

**THE ROLE
OF THE PRINCIPAL
IN
STAFF DEVELOPMENT**

**BY
THAMSANQA THULANI BHENGU**

**A DISSERTATION OF LIMITED SCOPE SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF EDUCATION**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
COURSE WORK**

DEGREE OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION

**IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND
ADMINISTRATION AT THE**

UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND

SUPERVISOR : PROFESSOR N. GAWE

DURBAN-UMLAZI

DATE SUBMITTED : OCTOBER 1999

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to the following persons:

1. Professor N. Gawe, my supervisor, for her professional guidance, encouragement and support in ensuring that this study was successfully completed.
2. Professor R.P.G. Ngcongo, my co-supervisor, for her invaluable support, advice and motivation. She has been an inspiration to me throughout this project.
3. Mr G.N. Msimango,(Chief Superitendent of Education Management - Inanda District), for his willingness to help me in formulating the research topic and for his constant guidance and support.
4. My wife, Happy, for her undying support and confidence in me throughout this study.
5. Respondents whose participation made this study possible.
6. KwaZulu Natal Department of Education and Culture for allowing me to conduct this study.

DEDICATION

To my children :

THAMSANQA JUNIOR ; THOBEKA ;

NOKULINDA ; THULILE AND

THABILE BHENGU

DECLARATION

I declare that this research study :

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Is my own work, that all the sources used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.



T.T. BHENGU
OCTOBER 1999

ABSTRACT

Staff supervision is central to the improvement of the quality of teaching in a school and if educators are well supervised and are aware of the benefits inherent in supervision, they need to be amenable to supervision. Yet educators are not, and they use every trick in the book to avoid or resist supervision. On the other hand, the principal struggles to persuade educators to understand the value of the exercise. Some resort to threats which may lead to animosity and resentment. The bottom line is that the principal is not able to play his/her role to encourage staff development, and as a result, the quality of teaching may drop.

This study sought to assess the principal's understanding of his/her role in staff development. Secondly, it sought to ascertain the extent to which principals' supervision strategies enhanced educators' professional development. Lastly, the study aimed to obtain an understanding of educators' perceptions regarding supervisors as an aspect of staff development.

Review of relevant literature of supervision and staff development was undertaken for the conceptual framework upon which the problem could be analysed. An interview schedule was administered in principals with an aim to soliciting information that would reveal the approach that they used to supervise their staff. Questionnaires were administered to educators with an aim of obtaining information from them about the perceptions that they had regarding supervision and staff development.

The study established that principals have the desire to play a constructive role in the professional development of their teaching staff, but they unfortunately lack the capacity to do so. Secondly that principals' supervision strategies as currently employed do not enhance the educator's professional development. Lastly that educators do not have a clear understanding of supervision as an aspect of staff development. They seem to understand the role that the principal can play but they have problems in implementing that role.

APPROVAL

Supervisor : _____
Professor N. GAWE

Co-Supervisor : _____
Professor R.P.G. NGCONGO

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE A POSITION HELD BY EDUCATORS.....	33
TABLE B EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS	33
TABLE C SEX OF RESPONDENTS.....	34
TABLE D AGES OF RESPONDENTS.....	35

LIST OF APPENDICES

	<u>PAGE</u>
APPENDIX A : LETTER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE.....	73
APPENDIX B : PERMISSION FROM THE DEPARTMENT TO UNDERTAKE THE STUDY.....	74
APPENDIX C : QUASTIONNAIRE FOR EDUCATORS.....	75
APPENDIX D : INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS.....	83

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Dedication.....	iv
Abstract.....	v
Approval.....	vi
List of Tables.....	vii
List of Appendices.....	viii

CHAPTER ONE

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1.1 Background to the problem.....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	2
1.3 Basic assumptions.....	3
1.4 Motivation for the study.....	3
1.5 Delimitation of the study.....	3
1.6 Objectives of the study.....	4
1.7 Research methodology.....	4
1.8 Definition of terms.....	5
1.9 Conclusion.....	7

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction.....	8
2.2 Historical development of supervision.....	8
2.3 Staff development.....	10
2.4 Supervision and staff development.....	16
2.5 Related studies.....	18
2.5.1 A Collaborative approach to supervision.....	18
2.5.2 Teacher Development in a Changing Society.....	21
2.5.3 An Investigation of Professional Induction of Newly Appointed Teachers in Post - Primary School in KwaMashu Circuit of KwaZulu Department of Education and Culture.....	21
2.5.4 The Management of Grant Related In-Service Training.....	21
2.6 Supervision and staff development in this study.....	25
2.7 Conclusion.....	26

CHAPTER THREE**METHODS OF COLLECTIONG DATA**

3.1	Introduction.....	27
3.2	Selection of candidates to the sample.....	27
3.3	Interviews.....	28
3.4	Questionnaires.....	29
3.5	Analysis of Data.....	30
3.6	Conclusion.....	31

CHAPTER FOUR**PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF COLLECTED DATA**

4.1	Introduction.....	32
4.2	Questionnaires for educators.....	32
4.2.1	Presentation of Data on General Information... ..	32
4.2.2	Data on Supervision and Staff Development... ..	35
4.3	The principal's interviews.....	53
4.4	Discussion.....	65
4.4.1	Objective 1 : To assess the principal's understanding of his/her role in staff development.....	65
4.4.2	Objective 2 : To ascertain the extent to which the principal's Supervision strategies enhanced educators' professional development.....	66
4.4.3	Objective 3 : To obtain an understanding of educators perceptions of Supervision as an aspect of staff development....	66
4.5	Conclusion.....	66

CHAPTER FIVE**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.1	Introduction.....	67
5.2	Findings.....	67
5.3	Recommendations.....	68
5.4	Conclusion.....	69
	REFERENCES.....	70

CHAPTER 1

1. THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

Professionals are always faced with the challenge to keep abreast of developments in their fields, and as professionals, educators cannot escape this challenge if they are to be competent practitioners. One area in which educator development may be upheld is through in-service education and staff development programmes (Cloete 1985: 152-166).

Staff development may be viewed in different ways by different people depending on their needs and interests. Dillon-Peterson (1981:3), for instance, regards staff development as a programme that is designed to foster personal and professional growth for individual within a respectful, supportive and positive organisational climate, having its ultimate goal better learning for learners and a continuous responsible self renewal for educators and schools. According to Oliva (1982:345), staff development is a programme of organised activities of both a group nature and an individual nature, planned and carried out to promote the professional and personal growth of staff members.

