of communication.

A remarkably high percentage 61% of educators agreed with the statement. Only 14.9% disagreed that their schools have properly established channels of communication, while 24% indicated that in their schools there was sometimes effective communication channels. From these findings it is clear that although the majority of schools have well established communication channels, still many schools in the Durban South Region do not have thoroughly planned communication channels. Communication serves as a primary means of instilling knowledge, of conveying information, of sending messages and receiving feedback, of enhancing relations, solving problems, of decision-making, of giving instructions and of sending messages to parents, to name but a few.

West (1985: 35) states that the function of communication in an educational, public relations programme is to ascertain that schools and communities are in agreement on their educational goals. Educational goals must be revamped to accommodate change. Without on-going and responsive communication schools and communities will shortly discover that they are operating at cross-purposes.

4.3.3 The instructional leadership role of the principal

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. The principal facilitates teaching and learning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The principal provides instructional leadership for staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. The principal is involved in facilitating teaching and learning process in our school.

The majority of the educators, 64.6% were in agreement with the statement. There is a small percentage 11.8% of educators who disagreed with the statement while a substantial percentage, 23.6%, of educators stated that their principals sometimes facilitated teaching and learning in their schools.

It can be concluded from these responses that principals in most schools do make it a point that they offer support to their educators with regard to the instructional programme. However 35.4% of educators is a big number that alleged that their principals do not exert enough effort to facilitate the teaching and learning process. A generally effective aspect of establishing and effective teaching and leaning culture at school is achieved when those in power, like principals and heads of departments, show concern for and support the teaching and learning process. Schreuder (1993: 15) that although an educator is intensively trained for performing his tasks, not everyone has all the skills to provide a high standard of teaching in his subject, thus a system must be developed in the school to help teachers in this respect. This implies that for each and every school there must be a teaching development programme.
for all educators.

21. Our principal provides instructional leadership for his staff.

Most of the educators 50,5 %, agreed with the statement that their principals provide instructional leadership for their staff. While the percentage of those who disagreed and those that strongly disagreed is 14,5 %, an alarming 35 % of educators indicated that their principals sometimes provided instructional leadership for their educators. According to Hoyle and MacMohan (1986: 112), successful principals are programmatic leaders who take an active part in structuring the instructional programme within their schools. This statement seems to challenge the principals to engage actively in instructional leadership.

22. The principal and staff in our school have provided for work evaluation, for correction and improvement for the future.

Table 7 indicates that 50,4 % of educators agreed with item 22 above while 22,8 % were in disagreement with the statement. The percentage of educators who stated that their principals provide for work evaluation is 26,8 %.

The above findings indicate that in many schools there is no sufficient programme for work evaluation. Perhaps it has not dawned to some principals that evaluation fulfils many purposes in the school organisation if organised around the school needs. For example, it helps with staff professional development and growth. The negative side of work evaluation comes about when administrators use it to exercise power over their staff. It would appear that strategies need to be devised by many schools to incorporate evaluation process as part of their instructional programme.
23. **The principal should teach.**

The research findings indicate that 50% of educators concurred with the statement that principals should teach. While 19.2% of educators disagreed with this notion, an alarmingly high percentage, 30.8%, of educators believed that principals should teach sometimes. Although principals have a lot of work to do, Resolution 7 of 1998 stipulates that principals should at least have between 5% and 40% of teaching time.

According to Dwyer et al (1993), “research on the principal’s instructional leadership roles indicate that some principals exemplify a ‘master-teacher role’. They are active in preparing and demonstrating instructional techniques for their teachers. They also spend many hours in classrooms interacting with the students and suggesting solutions to instructional programmes. Other principals are less obvious in their instructional management.

Indicators from the above findings are that principals should also teach although their instructional workload may not necessarily be the same as that of their educators.

24. **In our school the principal modifies the school curriculum when this is essential to facilitate the teaching and learning process.**

Table 7 item 24 shows that many educators, 47.6%, agreed with the above statement while 19.3% indicated their disagreement with the statement. There is, however, a substantial percentage, 33.1% of educators which indicated that principals in their schools develop the curriculum sometimes.

From these responses it can be concluded that many principals make an effort to indulge in curriculum modification. That as it may, it would appear that quite a number of principals
have not yet started making an effort to modify their school curriculum. These principals seem to be in the majority when taking into consideration that when combining the percentage of educators that disagreed with that of those who stipulated that their principals modify the school curriculum sometimes, these add up to 52.4%. This figure is worrisome especially during this time of transformation when the Department of Education both nationally and provincially has embarked on introducing the Curriculum 2005 programme to schools.

It would seem necessary that principals embark on devising strategies and putting programmes in place that aim at effective curriculum modification in their schools.

25. The principal and staff have established procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional leadership process.

Table 7 shows that 50.8% of educators were in agreement with the statement. The percentage of those that disagreed is 22.4%, while 26.8% opted for the middle value that sometimes established procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional leadership process is done by the principal and staff.

Although it is encouraging that 50.8% of many educators indicated that they were involved in evaluation instructional leadership in their schools, it is also surprising that 26.8% of educators do not form part of such an important process within their schools. The researcher would generally argue that non-involvement of educators in such processes might lead to strained relationships and mistrust between management and staff within the institution. De Roche (1981:16), believes that with the advent of management team management, it may be best for the principal take the initiative and assume major responsibilities along with all school personnel who have administrative duties, assistant principals, departmental
administrators and teachers in the formulation and evaluation of school programmes and personnel.

26. Educators who encounter teaching or any other problems, feel free to come to seek assistance from the principal.

It is encouraging to note that a large number of educators, 60.6%, acknowledged that their principals are ever willingly ready to solve any problems that they encounter. While 25.2% indicated that their principals solve their problems sometimes, only 14% of educators disagreed with the statement.

There are many relationships with a school, but presumably, of great importance is the one that exists between educators and their principals. From the researcher wants to assume that in many schools where educators freely approach their principals whenever they need solutions to their problems and concerns, there seems to exist open and good relations. Barth (1990:21), argue that since teachers are expected to do more and more remove with less, the principal has become an even more critical figure, capable of both creating and solving teachers problems.
Although many principals solving their educators’ problems, the 32.2% of educators, which includes educators who disagreed and those that responded with some uncertainty, indicates that in some schools educators do not freely approach principals to solve their problems ranging from lack of capacity, to fear of being accused of strange relations.

4.4 Analysis of the open-ended questionnaire

Introduction

For purposes of this study the open ended questions were subdivided into three subdivisions and these are:

1. The things the educators liked about administration in their schools.
2. The things educators disliked about their schools’ administrative process
3. How they would administer schools if they were given an opportunity to act in the principal’s position.

The responses to the open ended questions were categorized according to themes and these themes were based on a range of responses given; these themes were: leadership, administration, instructional leadership, resource development and human relations.

4.4.1 Things liked by the educators in their schools administrative process

(i) Leadership

From the research findings 68.2% of educators indicated that they liked leadership in their schools, while 31.8% of educators did not respond to the question. Those that liked leadership in their schools mentioned that there was good communication; educators were
motivated to work and there was delegation of leadership duties. Educators also stated that the principal and management staff consulted educators on matters of school administration. They also indicated that, decision making in their schools was done together with staff.