So engrossed are some people in Oliva's form of staff development that they often forget that as Dillon-Peterson (1981) asserts, staff development is a process that goes on daily as a practitioner pursues his/her career path. In other words, in their teaching career, educators who approach their work professionally will always assess their methods, knowledge and their impact. This kind of self evaluation helps practitioners to change, adapt or improve their performance. One area that is regrettably often misunderstood is the supervision by the principal of educator's performance. The principal as a manager in a school has a portentous task to employ competent and professional practitioners. More important is his/her role to see to the maintenance of the teaching standard. In that way the role of the principal as the supervisor is crucial to staff development.

Unfortunately, the task of the principal to develop staff is hindered by the resistance some educators have to being supervised, as they often perceive the principal to be autocratic and oppressive. Before 1994, South Africans were subjected, by the government of that time, to an autocratic, dictatorial, prescriptive and a top-down form of administration. Obnoxious laws were passed and viciously enforced. People in management positions were regarded as part of the state's oppressive machinery. Experiences like these have led people to lose confidence in school management. This research project sets out to investigate the crucial role played by the principal in supervising educators for the purpose of staff development.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Staff supervision is central to the improvement of the quality of teaching in a school and if educators are well supervised and are aware of the benefits inherent in supervision, they need to be amenable towards supervision. Yet educators are not, and they use every trick in the book to avoid or resist supervision. On the other hand, the principal struggles to persuade educators to understand the value of this exercise. Some resort to threats which may lead to animosity and resentment. The bottom line is that the principal is not able to play his/her role to encourage staff development, and as a result, the quality of teaching may drop. This state of affairs has led the researcher to aim to seek answers to the following questions that will underpin this study:

- 1.2.1 What do principals understand to be their role in staff development?
- 1.2.2 How do principals consolidate supervision and staff development
- 1.2.3 What are the educator's perceptions of supervision as an aspect of staff development?

1.3 BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Supervision methods currently used by the principals to supervise educators are not impacting on staff development.

- 1.3.1 Supervision and staff development can be successful if both educators and principals have common objectives and strategies regarding supervision and staff development.
- 1.3.2 All educators need professional support and encouragement to reach the highest levels of development.

1.4 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

The researcher has observed that after serving for a number of years as professionals, educators then aspired to promotion positions like Head of Department (H.O.D), Deputy Principals and Principals. More often than not, these young educators were not mature enough to assume work of such magnitude. It also concerned the researcher that some of these educators did not even realise the basic responsibilities of a class teacher, let alone that of an H.O.D, yet they still resisted the guidance the principal could give them. This situation in which people who stand to benefit from guidance abhor it, suggests that there is a break down in communication, and this has motivated the researcher to undertake the study. This study hopes to shed some light on what makes educators refuse a principal's access to their work.

1.5 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This research project will be carried out in schools in Kwa-Mashu/ Ntuzuma/Inanda areas. This is the area where these problems were observed and it is also closer to the research area so that it will be feasible for the researcher to undertake the study within the present financial and time constraints.

1.6 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.6.1 This study seeks to assess the principal's understanding of his/her role in staff development

1.6.2 It aims to obtain an understanding of educator's perceptions regarding supervision as an aspect of staff development.

1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The following research procedures to collect relevant data will be applied:

1.7.1 Literature Review

Relevant literature on staff development and supervision will be reviewed for a better understanding of pertinent concepts, and it will also help provide a conceptual framework upon which the problem can be analysed.

1.7.2 Interviews

An interview schedule will be prepared and administered on ten (10) principals representing eighty (80) schools.

1.7.3 Questionnaires

Questionnaires will be administered among fifty (50) educators representing educators in the population. They will be assigned to the sample through random sampling method to ensure that all educators' schools have equal chances of being selected. The questionnaires will aim to obtain educators' perceptions regarding supervision as an aspect of staff development.

1.7.4 Analysis

When relevant data has been collected and recorded, a qualitative method will be used to analyse non-quantifiable data.

1.7.5 Report Writing

When data has been collected, recorded and analysed, its findings and recommendations will be documented and made known in the form of a research report.

1.8 DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following terms are central to this study and are defined here below:

1.8.1 Staff Development

“Staff development provides opportunities for educators and other professional and support personnel to acquire new skills and attitude that can lead to the changes in behaviour that result in increased student achievement” (Seyfarth 1996:129).

Glover & Law (1996:8) regard professional staff development not only as an individual matter for educators, but they also recognise the crucial role that it plays as an enabling mechanism (at departmental and school level) for creating a professional environment in which improved strategies can flourish.

In the first definition, the focus is on what staff development does for a person; it emphasises a change for the better but it lacks the maintenance aspect, i.e. conformity to or the improvement of standards held by the school. The second one maintains the balance between the two, viz the individual and the organisation. This view is strongly supported by Kydd et al (1997:1-7), where they emphasise the symbiotic relationship between

the individual and the organisation regarding development. They argue that “Although individual development may not necessarily have tangible outcomes for the organisation, a developing individual is likely to make richer contributions to it, that is, organisational development will only happen if the individuals within it are developing” (Kydd et al (1997: 1-2).

The concept of staff development is used in this study to include all those planned systematic activities undertaken by principals to assist their staff members to personally and professionally grow, and thus help the school to prosper.

1.8.2 Supervision

Supervision is an act of management, overseeing and giving direction to people under your leadership (World Book Dictionary 1995: Vol. 24, P 2105). Rue & Byan (1990: 6) regard supervision as the first level of management in the organisation and is concerned with encouraging the member of the unit to contribute positively towards accomplishing organisational goals and objectives. Wiles & Bondi (1991: 8-9) describe it as encompassing administration; curriculum; instruction; human relations; management and leadership. The researcher views supervision as comprising a wide range of applications as an act and as a process. It can be an act of overseeing all activities of curricular and co-curricular nature as cited by Wiles & Bondi (1990: 8-9) above, but it can also be regarded as a process involving goal setting and designing of activities as well as implementation and appraisal of all supervision related activities, to assess the extent to which organisational goals set are achieved. It is quite evident from the above definitions firstly that supervision is a concept that is inherent in leadership and management of schools as organisations and secondly, that supervision (like staff development) recognises the important of individuals in ensuring that organisational goals are achieved.

In his study, supervision is regarded as a means to an end and not an end in itself. The end here is both the professional development of educators and improved performance as a whole. The means is supervision. Hence supervision is viewed in this study as forming part of the staff development process.

1.9 CONCLUSION

This chapter is about laying the background problem postulation and introducing the study as such. Aims and objectives of the study are given as well as the route the study will follow. The next chapter will be reviewing relevant literature on supervision and staff development.

CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Supervision and staff development of teachers is one of the most challenging and interesting fields of study. Successful implementation of policies pertaining to education and its importance (growth) is dependent upon the extent to which the teacher is effectively and successfully performing in the classroom. In chapter one, problems and challenges facing the principal in the school situation were highlighted. In this chapter, relevant literature on staff development and supervision is reviewed for a better understanding of the concept of supervision and staff development. This study aims to provide a conceptual framework upon which the problem of staff development and supervision can be analysed and clarified.

The rest of the chapter consists of a section on related studies that have been undertaken to investigate the question of supervision and staff development. Through these studies and articles, the extent to which other scholars in the fields of educational administration regard supervision and staff development as related concepts is explored. The question to be asked is whether or not supervision of teachers can be regarded as a component of staff development. Through the review of related literature, some perspectives that inform this study emerge.

2.2 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SUPERVISION

In understanding supervision of teachers, the researcher is arguing for, *inter alia*, the understanding of its historical development and evolution, to the present day, as well as the role that those tasked with the responsibility of supervision have played. Scholars of educational administration and management fields, like Wiles & Bondi (1991: 4-8); Jacobson,

Logson & Wiegman (1973: 138-146); Thurley & Wirdenius (1973: 216-222), agree that supervision practices have evolved over the years from pure inspections by administrators, initially from the outside, like Superintendents of Education and lay persons, Wiles & Bondi (1991: 4), Inspectors of Education and later, Principals. This type of supervision practice was characterised by unannounced visits to schools and/or classrooms, the checking of learners' written work, motivated by the desire to find fault with the teacher. Such supervisory behaviours were characterised by telling, directing and judging teachers, and sometimes, resulted in the dismissal of teachers. It is not surprising that in the United States of America, in the 18th, 19th and early 20th century, the relationship between inspectors and teachers was tense, stern and punitive in nature (Wiles & Bondi (1991: 4). Gradually, lay persons, appointed supervisors, and inspectors gave way to principals. The focus had shifted away from global oversights of school buildings and equipment, and observation of teachers in the classroom, to instructional supervision which required specialists in the field. The principal's supervisory behaviours however had not changed much; the approach to supervision was still characterised by the desire to find fault with the teacher by being evaluative and judgemental (Jacobson et al 1973:138-139). Changes in the environment outside school in the U.S., for example, economical and social transformation and the demand for more democratic participative supervision gained momentum. Supervision of teachers followed suit, and changed from an inspectional authoritative process, to one of working with people on problems of mutual concerns that are related to the structure of the school as an organisation (Alfonso, Firth, and Neville 1981: 32).

Contemporary supervision is characterised by what Alfonso, Firth & Neville (1981: 32-34) call 'sound human relations and cooperative professional effort'. This kind of supervision is founded on principles of inclusivity and transparency and cooperative participation of teachers, whereby, the principal moves along with teachers fully involved and sharing responsibilities without the supervisor relinquishing his/her leadership role (Alfonso et al 1981: 32-34). Contemporary

supervision is focused on teacher empowerment with a view to improving teacher performance, thereby improving learner performance, which is the primary aim of educational management. Empowerment in the school means a systematic, sustained effort aimed at change in the learning conditions and other related internal conditions in the school, with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively (Van Velzen and others in Bell & Day 1991: 138). Teacher empowerment and teachers' professional growth are used in this study to include all factors mentioned in the above definition of the teacher growth. Due regard is given to the significance of maintaining a healthy balance between needs and interests of educators and that of the school as an organisation.

2.3 STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Staff development was defined in chapter one as a process that provides opportunities for teachers to acquire new skills and attitudes that can lead to the changes in behaviours that result in increased student achievement (Seyfarth 1996:129). Main (1985: 2) describes staff development as a means by which a person cultivates those skills whose application will improve the efficiency and effectiveness with which the anticipated results of particular organisational segments are achieved. Various writers like Dale (1982); Dillon-Peterson(1981); Cawood & Gibbons (1981); Glover & Law (1996); Kydd, Crawford & Riches (1997: 1-7), and Webb (1996), to name a few, view staff development differently. However variously differing the views held by these scholars in the field of educational management are, those differences have nothing to do with the essence of staff development, but only with perspectives and emphasis.

Despite different descriptions of staff development, one element that cuts through all or most of these definitions, is the view that staff development is a process, that is purposeful, planned, systematic, and is aimed at improving performance of educators for the benefit of learners' performance. Alfonso & Others (1981: 395), argue that staff development programmes in a school must focus upon the staff competencies needed by

particular personnel to advance the goals of the school as an organisation, and also to enhance staff competence. The balance must be struck between the two extremes of personal and institutional interests. We will see in the following sections comments about the significance of maintaining the balance between individual personal needs of the teaching staff, and that of the school. Further discussions on staff development and various approaches to it are based on the work of Bell in Bell & Day (1991).

2.3.1 Bell's Three Approach Framework to Staff Development.

The three approaches by Bell and Day (1991: 5-17), are the following:

- a. Individualistic approach
- b. Group approach; and
- c. School development approach.

Within the individualistic approach there are two models, namely, apprenticeship and course-based models of teacher development. The latter involves professional development through courses, whilst the former comprises an individual teacher voluntarily associating him/herself with experienced colleagues for personal and professional growth. The course based model is divided into three groups namely, in-service education, top-up, and remedial education courses.

2.3.1.1 Individualistic approach to professional development of teachers.

The individualistic approach is based on three assumptions:

- a. that individuals can plan their own development alone;
- b. that what is good for the individual teacher is good for the school;
- c. that individuals can change schools.

The focus here lies in the individual teacher's needs, interests and development. Within this approach are two models, viz,

apprenticeship and professional development through course models. Under the apprenticeship model, the teacher who feels that he/she needs professional development by acquiring or improving skills acquired at college or university, works alongside other professional teachers. This kind of interaction however is not structured and systematic, but depends entirely on the willingness, motivation and enthusiasm of the individual teacher. Bell in Bell & Day, (1991: 6), argues for the successful developmental interactions between experienced colleagues and an apprentice teacher to make planned contributions to the work of the school, based on the self analysis of professional needs and effectiveness, of the school, as well as identifying and achieving a set of goals related to the level of analysis. The importance of planning and goal setting, for both individuals and institutions can never be over-emphasised.

The apprenticeship model is helpful in addressing the individual teacher's professional developmental needs that it is based on. It is also helpful because it is very close to the teacher and does not cost much in terms of finance because it is available at school; it therefore is relevant and allows the teacher to make individual choices. There are also obvious drawbacks to this model like the fact that it (interaction) is haphazard and unsystematic. There are no coherent needs analysis; needs may not be met; the role model available at school may not be appropriate for the inexperienced teacher to follow; the team of teachers at school may not be united or effective; the experience that a particular teacher may require in order to up-date his/her skills and knowledge might not be available in a school. Another limitation of this model is that it is passive, as the inexperienced staff member learns solely by association with colleagues, and it is not consistent with the needs to manage schools in a coherent, planned and structured manner (Bell & Day 1991: 6-9).