From the above response, it is clear that many educators are satisfied with the leadership style of their principals. However, those that did not respond seem to give a message that there was some uncertainty about leadership in their schools.

(ii) Administration

Findings indicated the 61.4% of educators liked the administrative style in their schools almost corresponds with the percentage of 68.2% of those who liked their principals’ leadership style. The areas where educators felt their principals were positive in their administration are: Principals in many schools are said to be democratic in their administrative styles; many educators also indicated their satisfaction with their schools’ admission and discipline. It was also stated that many principals had established and promoted a sense of belonging among their educators.

Both these percentages seem to indicate that most educators are supportive of both their principals’ leadership and administrative styles.

(iii) Instructional leadership.

From the research findings, 41.8% of educators expressed their satisfaction with instructional leadership which obtains in their schools, while 52.8% of educators did not express their feelings about the manner in which instructional programme was administered in their institutions. Under instructional leadership, educators liked the manner in which curriculum
modification and instructional programmes were administered; work evaluation were said to have been organised in consultation with the staff; they also welcomed the manner in which staff and professional development were planned by their principals.

It is however, disturbing to realise that 58.2% of educators did not respond to the item on instructional leadership. From these responses one would assume that most educators are sceptical about the instructional leadership in their schools.

(iv) Human and Physical Resource Development

In this item, a surprisingly high percentage, 67.7%, of educators did not respond. Only 32.3% of educators indicated that resource development in their schools does take place. This shows that most educators indicated a negative attitude towards resource development in their institutions. This entails training of educators improving physical structures and augmenting teaching materials and facilities for educators and children.

One would suggest that principals should devise some means to try and establish programmes for both human and physical resource development. Chetty (1998:165), supports this conception when she states that school leaders should help create useful staff development directly, or by providing the needed resources and indirectly by fostering a staff commitment and a supportive collegial environment.

One of the problems that could be cited that leads to the resource problems in school, especially in Black schools, is a fact that black schools have for years been neglected in as far as resource development in concerned and there had been little or no programmed that helped to develop human resources. It would be ideal perhaps that the existing resources mostly in the advantaged schools should be shared while strategies are being devised to
(v) Human Relations

In this category, research findings show that an alarming 52.7% of educators did not respond, while 47.3% of educators expressed their satisfaction about human relations that obtain in their schools. As far as human relations are concerned, educators believed that principals treated educators equally; principals did not reveal staff confidential matters; they also expressed their satisfaction about the atmosphere of sharing and team spirit prevailing in their institutions. Principals were also said to entertain teachers' views. The majority of educators who responded also felt that principals approach them with respect and dignity.

The researcher would generally assume that human relations should be an important concern for all school principals and their management teams. According to De Roche (1981:21), principals affect human relation by their leadership style, the opportunities they provide for school personnel to grow professionally and personally, and the atmosphere of trust, openness and humaneness, they attempt to create within their schools.

4.4.2 Things disliked by the educators in their schools administrative process

Below are the themes given by educators in response to the questionnaire on the things they disliked about the process of administration in their schools.

(i) Leadership

Research findings indicate that 50.8% of educators stated their dislike of their principals' leadership styles, while 49.2% did not express any feelings about their principals'
administrative style. They believed that there was poor communication, lack of consultation and there was also no team work in their institutions. They further expressed their disliked of the manner in which decisions were taken by management in their schools.

(ii) Administration

An alarmingly high percentage, 65.7% of educators expressed their dissatisfaction with regards to their principals' administration, while 34.3% of educators did not respond. Most educators who responded cited lack of democracy; poor discipline; lack of team spirit and unplanned meetings as some of the areas that their principals needed to improve on.

(iii) Instructional Leadership

From research findings, as many as 53.9% of educators were dissatisfied with their schools' instructional programmes, and 46.1% of respondents did not give their feelings about the instructional programmes that is used at their schools. The respondents felt that their principals did not make an effort to develop or modify their schools' curricular. They also disliked the fact that planning of the instructional programme was mostly the function of their principals and management. Also the educators were concerned that their schools had no properly organised work evaluation programmes.

(iv) Lack of Human and Physical Resource Development

Research findings indicates that only 19.3% of respondents stated their dissatisfaction with the lack of both physical and human resource development; also many of them felt strongly about the scarcity as well as the condition of their schools' physical structures and educators’ teaching materials. It is disconcerting that 80.7% of educators did not state their opinions
concerning this category. As stated above, the imbalances of the past years have not been addressed by the Department of Education especially in KwaZulu-Natal. This condition of resources, both human and physical resources, makes it very difficult for most schools to have a properly run instructional programme. Taking into account the type of training received by most educators, especially African educators, there has been no programme in place further train educators in order to cope with the current transformation in education.

(v) Poor Human Relations

In this theme, 57.4% of showed a negative response with regards to the nature of human relations that existed in their schools. On the other hand 42.6% of educators did not respond. Some of the things that were of concern to the educators included: poor relations among staff as a whole; poor communication of instructions; lack of team spirit; in some schools staff is concerned about poor working climate due to strained relations and lack of proper control. Some educators also stated that their principals had preferential treatment of some staff members.

4.4.3 If you were a principal of a school how would you ensure that all staff members work cooperatively in your school administration? List five points.

The sole purpose of this question was to solicit the educators’ views of how they would handle administrative process if they were given an opportunity to participate as principals of schools. From responses given, it became necessary to categorize the educators views in accordance with the themes as stated below:
(i) Leadership

Responses indicated that an overwhelming 85% of educators responded to this section of the questionnaire while only 15% did not respond. This response indicated that educators viewed themselves as people who can lead, given an opportunity to do so. Their response included the following ideas:

- They would establish proper channels of communication.
- They would motivate educators and establish teamwork at their institutions.
- They would delegate duties and leadership tasks.
- They would consult their educators before taking decisions and will ensure that decision making involves all staff members.
- They would embark on innovative leadership and allow flexibility and shared leadership.
- They would formulate goals and objectives in concert with their staff.
- They would ensure they are role models in leadership.

(ii) Administration

Research findings indicated that 80% of educators participated and only 20% did not respond. The percentage 85% of those who responded on leadership is almost the same as that of those who indicated their ability to administer. It thus appears that strategies are required to ensure that principals give educators more opportunities to participate in administration and leadership activities at various schools. The administrative role functions on which educators focused included tasks such as:

- the establishment of democratic administration.
- ensuring that their schools will have properly kept records.
- they would formulate a clear admission and discipline policies for their institutions.
- they would inculcate a sense of duty and a sense of belonging to their staff.
they would recognise and appreciate staff input
they would praise and recognise good work.

(iii) Instructional Leadership

It is discouraging to find that 66.5% of educators did not respond to this part of the questionnaire. Only 33.5% responded.

Educators who responded stated that:
• they would establish curriculum development programmes
• they would ensure that there is proper communication of instructional programmes.
• instructional work evaluation would be properly planned
• they would have professional and staff development programmes
• they would develop and inculcate the culture of learning and teaching in their staff, children and parents.
• they would formulate subject committees within their institutions.