2.3.1.2 Professional Development through Courses

The professional development through Courses model, is one of the most commonly used and accepted approaches to the teacher development process, whereby teachers leave schools

and attend courses in specialised specific areas of curriculum and co-curriculum areas. This model was popular in the 19th Century especially among the poorly qualified teachers, to improve their qualifications (Bell & Day 1991: 7). This in-service education (INSET), tended to fall in three groups. The first group of INSET involved the upgrading of teachers' professional qualifications. The teachers without diplomas trained and obtained degrees, on a full or part-time basis. This practice was effective and successful, particularly because both teachers and education department shared the same notion that after training, teachers would enhance their professional performance.

The second and third groups are interrelated. These groups are based on top-up and remedial training courses respectively. Top-up courses are meant to rectify perceived deficiencies in the teachers' skills and knowledge areas. This course based model of the individual teachers' professional development is based on the assumption that one teacher can influence the whole school or a group of colleagues; that theory can be translated into practice by the teacher at school level; that attending higher education institutions helped teachers increase their knowledge and improve skills; that teachers had opportunities of choosing courses they needed from a wide range of courses offered. This model provided teachers with opportunities of reflecting on their own professional practices, and it also enhanced their promotion prospects. One of the inherent limitations of this model, is its tendency to ignore teachers and expertise in the school, in favour of outside expertise of INSET institutions. Other weaknesses of this model are the fact that choices of courses to be offered are determined by the providers, and these courses may not reflect all the needs of the school and costs may be too high. The courses may also lack practical application in the classroom. These models had no means for feedback or appraisal of the effects of the course offered (Bell & Day, 1991: 9)

2.3.1.3 Group approaches to Professional Development of Teachers.

To counter the weakness of course-based development, in terms of them being removed from the school situation, groups of professionals interested in the quality of INSET provision available to teachers, designed an alternative programme, viz, school-based development programme and school focused programme of teacher development (Bell & Day 1991: 10). The school based model was founded on the view that schools could be used as centres of learning to identify and solve many of the in-service educational problems. Advocates of this model (school-based model), argue that if professional development was taking place within the school, then the process of identifying teachers' needs could be easier, close, and more accurate, and also that the programmes that were devised to address those identified needs, could be closely matched against established needs. The choice of content, as well as the delivery of such programmes, would rest with the teachers themselves within the school.

One of the major shortcomings of the school-based model, is its tendency to ignore developments in the environment outside the school. Another drawback is the fact that the model seems to be preoccupied with the internal needs of the school, and pretended that there was nothing to learn from other people or institutions. School-focused development, on the other hand, is essentially school-based, but at the same time it is different from school-based development, in the sense that a school-focused development programme does solicit external support in the form of consultants, advisors and other departmental teams, while the training itself originates from within the school. In this kind of in-service education, the conduction of the course may be an INSET institution, but teachers may have been involved in the planning and implementation of the programme.

In this way, there is a balance between needs and interests of individual schools, and exposure to other schools' experiences,

needs and interests. Because of the INSET institutions' involvement, as well as that of the department and other stakeholders, coordination of activities is ensured. The model is called school-focused because it focuses on individual school's innovations, its intended developmental tasks and needs, while stationed outside of school (Bell & Day 1991: 11-12).

Both school-based and school focused models of teacher development fall under group approaches to professional development. They are both attempts to explain how best to attend to the teachers development needs. Both models subscribe to the view that professional development of education is a collective effort. The school-based model, however, down plays the role that is played by other persons and/or organisations external to the school. School-focused interests, that is, autonomy and interests of individual schools and the perceived intrusion of outside bodies is viewed with suspicion. There is an inherent conflict between self-initiated programmes of a school and those initiated by outsiders: the question of who initiated, planned and designed the educator development programmes between the principal and the teaching staff is the bone of contention here. In this study, the principle of inclusivity, transparency and cooperative participation by all stakeholders is advocated.

2.3.1.4 School Development Approach

The school development approach is the third and last of Bell's three approach framework.

This approach is based on the assumption that development of the educator is closely linked to the overall planning and review processes of school management. It seeks to balance the needs and interests of educators, both as individuals and groups, and that of the school as an organisation, whose approach to staff development will reflect the needs and interests of management. Other assumptions upon which the school development approach is based, are the following:

- a. that the medium and long term planning is possible;
- b. that policies once formulated can be implemented in the classroom;
- c. that resources will be made available and that school policies are the most effective approach to managing and improving schools.

The strength of this model lies in the fact that it enables schools to choose appropriate methods of development. Some resources are set aside for the school; external support is available, and it is welcomed; it is subject to the governors' agreement (particularly for the needs and interests of management and School Governing Bodies); priorities, according to this model, must be identified, and more importantly, this approach is linked with appraisal, thus facilitating the sought after feedback. There are some dangers inherent in this approach. The strengths mentioned above can also serve as limitations, for example, it is likely that the programme can be taken over by the department because of the level of influence it has in the programme. If it is taken over by the department, it loses its school base, and initiation. Another limitation lies in the fact that it is subject to agreement by the school governors. Lack of financial resources is another shortcoming of the school development approach. There is also a danger of more stress being put on the school needs at the expense of the individual educator. The school development approach may also be seen as a challenge to the educator's professional autonomy (Bell & Day, 1991 :117).

2.4 SUPERVISION AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

In chapter one, supervision was described as a process whereby the manager monitors; oversees; encourages educators to actively and positively contribute towards the accomplishment of organisational goals. Supervision in practice has demonstrated three interrelated managerial behaviours of goal setting exercise, design and implementation of plans or programmes, and appraisal (Alfonso, Firth & Neville 1981: 3-4), (Wiles & Bondi 1991: 12-16). Viewed as such, supervision is an ubiquitous imperative found in all institutions

(simple or complex), where organisational goals are set and must be understood by all; where production procedures are followed, schedules met, work evaluated, and where need be, adjustments are made. The common attribute found in most organisations' supervisory activities, is that supervision purposes are to provide conditions and to promote behaviours among employees that are necessary for the achievement of organisational goals (Alfonso et al 1981: 4). Wiles & Bondi (1991: 109), regard it, basically, as a leadership role that is concerned with improving learning experiences for learners.

For a better understanding of supervision of educators in a school situation, it is imperative that its nature and essence, as well as its manifestation over time be looked into. Its evolution over centuries and decades, up to the present time, needs to be reviewed with the aim of getting an insight into its conceptual nature. As this aspect has been covered in 2.2 above, only a few comments will be added later on. The researcher feels, however, that it is important to have a cursory look at Alfonso, Firth & Neville's (1981: 3) analysis where supervision is described as a compound term comprising 'super' and 'vision', with the former connoting 'above', 'over' and 'beyond', while the latter is derived from 'video'- to see. Conceptually therefore, supervision means looking from above (to oversee). It implies being watchful; being in control; giving directions and being present in the field of operations. Supervision can also be looked at as a process involving a series of decisions, actions and interactions with people (stakeholders), with a view to achieving preconceived organisational goals.