(iv) Physical and Human Resource Development

Research findings indicated that most educators, 90%, did not respond to this theme in response to the questionnaire. Only 10% had something to say about resource development. It was unfortunate that there was such a low percentage of responses. The responses to this question could reflect needs which educators have for their staff development.

The 10% of the educators that responded indicated that:
• they would organise workshops to develop their staff
• they would retrain some of their staff members in matters such as financial management.
• they would develop human resources, they would also as much as possible, invite subject advisors to workshop educators in various department.
• they would budget for gradually augmenting their physical resources.

(v) Human Relations

Under human relations the highest percentage, 71.3% did not comment while only 28.7% of educators had something to say about human relations. It can be concluded from these percentages that most principals need to work hard to develop good human relations in their schools. The response in table 8 also indicated that human relations at schools cannot be referred to as good and conductive to productive teaching. Without good human relations, the schools cannot be maximally effective. Strained relations in a school situation has detrimental effect on the instructional programme within the school.

Some of the responses from educators that responded to this section are as follows:
• as principals educators would avoid preferential treatment
• they would ensure that confidential matters especially those that involve particular educators would be kept as confidential as possible
• they would establish good working atmosphere.
• they would ensure that their staff work as a team.
• they would be accommodative.
• they would as much as possible try to address and consider educators’ concerns.
• they would welcome educators’ constructive ideas.
4.5 Analysis and interpretation of data from principals

4.5.1 Introduction

Having discussed the educators' perceptions and opinions on the role of principals as administrators, the researcher now analyses and interpretes data from principals on their perceived roles. This section also focuses on the principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of their administration.

Basically principals are in charge of administrative ans leadership functions. They are also expected to take a lead in the teaching and learning conditions and activities in their schools. In interpreting data, the researcher will compare the differences and similarities of principals perception of their roles with the educators perceptions, regarding the subject studied.

As with data from educators, biographical information is categorized and commented on first.

4.5.2 Gender frequency of principals

*Table 8*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON RESPONSE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that 63.3% of the respondents were males while only 22.7% were females. The proportions of male and female principals in the sample were compare with
the proportions of the educators sample. The educators sample indicated that there are more females in secondary schools than males, yet, there are far more male principals than female principals. The representation of females as principals in secondary schools is thus not proportional to the population. The findings from the study may thus be reflective of administration and leadership which are typically male in character.

4.5.3 Age frequency of principals

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 49 YEARS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 59 YEARS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON RESPONSE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 indicates that 18.2% of principals are under 30 years of age. Most principals about 47.7% range between 30 and 49 years of age. With 15.9% ranging between 50 and 59 years. It is unfortunate that 18.2% of principals did not indicate their ages. The proportions of high concentration of principals is between the ages of 30 and 49 years, and it is the same as that of educators.

As the table shows below, there are few principals beyond 50 years. Lots of experienced principals seem to have left the department assumingly, due to taking severance packages or because of retrenchments. Whatever the cause, one wonders if the region has not had a drain of experienced educators.
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Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALIFICATIONS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATRIC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE COURSES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONOURS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research findings indicate that 6.8% of principals have matric without a professional certificate. Principals with diplomas as the highest qualification form 22.7% of the population, while 27.3% are those with diplomas and degree courses. Degreed principals form 9.1% while 18.2% have honours degrees. The last category of 15.9% is composed of principals with Bachelor of Education degree. In terms of academic qualifications, not necessarily in administration and leadership, principals seem fairly well qualified.
4.5.5 Teaching experience of principals

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON RESPONSE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows that 27.3% of principals have 1-4 years of experience as principals while 11.4% have between 5 and 10 years experience. Nine percent has between 11 and 20 years experience, while 2.3% fall between 21 and 30 years of experience as principals. Surprisingly, about 50% of principals did not indicate their years of experience. However, from these findings the majority of principals have between 1 and 4 years of experience as principals.

4.6 Perceptions of principals of their administration

4.6.1 Introduction

The table below examines the administrative capabilities of the principals. The first five items generally view the part played by the department to expose the principal to some training and/or orientation before assuming his/her position as a leader and administrator of an institution.

The research question in this section are aimed at determining whether principals were trained for their roles.
### Table 12.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative process</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have you had administrative training since assuming your position?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have you had management experience before your promotion?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has the department trained you on leadership?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did you receive orientation before assuming your position?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did your superintendent give you, your job description?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Have you had any administrative training ever since you became a principal?**

The above table shows that 40,9% of educators have been exposed to some training, while 29,5%, have never been trained in school management. While the question did not solicit the nature, duration and effectiveness of the training received, it is notable that 29,5% of principals in the region state that they have had no training in administration and school management.

It can be concluded that not enough training is done on school management before incumbents like principals assume their duties as administrators. Furthermore, in the writer's experience as a principal for six years, there has been no evaluation of training principals given, while in service. The training is also not comprehensive and consistent.
2. Have you had any leadership and managerial experience before assuming your position?

Only 29.6% of principals appear to have had some managerial experience. This could be through acting in the position of a principal before actual appointment or by being exposed through delegation by a principal of a particular school. Twenty-nine point five percent had no experience before assuming their duties, while 40.9% had little or no experience.

3. Has the department exposed you to any seminar on leadership?

The response to the above question as shown in table 12.1 shows that 54.6% of principals did attend leadership seminars while 20.4% did not attend any seminar. Eighteen-point-two percent have sometimes attended seminars. About 6.8% of principals did not respond to this question.

As in item 1, it is a concern that not all principals have had training on leadership, particularly in a society where most principals have no formal qualification in administration. Chukwuemeka (1982: 15), maintains that it is known that many outstanding administrators have never had a formal course in administration.

4. Did you receive any orientation before assuming your position as a principal?

An encouragingly high percentage, 72.7% of principals were orientated before assuming their positions as school managers. Those that were in disagreement with the statement form 20.4% while only 4.5% of the principals stated that they were to a certain extent given orientation. From these responses the researcher concludes that some effort has been made to orientate principals about their responsibilities and duties before assuming their positions. Only 2.3% did not respond.
5. Did your superintendent give you, your job description?

From table 12.1 it is indicated that 77.3% of principals were informed about their job description, while 11.3% denied having been informed by their superintendent. The rest of the principals, 11.4%, were to some extent given their job description.

From this section, which aimed at examining teacher training and orientation, it can be generally concluded that although in some districts there is some effort done to train principals, a lot still needs to be done to expose principals to workshops and seminars in order to give them a comprehensive understanding of their responsibilities and roles as managers of schools.

It was stated in chapter two of this study that school administrators are responsible for setting goals and objectives for their particular institutions and for influencing their staff to work towards set goals and objectives. Obviously these are some of the very important responsibilities which cannot be placed in the hands of untrained administrators and leaders.

It needs to be restated that the principals administration roles overlap. Hence question in table 12.2 and table 13 below, may each not be purely administrative or leadership questions, they may be about both.

Section 13 focuses more on educator participation while section 12 relates to planning and goal-setting elements of administration.
### Table 12.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Principal and staff define goals and objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,4%</td>
<td>38,6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Principal and staff plan activities early in the year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,5%</td>
<td>2,3%</td>
<td>40,9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Principal and staff develop rules and regulations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,7%</td>
<td>52,3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Principal involves staff in school management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3%</td>
<td>52,3%</td>
<td>45,4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Principal recognises staff suggestions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,9%</td>
<td>59,1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. The principal and staff define school goals and objectives.