Staff development has been described as a planned, purposeful, systematic and sustained programme that is geared towards improvement of teaching staff. One way in which the desired improvement can be facilitated is through supervision. It is in supervision that weaknesses can be discovered and it is through a development programme that identified problem areas can be addressed. This aspect can be discussed in 2.6 below.

2.5 RELATED STUDIES

The following section outlines research reports and articles that are relevant to the topic of Supervision and Staff Development.

2.5.1 A Collaborative Approach to Supervision (Article by Burke, PJ & Fessler, R) Clearing House, Volume 57, November 1983.

A collaborative approach to supervision is a perspective which says that supervision and staff development should not be limited to the interactions between the teaching staff and middle management only, but that the process of supervision and development of staff should be opened up to multiple interactions on the educational scene. The interactors referred to here are significant others (parents, learners, organised teaching profession, management and peers). All the above mentioned structures play a role in identifying growth needs for the educator. A collaborative approach to supervision recognises this role, and maintains that supervision of educators by the principal is not his/her prerogative alone, but that all of the above play a crucial role in it.

The article explores the key components of the educator's professional growth processes and examines how the significant others can contribute to those components. The article also presents a structure for the collaborative approach to supervision and staff development, which the authors believe, is the answer to helping educators attain the professional growth they desire. This approach to supervision and staff development puts the educator at the centre of the process, with peers, clients, and management playing the role of feedback and collaboration. In the collaborative approach to supervision, the educator is not only the main focus for development, but he/she leads the process (Burke & Fessler 1983: 109). The four major components for professional growth are the following:

- a. Growth needs identification
- b. Feedback
- c. Internalisation and agreement, and
- d. Action plan

Growth needs identification is a process whereby educators identify areas where they think they need to grow (improve). This component presupposes a shortcoming in the educator's professional interactions with learners, parents, learning material and stakeholders. Hence parental contacts and interactions with learners provide the educator with the environment for growth needs identification. It is assumed that educators have a continual need for programmatic help with regard to professional growth. It is further assumed that the identification of these needs can be facilitated by the significant others in the educational system, and that educators can make use of these people in the identification process (Burke & Fessler 1983: 105).

Feedback has to do with confirmation and further clarification of the need for growth. Without appropriate feedback to the individual educator, growth need might never be known. In a structured supervision, feedback occurs formally in conferences, especially after observations. Feedback, according to the collaborative approach to supervision, is based on a number of assumptions. It is assumed that educators need feedback on aspects of their work on a continuous basis. It is also assumed that learners in the classroom may be the best source of data for feedback. Another assumption is that educators need to discuss feedback with someone in order to define professional development needs.

Internalisation and Agreement: This component refers specifically to a stage where the educator actually comes to terms with the identified need for help. The educator can either accept or reject the fact that there is a perceived need for change. If the educator accepts the fact that there is a need for growth, he/she then internalises it (the need for help). This is the most crucial component that can make or break the whole

process. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to help the teacher if that teacher does not see the need for help.

Action Plan is the last component. At this point, the educator has identified the need for growth, and feedback has been internalised, so that the programme can be implemented to accomplish the agreed upon objectives.

The structure of collaborative approach to supervision is such that the educator and a facilitator interact collaboratively as equals. Interactions are initiated by either of them. It can be initiated by the facilitator of the interaction, or by the educator him/herself, as a person who is supervised. A facilitator can be a representative of the teaching profession, a peer or management who helps the educator with professional growth needs identification, feedback, internalisation and agreement, as well as development's action plan. As a result of these interactions, three scenarios emerge: that the collaborative approach to supervision links professional growth of the educator with supervision; that the educator in this approach leads the process; and that the educator (recipient of development) may choose to involve or not to involve the management of the school. In this study, it is postulated that there is a link between professional growth of the educator and supervision. That is, supervision plays a facilitating role for the educator's professional growth to take place. The researcher, however, has a problem with some of these points, viz the educator leading the process and the question of the educator choosing to involve or not to involve management in the supervision process. The emphasis on the educator's ability to lead process is, in my view, premature and overestimated because the educator's ability to identify his/ her weaknesses, as well as growth needs identification is a personal matter and it is very difficult to know if the educator individually, possesses this ability. If the principal's role as a supervisor is undermined (because of his/her exclusion from the supervision process), there is a danger that the principal may lose contact with the situation. He/she will not be in a position to advise and give guidance to his/her staff if he/she is not made to be part of the supervising body.

2.5.2 Teacher Development in a Changing Society

(A selection of papers from a Southern African Society for Education Conference, held at Kei Mount Beach Hotel in October 1998 (Van der Vyver, J. [Editor]).

This paper on teacher development in a changing society, tackles staff development from an historically black educators' perspective in terms of resource deprivations, as a result of the past government's apartheid policies. Mashile in Van der Vyver (1998: 84), regards staff development as a fundamental and imperative component of the continuing preparations, training of educators, administrators, and other non-teaching staff alike, for the purpose of extending their professional and technical skills and knowledge. This paper covers many areas, like historical development and evolution of supervision, school-focused in-service education, range of in-service education provision, whole school concerns, partnership and guidelines in designing successful staff development programmes. For the purpose of this study, the researcher focused on historical development of supervision, and school focused in-service education, both of which are covered in detail in 2.2 and 2.3 respectively. The topic on teacher development in a changing society is relevant to this study in the sense that the importance of historical development of supervision for the understanding of its nature, is postulated. In this study, a similar view is held. The significance of staff development programmes that are generated from within the school is advanced, rather than the imposition of programmes from outside the school. A balance between internally generated programmes for staff improvement and the outside assistance and expertise, if need be, is sought. Over-reliance on any of the two sources for professional growth is viewed with suspicion by the researcher.

2.5.3 An Investigation of Professional Induction of Newly Appointed Teachers in Post Primary Schools in KwaMashu Circuit of KwaZulu Department of Education and Culture.

M.Ed. Dissertation(1994) by Sonto Nsele

Nsele's study aimed to investigate the extent to which the process of induction of newly appointed teachers was conceived and practiced within the ex-KwaZulu Department of Education and Culture (KDEC) in KwaMashu Circuit. It aimed to obtain information about problems and difficulties experienced by the teachers in their first year, and the extent to which they considered they received support and guidance. It expected to ascertain whether or not these teachers were made aware of the criteria and procedures that were used to appraise them. It also sought to identify the type of guidance, if any, as well as the support given to them by the inspectorate and school management, (Principal, Deputy-Principal and Heads of Departments). It also sought to find out if there was provision made at circuit level for the novice teacher's induction programme.

The significance of Nsele's work to this study is twofold: Firstly, the induction programme for the newly appointed teachers forms one major component of the staff development process. Wiles & Bondi (1991: 22), and Main (1985: 112), for instance, recognise the importance of the induction of the newly appointed educators in the whole process of staff development, when they define the parameters of professional growth of educators, as beginning at the entry point to the teacher education programme, and continues until employment ends. Secondly, its target population (geographic location), is adjacent to the location of this study (where it will be carried out). Although Nsele's study focused on post-primary schools while this one will include both primary and secondary schools, it will be interesting to find out if Nsele's findings relate to this study given the fact that conditions described in Nsele's project are similar to the ones presented in chapter one of this study.

Some of the findings of Nsele's study were the following:

- a. There were professional problems (classroom discipline, control and organisation), as well as personal problems relating to work and organisation.
- b. Dearth of resources (books and equipment).

- c. Problems relating to the interpretation of the syllabi, stress and control of class, as well as interactions with the parents.
- d. Teachers were not aware of the school's aims and objectives.

Those educators who did receive help from the principal and or the deputy-principals, were not aware of criteria used to assess them, nor was the assistance organised and systematic. These findings have serious implications for supervision and staff development management in schools.

In this study it is postulated that, for the educator's professional development to take place, there has to be a planned, continuous, organised and sustained programme at school level under the leadership of the principal, as a manager tasked with the responsibility of supervision. It is also assumed in this study that for supervision to take place successfully it must be linked with professional development of the educator, and that the latter has to be fully involved in the planning, designing and implementation of such development programmes. Objectives of supervision, as well as the criteria that are used to appraise them, must be clearly understood by the educator so that, both the principal and educators share the same vision for the school. Supervision of educators by the principals and staff development are two closely related terms whose objectives are mutually inclusive.

2.5.4 The Management of Grant Related In-Service Training

Grist: Research by Lockwood, B in Bell & Day, (1991)

The main aim of Lockwood's research was to consider the effects the introduction of the new form of in-service training had on local education authorities, as reflected in a small sample of schools. Although Lockwood's study focused on the introduction of the GRIST in-service programme, it came out with interesting findings that have a bearing on this study. Some of these findings are as follows:

- a. All interviewees mentioned the importance of professional development for educators.
- b. There were perceptions among educators that the GRIST programme put more emphasis on the whole school INSET programmes, although the department on the other hand claimed that the GRIST programme was solely aimed at the professional development of educators. Implied in these findings, is the conflict between individual needs and interests on one hand, and that of schools as organisations, on the other hand.
- c. It highlighted the need for schools to think about INSET training in schools in a planned, systematic and organised manner.
- d. For school policies to be implemented, training needs to be school based, and this training must involve all staff.
- e. Monitoring and evaluation must be built into any process that schools may design.
- f. It expressed the need of collaborating with other stakeholders and authorities. (Bell & Day 1991: 67-78).

Although GRIST was a government sponsored project, investigating implications of a programme initiated by the government department, much of its findings have significance for the perceptions of stakeholders, regarding supervision and staff development. Educators viewed with suspicion, government initiated (top-down) programmes. Educators also suspected monitoring and evaluation aspects of the programme, as attempts by education authorities take control and power of initiating changes away from the school. Supervision by the principal is susceptible to suspicion by educators, if its aims and objectives are not known to the educator. The manner in which the principal has been supervising educators in the past, was prescriptive and top-down, and the educator had no inputs in deciding how he/she is to be assisted in overcoming his/her professional problems he/she encountered in the classroom. Educators at school level, it is assumed, perceived principals supervisory practices with suspicion if they are not fully involved in the planning, design and implementation of programmes that are formulated to assist them.

2.6 SUPERVISION AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN THIS STUDY.

Supervision and staff development are regarded as two closely related terms that cannot be separated. The way the principal supervises his/her staff determines whether or not there is going to be development. There are two basic assumptions that underpin the understanding of staff development and supervision in this study. The first assumption says that all educators (novice or experienced), need professional support and encouragement to reach their highest potential level of growth, both personally and professionally. The second assumption says that, collaboration between the principal and staff members is a *sine qua non* for staff development and supervision to be carried out successfully. The more diverse views come together for the common purpose of advancing educational improvement, the better equipped the school is going to be, to be able to fit into the wider community in terms of providing relevant educational experiences, that will help the learner to contribute positively in the outside world.

2.6.1 Leadership and Supervision

In this project, the view is held that the practice of supervision is influenced by the view that the principal has about his/her staff. One way in which the teaching staff can be viewed is that educators are by nature not willing to work, and in fact dislike it, and the only way to cause them to perform their duties is through pressure, threats and coercion. The principal who views his/her teaching staff this way, will supervise them in a different way from the one who says that educators are willing and enjoy doing their work. In the former scenario, the principal will supervise them closely, and there will be less room for them to initiate, innovate and experiment as professionals who enjoy their autonomy. Supervision of educators will be characterised by telling the staff what, where, when and how they should do things. He/she will scold them. There will be no trust between them and the principal, and obviously, there will be no staff involvement in the management of that school. The

supervisor will be dictatorial and there will be no collaboration. The climate will be tense, resulting in an inherent conflict with the current changes outside the school. There are demands for inclusivity and democratic participation in all spheres of life. It is doubtful if there can be talks of staff development if such a state of affairs persists.

Another way of viewing educators is to regard them as professionals who are able and willing to perform duties, and who need to be assisted to accomplish their objectives, both professionally and personally. Supervision, in the second view, is linked with staff development. Supervision objectives are to provide the teaching staff with support, guidance, feedback, effective communication in the school and to control and provide development throughout the school. This kind of development is regarded as a component of supervision. Staff development and supervision involve the educators' professional growth and appraisal as well. In staff development, appraisal include the appraising of the teaching staff; non-teaching staff, resources; management styles and general atmosphere within the school, as well as parents. The ultimate aims and objectives are the improvement of learning conditions and experiences for learners, which can be brought about by thorough planning and preparation of the school climate.

2.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter has explored the understanding of supervision and staff development. Historical development of these concepts were reviewed. A collaborative approach to supervision and staff development was advanced. Linkages between these two terms were explained, and the importance of maintaining a healthy balance between individual needs and interests, and that of the organisation was advocated. Underpinning supervision and the development of staff are the three management process steps of goal setting, design and implementation of plans and appraisal for feedback purposes, so that change or adjustments can be made to the programme. The next chapter will present a detailed exposition of the research methodology that this study will be using.