According to the research findings, 88,6\% of principals agreed with the statement; namely, they report that they define school goals and objectives with their staff. It will be recalled that only 62,6\% of educators believed that their principals set school goals and objectives together with them. It is surprising that most principals perceived themselves to be performing very well in this task of administration while educators often rated them low. However, that as it may, the assumption that can be made from these findings while principals believe that they have made an effort to involve educators in school administration, not all educators think they have done so. On the other hand, there is however, a need for some principals to put more effort to include their educators in the administrative process, especially in the setting of goals and objectives.
7. The principal and his/her staff work out a plan of activities together at the beginning of the year.

Table 12.1 shows that 93,2% of principals were in agreement with the above statement. While 4,5% of principals disagreed with the statement, only 2,3% indicated that planning with the staff at the beginning of the year was done sometimes. The principals again ranked themselves higher than the educators' ranking of 62,6%. The difference of 30,6% between these rankings is of great concern from the researcher's point of view. This somewhat shows a great deal of difference of opinions and views between the principals' and educators. The point is that unless principals are seen by educators to be participative in their administration, schools cannot be said to be democratic.

8. The principal works co-operatively with his/her staff to develop school rules and regulations.

Research findings indicate that 52,2% of principals strongly agreed with the statement, while 47,7% agreed with the statement. This implies that all principals sampled involved their staff in developing their schools' rules and regulations, as none disagreed with the statement. Neither did anyone opt for the middle value, 'sometimes.' Contrary to the principals' responses, educators perceptions are that only 56,7% of principals worked together with their staff in the formulation and discussion of rules and regulations. The difference in responses between principals and educators is worrying and the question of objectivity of responses from the two parties remain an area of great concern to the researcher.

9. The principal involves his/her staff in school management.

Again a high response of 45,4% of principals strongly agreed with the statement, while 52,3% agreed with the statement. It si only 2,3% of principals who expressed their
disagreement with the statement.

As in item 8 above, while the educators rated their involvement as permitted by their principals at 51.5%, principals’ rating is again as high as 97.7%. Principals in this category have rated themselves as performing exceptionally well, contrary to this, many educators feel that they are left out of school management practices. This is described in item 10 of table 5.

10 The principal recognises suggestions of his/her staff.

The research findings in this category shows that 100% of educators agreed with the statement. There was no response contrary to the statement given. Another worrying difference exists between educators’ perceptions of principals’ ability to recognise their suggestions and the level at which principals rated themselves. Only 48.1% of educators agreed that principals at their schools did recognise educators’ suggestions and this is discussed in item 8 of table 5. The responses given by the principals are in conflict with the educators’ views. As stated before principals have to be seen to be recognising staff. To be credible in this regard.

4.6.2 Principals’ perceptions of their leadership.

The table below examines the leadership capabilities and capacities of the principals from the principals’ perspective. This table has five items which examine the principals’ leadership capacities and capabilities.
### Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Decisions are taken in consultation with staff.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,3%</td>
<td>2,3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Leading is democratic in our school.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>61,4%</td>
<td>27,3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Educators are permitted to be innovative.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>56,8%</td>
<td>40,9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Principal encourages strong relationship among staff.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,4%</td>
<td>58,1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Educators share their problems and concerns with the principal.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38,6%</td>
<td>54,5%</td>
<td>2,3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11. Decisions in our school are taken in consultation with staff members.**

From table 13 it is indicated that 95,4% of principals perceived themselves as actively involved in taking decisions after consulting their staff members. Only 2,3% disagreed with the statement, while the other 2,3% of principals stated that they sometimes consult their staff before taking decisions. According to the educators’ response in table 5 item 7, it is only 57,1% of educators who agreed that their principals made decisions after consulting them.

**12. Leading is democratic in our school as it includes staff members.**

Table 13 shows that 88,6% of principals perceive themselves as leading democratically in their institutions. There is no principal who disagreed with the statement, except for 11,4%
who indicated that they sometimes exercised democratic leadership and administration in their schools.

In item 11 of table 6, only 49,2% of educators perceived their principals to be democratic in their approach to administration. There is again a big difference between the principals’ view of their leadership role and that of their educators who rated them very low. Jacobson et al (1973:55), have this to say about democratic leadership:

"principals are often tempted to sacrifice the rights of the individual teachers to participate in school management, for control by a few individuals. When this is done the control ceases to be democratic. In order to keep the control democratic, the principal must constantly strive to have control exercised by the individuals who constitute School staff."

13. Educators are permitted to try innovations in our school.

From the research findings 97,7% of principals agreed with the statement. No principal indicated his/her disagreement, while only 2,3% indicated that they permitted innovations sometimes. Item 14 in table 6, indicates that only 55,9% of educators were in agreement with the statement, that their principals permitted them to be innovative, compared to the big percentage of response by principals on this subject. It is difficult to determine whether principals gave responses which placed them in a favourable light or truly believed they are democratic.

14. The principal encourages a strong relationship between educators and management personnel.

Table 13 shows that most principals indicated their agreement with the statement that they
encourage strong relationships among their staff. Only 4.5% of the respondents indicated that the above occurred only sometimes in their institutions, while 95.5% agreed that they encouraged strong relations between educators and management. Hersey and Blanchard (1988:53), believe that the interpersonal relationships that are developed on the job are one of the most significant factors affecting organizational productivity. It can be generally assumed that in schools where there are strained human relations, productivity remains at a low level. The researcher would suggest that it would be beneficial for school principals to develop good interpersonal relations within their schools in order to improve effective teaching and output.

15. Educators are encouraged to share their problems, needs and feelings with the principal

Table 13 shows that only 4.5% of principals opted for the middle value of sometimes, while 95.5% agreed that they encouraged their staff to freely share their problems, needs and feelings with them. Only 2.3% of principals did not respond.

From this response, it is clear that in most schools principals have embarked on an open-door policy. This response also shows that most principals are concerned about their well being and feelings. In schools where such a spirit prevails, it should have a positive influence in the educators’ attitudes and behaviours. This spirit will in turn educators’ confidence in their school administrators and thus enhancing productivity. Barth (1990: 78), maintains that the involvement of principals in the process of being helpful to staff, is one of the most powerful ways of generating respect and recognition for oneself as well as for those one helps.
4.6.3 The principals’ perceptions of instructional leadership.

Introduction

One of the major purposes of the school include the teaching and learning of students. This implies that for the principal to be an effective instructional leader, he/she must take a leading role in influencing student learning. However, the principal cannot do this without extensive planning and working with educators. Educators are the immediate group that the principal frequently interacts with about the institutional functions, especially instructional programmes. It must also be borne in mind that while the principal frequently interacts with educators, educators have a direct interaction and contact with students. So that, the involvement and the attitude of educators are important factors for the effectiveness of instructional programme.

According to Jenkins (1991:84), the indications of strong instructional leadership in effective schools, include the following:

- a school leader with strong opinions and beliefs about curriculum development.
- a clear and well-ordered curriculum with appropriate learning programmes and assessment systems.
- the establishment of work-centred environment where pupils and educators enjoy their work and spend their time on tasks.
- the establishment of the continuous work-monitoring programmes with constant feedback to both students and educators.
- regular setting and marking of homework.

This is an impressive list which can only come about if and when principals strive for effective school administration and effective instructional leadership roles.
### Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Principal provides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Principal consults staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before modifying curriculum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Principal supervises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching activities by</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Principal facilitates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning and teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Principal facilitates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff evaluation procedures.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Principal and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establish evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Principal holds meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for instructional guidance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The principal provides instructional leadership for his/her staff.

It is encouraging to observe from research findings that the majority of principals, 79.6% expressed their agreement with the statement, while only 6.8% disagreed. 11.4% of principals stated that they provided instructional leadership for their staff at times, while only 2.3% of respondents did not respond.

While it can generally be concluded that most principals are involved in providing for
effective instructional leadership in their schools, the relevance of quality this leadership is important. Instructional leadership should promote and facilitate the culture of learning and teaching in their institutions.

While most principals seem to be involved in instructional leadership, the researcher is however concerned about 18,2% of principals who are still lagging behind in facilitating and leading instructional programmes for their institutions.

17. The principal consults his/her staff before modifying school curriculum.

Table 14 indicates that 90,9% of principals agreed with the statement with only 2,3% stating that they sometimes consult their staff before modifying the curriculum. There was no principal who stated his/her disagreement with the statement, while only 6,8% did not respond to the statement.

The responses between principals and educators, on whether they consult staff before curriculum modification differ. The need for many principals to work more co-operatively and consultatively with their staff on curriculum matters cannot be overlooked. School principals who appear to have little to do with the articulation of curriculum development need to reorientate their priorities by concentrating more on developmental instructional leadership consultation with their staff.

18. The principals supervises the teaching activities of the educators.

Form the principals’ response, it appears that 88,7% of principals indicated their agreement with the statement, while only 2,3% disagrees and 6,8% indicated that they sometimes supervised educators’ teaching. 2,3% did not respond. In table 7 item 25, educators rated work supervision by the principals very low compared to the principals’ response. Only
50,7% indicated their support of the principals' supervision of work in their schools. It is essential for principals to be seen to provide instructional leadership where needed.

19. *The principals is actively involved in facilitating the teaching and learning process.*

Table 13, indicates that 93,2% of principals viewed themselves as being active in providing and facilitating learning and teaching in their schools. Only 4,5% stated that they sometimes facilitate the instructional process while 2,3% of principals did not respond.

Although the educators' response is slightly lower that of principals, the different is fairly low, as can be ascertained in item 20 of table 7. It is encouraging to note that the majority of principals are actively committed in ensuring that the teaching and learning take place in their institutions.

20. *The principal is effectively involved in the professional development of his/her staff.*

Findings of table 13 indicates that 63,6% of principals create opportunities of the professional development of their staff, while only 9,1% stated their disagreement with the statement. 22,7% of principals indicated that they did create opportunities for the staff development to a certain extent, while 2,3% gave no response.

21. *The principals and staff have established procedures for evaluating educators' work.*

The research findings as shown in table 13 reveal that 96,4% of principals expressed their agreement with the statement, while 9,1% disagreed the statement. Only 2,3% stated that they sometimes planned work evaluation with staff while the other 2,3% of principals did not respond.
There is a big difference between responses of educators and principals who agreed with the statement. The educators' response was 50.4% while that of principals was 96.4%. This discrepancy reveals that although many principals say they are involved in work evaluation quite a number of principals still need to put in place a properly organized and a jointly designed programme for a systematic evaluation of their schools' instructional programmes. De Roche (1981:1) is of the opinion that systematic evaluation may help administrators find out how it improve the quality of instruction and services provided by the teachers to learners.

22. The principal regularly holds meetings to give staff instructional guidance.

Table 14 indicates that 86.3% of principals were in agreement with the statement, with 6.8% expressing their disappointment. Those who sometimes held meetings from 4.5% of the sample, while 2.3% did not respond.

While the response of principals who say they provide instructional guidance is so high, 86.3%, it must be remembered that some educators believe principals do not give this guidance, they point out that they are either not supervised nor included in programmes designed to assist them in their teaching. We refer to table 7, item 21 in page 19.

The introduction of the centralised National Curriculum 2005 and other curriculum developments needs principals with a positive view of learning ans teaching strategies. Among other things instructional leaders need to spend more time with their staff on instructional leadership and training. This notion is supported by Jenkins (1991:87) who states that principals in the exceptionally good schools chose to be instructional leaders first and administrative leaders second.
4.7 The principals’ opinion questionnaire

The purpose of including this section, was to give principals an opportunity to voice their own original views, in addition to the structured questionnaire. This section had two questions to which principals were expected to respond.

4.7.1 Do you think the success of the school depends on the principal’s administrative and leadership skills?

The responses from principals indicated that 28 principals agreed with the statement, while only 7 disagreed. There were about 9 principals who did not respond.

What is noticeable in this response is that most principals seem not to have recognised the importance of acquiring leadership and administrative skills. These skills are generally of major importance for administrative effectiveness.

The question that followed aimed at enquiring about the principals’ views and recommendations as how the Department of education could help principals acquire more administrative skills.

4.7.2 What do you think the department of education should do to enable you to acquire more administrative and leadership skills?

The principals’ recommendations on how the department could help them acquire administrative skills is discussed below. The responses were sub-divided into five categories:
(i) Management and leadership training

The majority of principals recommended management training as being of major importance, especially on how to establish leadership models based on staff participation. According to Whitaker (1993:4), in recent years theories of management stress that, it is becoming necessary that headteachers are encouraged to involve all staff in decision making and the day to day management of the school, and leadership should be seen as a process of harnessing the potential of individual participants, not controlling and prescribing their behavior.

(ii) Effective communication

From the principals' response it was noted that many of them felt there was a pressing need for principals to receive skills training on how to establish proper channels of communication.

(iii) Financial management

Principals also expressed that it was their wish that they be exposed to extensive skills training in financial management and budgeting for their schools. They felt not enough training was given to the Schools' Governing Bodies and their finance committees.

Principals' functions are extensive and as a leader, the principals is expected to be knowledgeable about teaching and learning as well as financial management. She/he must prepare the school budget with his/her staff and the school governing body. She/he must control expenditure. Over and above these responsibilities, he/she is accountable for all that happens within the school. Providing principals with additional administrative staff will support their successful focus of leadership. Principals also felt that training should include other members of staff especially the management team and school governing bodies.
(iv) **Strategic planning**

Short term and long term planning has always been a necessity for planning for the present and the future. From the principals’ responses, most of them indicated their strong wish to receive training in strategic planning.

(v) **Seminars and workshops**

Another major recommendation that was made by most principals was that the department should put in place a programme of ongoing workshops and seminars that will address training of educators in various aspects of school management. Taking into account past history, the researcher supports the recommendations made by principals to establish intervention programmes that will help to empower both management and educators with necessary information on general school administration.

From these findings it can be concluded that a lot of effort and strategies need to be put in place by the Department Education in order to enlighten and guide principals about the important administrative skills required in their day to day leadership roles as school administrators, leaders and instructional programme leaders.