CHAPTER 3

3. METHODS OF COLLECTING DATA

3.1 INTRODUCTION

One of the objectives of this study as set out in Chapter One, was to seek the principal's understanding of his/her role in staff development, as well as to ascertain what his/her supervision strategies were and the extent to which those strategies enhanced educators' professional development. Relevant literature on supervision and staff development was reviewed in Chapter Two with a view to getting a better understanding of the concept of supervision as an aspect of staff development. This chapter sets out to show how information was collected, that would help find answers to questions posed in Chapter One. Instruments that were used to obtain information were interviews and questionnaires. These two instruments are discussed in the following paragraphs.

3.2 SELECTION OF CANDIDATES TO THE SAMPLE

The target population of the study were schools in the previously disadvantaged areas of KwaMashu/Ntuzuma and Inanda. These areas are familiar to the researcher and were easily accessible to him in terms of travelling costs involved. It was also easier for the researcher to go in and conduct the study within the short time available. Schools covered by this study fall under KwaMashu and Inanda districts. Including all educators in the two districts would have been very difficult in terms of time constraints and financial costs involved. However, to ensure that reliable conclusions could be drawn, a representative sample of (50) fifty educators out of 229 was constructed. Both secondary and primary schools were included in the sample.

A systematic sampling technique was used whereby, out of (80) eighty schools falling under the two districts, every eighth school was selected to the sample. The educators and a principal from each of the selected schools participated.

3.3 INTERVIEWS

Interviews in a research method that involves “two person conversation” initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research-relevant information, and focussed on the content specified by research objectives of systematic description or explanation (Cohen: Manion 1989: 307-308). Interviews are characterised by direct verbal, face-to-face interactions between individuals, one being the interviewer and the other, the interviewee, as well as flexibility and simplicity (Johnson 1994: 43; Powney & Watts 1987: 7-9).

Interviewing is one of the most effective methods of data collection as it gives the interviewer ample opportunity of giving to respondents full and detailed explanations of the purpose of the study. The respondent is afforded an opportunity to understand what is required of him/her. For example, the respondent might not understand what the question requires of him/her, and with this research method, the researcher can clarify further (Soer 1997: 106). It is highly flexible in that the respondent can answer in his or her own words. Another advantage of using an interviews schedule is that the interviewer has the opportunity of persuading respondents to participate in the project, by emphasising the significance of his/her role in the study, which otherwise would not have been possible had the study been undertaken for instance by using posted questionnaires. Interviews ensure maximum participation by respondents/interviewees, and the initiative as well as control of the process remains with the interviewer, unlike questionnaires where control rests with the respondents (Johnson 1994: 44). It also allows for greater depth than is the case with other methods of collecting data.

There are, other in-built shortcomings in this tool of data collection. One of the main disadvantages of interviews is that it is difficult to compare data obtained from various respondents so as to arrive at reliable generalisation. Another drawback is that it is time consuming, and makes heavy demands on the researcher's time, thus it is not suitable for a large number of respondents. An alternative to this would be the use of hired

hands (hired persons), but that option too, is expensive in terms of financial costs involved (Soer 1997). Other authors like Powney & Watts (1997); Cohen & Manion (1989); and Soer (1997) acknowledge the fact that interviews are prone to subjectivity and bias and therefore the use of structured questions in the interview is preferred to counter this problem.

In this study, structured interviews were used as a method of collecting data from principals concerning their views about supervision and staff development. This method was useful for greater in-depth questioning of principal's opinions and attitudes about supervision and staff development. The personal interaction that this method uses, is favoured for a number of reasons: there is an opportunity for respondents to ask questions where clarification is sought; there is an opportunity for the interviewer to probe and follow up on responses from interviewees; it has a good rate of return; it is suitable for small scale survey, like this study; and lastly, principals were implored to acknowledge the value of their participation for the project to succeed. An interview was used in conjunction with questionnaires although the latter was only used to collect information from a larger number of respondents (50 educators), to find out what their perceptions were of supervision and its role in the staff development exercise.

3.4 QUESTIONNAIRES

A questionnaire is a document that is distributed to respondents either by post or filled in by respondents in the presence of the researcher, in order to obtain information from them about something (Soer 1997: 107-108). The nature of questionnaires as research tool is such that control remains in the hands of the respondents and is completed by him/her in his/her own time. They empower respondents in that the latter may read all the questions in his/her own time, before filling them in, and may decide not to fill them in at all if he/she so desires (Johnson 1994:37).

In this study, both closed and open-ended questions were used. Closed questions for quantitative data and open-ended

questions for in-depth probing of respondents, for them to freely express their feelings in their own words.

The questionnaire as a tool of data collection is widely used on social and educational research world wide. It has many advantages over other tools of information gathering. One advantage is that it saves time, as it can take only about one hour for the principal or educator to complete, thus not infringing too much on their time. It can afford a good measure of objectivity in soliciting and coding of responses. It also allows for uniformity in the way questions are asked, thus ensuring greater comparability in the responses (Monly 1978: 189); (Oppenheim 1966: 13-16) and (Mason & Bramley 1978: 78). It is generally regarded as one of the best available instruments for obtaining information from a widely spread source (Soer 1997: 108).

Questionnaires too, have disadvantages that must be borne in mind when using them. It has poor rate of return, opportunities for asking questions for clarification purposes are limited and chances for personal interaction are limited. Opportunity for probing is minimised and it may be expensive to administer in terms of large volumes of printing work and postage, whilst at the same time, less responses can be expected (Cohen & Marion 1989: 308). Questionnaires were used in this study to solicit information from educators', as explained in the first paragraph. It was administered among 50 educators, drawn from 80 schools in Inanda and Kwa-Mashu districts. They were allocated to the study by using systematic sampling. Both interviews and questionnaires were used. Interviews were used for 10 principals' and questionnaires for 50 educators. Questionnaires saved on time available and made comparisons, coding and analysis much easier to handle.

3.5 ANALYSIS OF DATA

Collected data was manually recorded and presented in the form of tables to ensure it was clear and easy to understand. Analysis was done manually. There was both quantitative and qualitative data to deal with.

3.6 CONCLUSION

The research used both interviews and questionnaires to collect data from respondents. Collected data are presented and analysed in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER 4

4. PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This study aimed to obtain an understanding of educators' perceptions regarding supervision as an aspect of staff development. It sought to assess the principal's understanding of his/her role in staff development. It also sought to ascertain the extent to which the principal's supervision strategies enhanced educators' professional development. A structured questionnaire with both open-ended as well as closed questions was administered on educators in order to solicit information from them about their perceptions regarding supervision and staff development.

In this chapter, data collected from educators and principals is presented and analysed to obtain their views on supervision and staff development. Tables are used to present data.