In the next section, the researcher restates the assumptions posed in Chapter 1 and give responses to them.

4.8 **Assumptions restated**

(a) Administration by principals in the Durban South Region is not supportive of the professional needs of teachers.
(b) Lack of training of principals in administration and management seem to contribute to the lack of administrative skills.

The research rejects the first assumption. While many principals in the region where the research was conducted, do need to improve their input to be supportive to the professional needs of the educators, the research found that many principals already make a significant contribution in this regard.

With regard to assumption two, there appears to be insufficient training of principals. There is no coherent pre-service and in-service strategy for training of principals. Many principals who were questioned administer and lead their schools, with little or no capacity building, given.

This impacts adversely on their role as administrators and leaders of schools. The second assumption is thus upheld.

4.9 Conclusion

This chapter further drew comparisons between the principals' and educators' perceptions of the administrative capabilities of principals with regard to their administrative, leadership and instructional leadership roles in various institutions. The purpose of the research which was to determine the leadership and administrative roles of principals has been achieved.

In the next chapter an attempt will be made to draw conclusions from the research and thereafter make recommendations. It is believed that such recommendations will provide to contribute to effective school administration and leadership.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion of conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Introduction

The major purpose of this study was to evaluate the administrative role of the principals of the secondary schools in the Durban South Region. Specifically, the study focused on the principals' administrative roles as administrators, leaders and instructional leaders. The investigation for this study looked at how principals perceived their administrative role functions in comparison with the teachers' perception of how principals viewed their principalship role in overall as administrators and as leaders.

The study tried to determine whether significant differences existed between the educators' perception of principals' roles and the perception of teachers' own roles. The summary of findings provided by this study is based on the whole study as well as the empirical investigation and the resultant analysis thereof. Recommendations are finally made to help the educational administrators and other stakeholders to develop and sustain an effective administrative and leadership process in school organizations.

5.2 Conclusions Of Research Findings

On the basis of the findings of this study in various categories, the following conclusions are discussed below:
5.2.1 There are more male principals than female ones.

Gender comparisons indicated that although there are more female educators than male educators, as shown in table 1, the number of male principals still far exceeds that of lady teachers in the secondary schools. Table 10 shows that there are 10 lady principals out of 44 principals. Although these finding may still need confirmation by additional research, the observation is that there is no culture of gender equity in secondary school principalship. The practice of promoting females to higher administrative positions at secondary school level is still not equitably followed.

5.2.2 Areas in which administration by principals needs to be improved

Administrative areas on which findings focused include:

5.2.2.1 Lack of educator involvement in defining school goals and objectives

Research findings indicate that most principals had a tendency of excluding educators from the process of defining and determining goals and objectives. Although more principals than educators stated that they defined school goals and objectives together with their educators, the difference in responses makes one conclude that many principals still inhibit educators’ participation in goal setting.

5.2.2.2 Not all principals plan together with their educators.

From the educators’ and the principals’ responses, it can be concluded that although there was some educator involvement, in planning in most schools, this appeared to have not been adequately done by many principals. For example, item 2 (table 5) reflects that more than
one third of educators, 37.4\%, indicated that they were not involved or less involved in the planning of activities in their institutions.

5.2.2.3 General lack of delegation of administrative work to staff.

In response to the item on the principals' delegation of administration work, research findings indicate that 12.2 \% of educators responded negatively, namely: there was not enough delegation of work, while 28.3\% opted for sometimes. These findings indicate that many principals are reluctant to delegate administrative duties to their staff. Schrewder et al (1993:29), view unwillingness to delegate as stemming from the belief that some principals want to be involved with everything so that they can be regarded as hardworking and competent; also it may stem from the principal's fears that educators will abuse the delegated authority. It may also happen that principals fear that delegated educators may demonstrate better confidence than themselves in performing administrative duties. From these findings it can be assumed that many principals appear to lack delegation skills and lack confidence not only in their ability to delegate but also in their staff.

5.2.2.4 Most principals do not involve educators in managerial work.

Empirical investigation findings indicate that 21.3\% of educators have never been given an opportunity to participate in managerial tasks. It can be concluded from this response that the extent to which educators are involved in managerial activities is limited. According to Barth(1990:124), all teachers can lead; teachers harbour extraordinary leadership abilities and their leadership is a major untapped resource for improving our nation's schools. Chetty (1998:189), is of the opinion that principals need to be fully informed about their staff members so that skills can be matched with tasks in order that there may evolve a shared sense of responsibility in terms of managerial functions and duties.
5.2.2.5 Principals do not adequately expose their staff to the Departmental policies and regulations

According to the research findings it is obvious that administrators in most schools mainly implement and execute policies and regulations without recognising the need to train and workshop staff, so that they are part of the implementers of relevant school policies.

With reference to item 4 in table 5, almost 43.3% of educators indicated that they have little or no knowledge of the Departmental regulations and policies.

5.2.2.6 Principals do not fully involve staff in decision making.

Research findings indicate that there were limited opportunities for teacher involvement in decision making. For example the picture displayed in table 6, and explained in item 12 indicate that 18.1 never participated in decision making, while 37% desired more decisional participation. If participation by educators in decision making is lacking, then educators think that, on many occasions, they are only invited to participate in problem solving only after senior management has done the preliminary work and their action is only restricted to endorsing decisions made and identified by senior staff members. If staff feel that they are not involved in decisions affecting their school, their job satisfaction and their sense of productivity may not be realised. According to Chukwuemeka (1982:142), much as principals need to a better job in administering their schools, they need to allow followers scope for initiative, decision and action.

5.2.2.7. Some principals resist new ideas from teachers.

It was found that most principals are opposed to new ideas and innovations by educators.
Principals need to know that being open to teachers' innovation would go a long way to improve school effectiveness.

5.2.2.8. Relationship between principals and educators could be improved

Principals do not adequately encourage strong relationships between educators and management personnel. School principals should realise the importance of establishing good relations at their institutions as this is often a critical factor in motivating educators. It is important that principals strive for good human relations as this leads to a productive teaching and learning environment; it also leads to job satisfaction and a satisfying school situation within which educators and learners can live and work.

5.2.2.9. Lack of properly established channels of communication in some schools.

Communication is not well established in quite a number of schools. We refer to 61% of educators, as shown in table 6, who indicated that there no properly established communication channels in their institutions. From these findings it can be concluded that a lot of work still remains to be done to ensure that principals are made aware of the importance of communication in their work environment. It is unlikely that schools can be in a position to fulfill their goals and objectives without properly defined channels of communication. According to West (1985:35), a formalised two way communication system does not spring into existence on its own. It stems from a well developed school policy that authorises and fiscally assures the continuity of an educational public relations programme. Poor communication affects human relations and general school effectiveness and instructional programme.
5.2.2.10. Instructional leadership in schools must be improved.

From research findings it might be concluded that much as many principals provided instructional leadership for their educators, quite a number of principals has however, neglected effective instructional leadership for their educators. Some have also failed to provide for the facilitation and promotion of learning and teaching culture in their schools. Obviously many principals need to spend more time and put more effort in supporting their educators to continuously improve their teaching and establish an effective instructional programme for their schools. This is what the schools should basically strive for. According to Clark (1980) principals in effective schools devote more time to the co-ordination and management of instructions and are more skilled in instructional matters. They observe their teachers at work, discuss instructional programme, support teachers’ effort to improve and develop evaluation procedures that access teachers and students performance.

5.2.2.11. Some principals do not consult staff on curriculum change.

Some principals do not adequately consult educators before modifying school curriculum. From the research findings, many principals do not work consultatively with their educators on curriculum development. As indicated in table 7, item 24, 52.4% of educators either have never been consulted on curriculum matters or have to a certain extent been involved in curriculum development. Obviously, it would be advisable that principals who have a habit of excluding educators from curriculum matters need to change their attitude and devise strategies and programmes that will always incorporate educators in curriculum matters.
5.2.2.12. Most schools do not work according to a properly structured evaluation or supervision programme.

Findings from the empirical investigation indicate that most schools do not have a properly structured work evaluation and control programme. In schools where principals do not supervise and evaluate work those principals are not in a position to recognise and honour educators for the good work they do. According to Locke (1969) compared with other occupations, the opportunity for the individual teacher to attain a pleasurable emotional state is when appraised that the job he/she is doing is achieving and facilitating its values.

In order for evaluation to be successful, the principal should work hand in hand with his/her staff in initiating and delegating responsibilities for the formulation of personnel and work evaluation.

5.2.2.13. The difference in teachers’ ratings of principals and the principals’ own ratings.

From the research findings it is generally observed that while principals rated themselves high in their leadership and administrative roles, educators generally viewed them as lacking in various areas of leadership and administration.

With reference to instructional leadership the general view is that principals need to improve their role functions by striving for higher productivity and a high educational quality programme. Principals must also have an up to date knowledge of the latest curriculum developments, like Outcomes Based Education Programme and Curriculum 2005 Programme and new teaching methods.
5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

5.3.1. Recommendations directed to the Department of Education.

(i) As far as gender is concerned the researcher recommends that the Department of Education need to encourage more females to enter the administrative ranks.

(ii) Following on the observation, is that from the demographic analysis, young educators with leadership abilities should be given an opportunity to participate in administrative school roles, probably be readily mentored as leaders. It is the duty of the government to consider providing these young educators with resource development and to encourage them to actively participate in administrative ranks.

(iii) It is recommended that administration and leadership training programmes should be planned at district and regional levels in order to provide principals with leadership capacities that will enable them to become effective school administrators.

(iv) The Department of Education must arrange ongoing programmes for school administrators and their teams to effect personal and professional development.

(v) To further empower educators and principals with administrative skills, educational administration programmes which are experiential should be introduced in the teacher training colleges and at universities nationally. In view of the current role transformation for school administrators, it would be advisable for the Department of Education to pre-service training and development on administration.
5.3.2 The recommendations to principals.

(a) Secondary school principals should be aware that in order to gain the cooperation of their staff, they must set and define goals for the school organisation together with their staff. In their administration, principals must remember that staff members also have goals and needs which must be incorporated in the organisational goals, and that staff is part of the organisation. Barth (1990:135), suggests that the involvement of educators parents and children is more likely to occur when the principal openly articulates school goals at meetings, conversations, departmental meetings and community meetings in this way shared leadership becomes part of the school culture.

(b) With regard to planning, principals must be aware of the fact that the responsibility for planning, is for both school management and staff as a whole. This will cause educators to support and own the plan and they will feel obliged to do everything possible, to make it effective. Planning without staff involvement is tantamount to dictatorship. Whittaker (1993:116), believes that the school developmental plan is a vital policy link between the governors, the professional staff of the school and the local education authority. This implies that planning must be inclusive.

(c) Since there is an indication that some principals do not expose their staff to the Departmental policy documents and regulations, it is recommended that principals and staff should workshop themselves on key policy documents so that they work in line with the Departmental policies and regulations. Familiarity with policy documents, may assist implementation thereof.

(d) In view of the observation that administration entails working with and through
people, principals need to learn to enhance trust of their educators and to delegate. Clearly the need to build the capacity of those to whom they delegate. Once educators are in a position to manage the job for themselves, there will be less need for supervision by the principal and there will be increased job satisfaction. When principals overcome barriers that cause them to avoid utilising educators in managerial functions and tasks, leadership expertise, fundamental school management improvement and interdependence will prevail in schools.

(e) In view of the implication that principals do not permit educators to participate in decision making, it is recommended that principals should therefore see to it that, they create more opportunities for educators’ participation in decision making.

(f) Principals must be open to be appraised by educators.

For principals to grow in their job they need feedback through appraisal. It is also reasonable for principals to allow their staff to evaluate them. The current Departmental appraisal document suggests that all civil servants should be appraised and this developmental appraisal has as its main objective the development of instructional and administrative process.

(g) Finally the findings that school principals do not involve educators in their leadership and administrative roles are in conflict with the democratic manner in which schools are to be administered. It is recommended that principals rearrange their administration in order to ensure that as much as possible educators play a vital role in school administration, leadership and instructional leadership.
5.3.3. Recommendations to principals and educators

With regard to instructional leadership and development, the following recommendations are made:

(i) In order to strive for quality education, it is vital principals and educators to establish a well co-ordinated instructional programme which has as its main focus, the establishment of effective teaching and learning.

(ii) All principals must supervise and use methods of supervision relevant to each teacher’s development. Work supervision, according to Cassim (1982:32), is concerned with “the development of the curriculum and the improvement of teaching and learning process.” Both teachers and educators have a responsibility to work co-operatively to solve instructional problems and accomplishing instructional goals. It is further recommended that educators should play a vital role in curriculum improvement. This makes it necessary for principals and their school management teams to, as much as possible, involve educators in curriculum and instructional improvement matters.

(iii) With regard to work evaluation, principals should come together with their staff and plan the programme of evaluation. These evaluations should aim at helping educators to discover needs for improvement. This programme should be based on communication and shared vision by the whole staff. For evaluation or assessment to be effective, it should also incorporate feedback. Self and peer evaluation are critical forms of effecting self growth.

(iv) Provision must be made in school for educators’ self and peer evaluation.
Educators and principals must arrange feedback opportunities and follow up evaluation or teacher assessment.

5.4 Conclusion

This study has attempted to determine the principals' capacities and roles as school administrators in the secondary schools of the Durban South Region. The need to research and analyze the principals' administrative roles emanated from the assumptions as stated in chapter 1 of this study. The need also emanated from the researcher's concern about the radical change that is currently taking place in the South African education system. This concern is clearly articulated by Whitaker (1993:73), who maintains that schools are undergoing radical changes in the manner their business is conducted. One of the most significant of these, is that leadership and administration should be seen as the most crucial focuses for institutional development and growth in the years ahead.

It should be remembered that school administration is a wide ranging process and it needs principals to understand their roles and priorities. Cassim (1982:74), believes that what is necessary is that an administrator needs to know and to come to grips with the normal workings of his/her institution. One of the major areas of research in this study concerned itself with educators involvement in the leadership and administration of their institutions. The findings indicated that in many instances teacher involvement was limited. This is opposed by Toffler (1980), who argues that it will be necessary to release ourselves from the myth of authoritarian efficiency which attaches so much importance to the small group at the top of the organizational hierarchy to provide all the direction, supply all the answers and exercise all the control; which has the effect of missing the capacity of others in less senior positions to offer their capacities and creativity. In supporting the need for teacher involvement in school administration, Whitaker (1993:74), proposes that effective
administration will be achieved when staff have helped and have had a full and have played an active role in designing and planning the activities and the development of the school as a learning organization.

Although teaching is mainly concerned with learning and teaching process, the educators' potential role as instructional leaders is also of utmost importance. This role, not only concern itself with instructional programme only but is also concerned with the general school effectiveness and general school administration. The lack of administrative and instructional leadership skills among many principals as well as educators should be of great concern to the Department of Education.

The shift from administration and leadership which is status related and that regard the principal as the only person in authority, to the administration that entertains the inclusion of all stakeholders and which aims at being staff and team focused, and also which is collaborative, is the main focus of this study.

The researcher hopes that data collected from various sources and the recommendations made, will be of value to all school and educational administrators. Further to this, the researcher hopes that the findings and recommendations made will prompt the Department treat the need to have ongoing skills training for educational and school administrators as well as educators, as a matter of urgency. This will provide school principals and other administrators with the needed means that will help them run their institutions effectively.
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Appendix A

Dear Educator

I am doing a Master of Education Degree on the quality of the Principal’s Administrative behavior in a secondary school.

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a survey being conducted in the above-mentioned study. Kindly complete this questionnaire for me.

I realize that I am asking you to give up some of your valuable time. Nevertheless your contribution to this study is highly valued. I hope you and your colleagues will view this study as an opportunity to voice out your thoughts and opinions on some vital issues on the principal’s administrative role.

Kindly submit your the questionnaire to your principal.

I wish to thank you in advance for your kind assistance.

Yours faithfully

G. M. GUMEDE
Appendix B

Dear Principal

I am doing a Master of Education degree on the quality of the Principal’s Administrative behaviour in a secondary school.

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a survey being conducted on the above mentioned study.

Kindly respond to the attached questionnaire.

I realise that I am asking you to consider giving up your valuable time. Nevertheless your contribution to this study is highly valued and I sincerely hope you and your colleagues will view this study as an opportunity to voice out your thoughts and opinions on some vital issues on the administrative role.

Kindly submit the questionnaire to your District Office.

I wish to thank you in advance for your kind assistance.

G.M. GUMEDE
Appendix C

EDUCATORS

Chapter 3

Section A

This questionnaire aims at determining the administrative role of a principal as an administrator, an instructional leader and his/her role in general school leadership. You are requested to respond to the questions and statements in accordance with the conditions that obtain in your school. All responses will be treated confidentially. I wish to thank you in advance for your input in this study.

Questionnaire for educators

3.1 Your personal particulars: Please circle what applies to you

3.1.1 Sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Age in years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30 - 39</th>
<th>40 - 49</th>
<th>50 - 59</th>
<th>60 upwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3 Academic Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matric</th>
<th>B.Ed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>M.A./MSc/MCom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.4 Teaching experience in years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - 4</th>
<th>5 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 20</th>
<th>21 - 30</th>
<th>31 - 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please complete the questionnaire below by circling the number that represents your opinion.

1. The principal and staff define school’s educational goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. The principal and staff work out the plan of school activities at the beginning of the year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. The principal delegates some of his administrative work to his staff members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. The principal keeps his/her staff informed about Departmental policies, and regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. The principal and staff work out a manner in which work is to be distributed among them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. The principal recognizes good teaching procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. I am happy with the manner in which the principal consults with us.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. The principal experiments with suggestions made by educators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. The principal effectively solves staff problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. The principal understands the need to involve all staff members in school management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
11. Leading in this school could be described as democratic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Decisions in this school are taken consultatively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. School goals objectives are mutually established by the staff members and the principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Educators are permitted to try innovation in our school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Our principal promotes a sense of belonging among staff members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Our principal encourages leadership to emerge from educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. The principal has earned his/her status through group acceptance and competence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. Our principal has established a school climate that is conducive to effective teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. The principal has effectively established formal and informal channels of communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. The principal is actively involved in facilitating teaching and learning processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. Our principal provides instructional leadership for his/her staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
22. The principal and staff in our school have provided for work evaluation for work correction and improvement for the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. A principal should teach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. In our school the principal modifies school curriculum when this is essential to facilitate the teaching learning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. The principal and staff have established procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of instructional leadership process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Educators who encounter teaching or other problems feel free to seek assistance from the principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3.1.5 Open-ended questions

Kindly give your views openly on the following questions.

1. What are the good things about your school administrative process? List five.
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 
   e) 

What are some things you don't like about the administration and leadership of your school? List five.
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 
   e) 

3. If you were a principal of a school how would you ensure that all staff members work co-operatively in your school administration? List five points.
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 
   e)
Section B

This questionnaire aims at determining the principal’s administrative role. You are requested to respond to the questions and statements in accordance with the conditions that obtain in your school. All responses will be treated confidentially.

Questionnaire for principals

3.2 Your personal particulars: fill what applies to you

3.2.1 Sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.2.2 Age in years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30 - 39</th>
<th>40 - 49</th>
<th>50 - 59</th>
<th>60 upwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3 Academic Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matric</th>
<th>B.Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree courses</th>
<th>M.Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>M.A./MSc/MCom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honours</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.4 Teaching experience in years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - 4</th>
<th>5 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 20</th>
<th>21 - 30</th>
<th>31 - 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DIRECTIONS:** Please complete the section below by circling the answer that best represents your response to each item.

1. How much administrative training have you had as a principal?
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How much management (leadership) experience did you have before assuming your position as a principal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you have not received any training, has the department exposed you to any seminar on leadership training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Did you receive any orientation before occupying the present position as a principal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Did your superintendent or senior inspector give you, your job description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIRECTIONS: Answer the items below by circling the number that best represents your response to each item.

6. Principal and staff define school goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. The principal and his or her staff work out a plan of school activities at the beginning of the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. The principal works co-operatively with his/her staff to develop school rules and regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. The principal involves his or her staff in school management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. The principal recognizes suggestions made by his or her staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
11. Decisions in our school are taken in consultation with staff members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Leading in this school could be described as democratic as educators are involved in most leadership activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Educators are permitted to try innovations on our school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Principal encourages a strong relationship between educators and management personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Educators are encouraged to share their problems, needs and feelings with the principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
16. Principal provides instructional leadership for their staff members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. The principal modifies school curriculum in consultation with his staff to improve the teaching learning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. The principal supervises the teaching activities of the staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. The principal is actively involved in professional development for his/her staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. The principal is actively involved in the professional development of his/her staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. The principal and staff have established procedures for evaluating educators’ work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
22. The principal regularly holds meetings with his/her staff to give them instructional guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.5 The success of the school in its educational goals and objectives depends on the administrative skills possessed by the principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.6 What do you think should be done by the Department of Education to help you to acquire more administrative skills? List five points.

(a) 
(b) 
(c) 
(d) 
(e)