4.2 QUESTIONNAIRES FOR EDUCATORS

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

4.2.1 Section A

4.2.1.1 Presentation of data on general information

Section A was on general information of the respondents. The researcher needed information from respondents regarding experience, sex age and position they hold at school. The following responses were recorded:

TABLE A POSITION HELD BY EDUCATORS

	%
Teacher	88
HoD	12
Total	100

The overwhelming majority of educators who participated in the survey were teachers (post level one educators) (88%), however, Heads of Departments (HoD) (2%) did participate. Their participation helps in presenting a balanced view about the perceptions of educators in general.

TABLE B EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS

Range (Years)	%
1-5	18
6-10	20
11-15	18
16-20	06
21-25	10
26-30	04
31-40	02
Un-Identified	22
Total	100

82%

The majority of educators (82%) had more than 5 years experience, and 18% had below 5 years experience. They did not want to disclose their ages. It is worth noting that the majority of educators were above 5 years experience; they have been in the educational field for a considerable time, and are still energetic and can bring about some changes and transform the education landscape.

TABLE C SEX OF RESPONDENTS

Sex	%
Male	38
Female	60
Un-Identified	02
Total	100

60% of educators surveyed were females and 38% male. The data is understandable, considering the fact that the 60% of schools sampled were primary schools. Female educators are more likely to be found in primary schools than secondary schools in the South African education system. The equity regulations have not yet made an impact on existing structures.

TABLE D AGES OF RESPONDENTS

Age Range	%
20-30	12
31-40	46
41-50	26
51-60	02
Un-Identified	14
Total	100

72%

72% Of educators were in the 31-50 year age group, with 14% who did not reveal their ages. 82% of educators had more than 5 years experience, with 22% not disclosing their experience.

4.2.2 Section B – data on supervision and staff development

This section asked for information that would throw light on the perceptions of educators on the question of supervision and staff development.

4.2.2.1 Presentation of data on supervision and staff development

In questions 7-16 educators were required to state whether or not they agreed with the statement given.

4.2.2.1.1 Question 7

The question asked whether respondents agreed or not with the statement that there was no programme for staff development in their schools.

	%
Strongly agreed	04
Agreed	28
Neutral	06
Disagree	44
Strongly disagreed	14
No Response	04
Total	100

58%

32% confirmed that there was no programme for staff development in their schools, while 58% disagreed, thus claiming that there were staff development programmes in their schools. Those who disagreed with the statement indicated that meetings were held where feedback on various educational issues affecting them were discussed. Some of those who disagreed could not back up their claims with details of what was going on in their schools.

The 32% who confirmed the non-existence of staff development programmes based their claims on the fact that the education department did not have guidelines for staff development and also that there were no structures for staff development.

4.2.2.1.2 Question 8

The question asked the respondents to state whether they regarded the principal as the main person responsible for staff development

	%
Strongly agreed	06
Agreed	18
Neutral	06
Disagree	48
Strongly Disagree	20
No response	02
Total	100

68%

The majority (68%) felt that the principal was not the main person responsible for staff development, with 24% agreeing that the principal was the person responsible for staff development. It is interesting to note that those who agreed with the statement mentioned three points, that is, the principal should work with the teachers on staff development issues; the he/she should organise meetings for staff development and lastly, that he/she leads, therefore he is responsible for development. The majority of educators that disagreed also maintained that the principal should involve his/her management team and that the teaching staff should be consulted.

4.2.2.1.3 Question 9

This question asked the respondents to state whether they agreed or not with the statement that there was no collaboration among educators to build each other up.

	%
Strongly agreed	02
Agreed	24
Neutral	08
Disagree	32
Strongly Disagree	28
No Response	06
Total	100

60%

60% felt that educators were collaborating to build each other up, with 26% feeling that indeed there was no collaboration among educators to build each other up. Many of those who disagreed claimed that the meetings were held where ideas on diverse topics were shared among educators, with management included. Others felt that there was collaboration among educators, because they worked as a team and they promoted team work among themselves.

Those who agreed with the statement gave varying reasons, for instance that there was no development programme; it was not educators' duties or responsibility to build each other up; and that there was a lack of guidance from school management.

4.2.1.4 Question 10

This question asked the respondents to state whether they agreed or not with the statement that there was no need for staff development, if one is well qualified.

	%
Strongly agreed	-
Agreed	-
Neutral	-
Disagree	38
Strongly Disagree	62
Total	100

It must be noted that all respondents were unanimous (100%) in saying that staff development was not reserved for educators who were not well qualified, but that all educators need to develop as there are new trends in the field of educators and that knowledge was dynamic and ever changing, and all educators needed improvement. Networking and sharing of experience was part and parcel of staff development, needed by both qualified and less qualified alike.

4.2.2.1.5 Question 11

This question asked the respondents to state whether they agreed or not with the statement that supervision has nothing to do with staff development.

	%	
Strongly agreed	04	
Agreed	08	
Neutral	02	
Disagree	44	80%
Strongly Disagree	36	
No Response	06	
Total	100	

An overwhelming majority (80%) felt that supervision and staff development were related 12% feeling that the two concepts were not related. The majority (80%) stated that supervision and staff development went hand in hand. They said that supervision had to do with checking progress that was being made, that there was a need to detect weakness and thereafter correct those shortcomings for the improvement of teaching. It is once again to note that the 12% that agreed with the statement did not differ much from the 80% that disagreed with the statement. They maintained that staff development was for improvement and new methods, whereas supervision was there check right from wrong (the latter is a narrow conception of supervision).

4.2.2.1.6 Question 12

This question asked the respondents to state whether they agreed or not with the statement that staff development for junior staff only.

	%	
Strongly agreed	02	
Agreed	00	
Neutral	00	
Disagree	32	
Strongly Disagree	66	98%
Total	100	

Again the respondents were quite clear that staff development was not for junior staff only (98%). In this question, as in Question 10, all respondents answered the question. The same sentiments were expressed, namely that staff needed to cope with changes in education and to improve that performance.

4.2.2.1.7 Question 13

This question asked the respondents to state whether they agreed or not with the statement that supervision meant that they as educators were incompetent.

	%	
Strongly agreed	02	
Agreed	00	
Neutral	02	
Disagree	40	
Strongly Disagree	56	96%
Total	100	

96% of educators deny the notion that supervision and incompetence were related. Like in the previous two questions, i.e. development to qualification and development to seniority respectively, they stated that human beings were not open to improvement, and as supervision was guidance given to educators for developments, competency was not an issue.

4.2.2.1.8 Question 14

This question asked the respondents to state whether they agreed or not with the statement that the principal was not competent enough to supervise them.

	%	
Strongly agreed	00	
Agreed	14	
Neutral	10	
Disagree	30	72%
Strongly Disagree	42	
No Response	04	
Total	100	

72% felt that the principal was competent to supervise them. 14% felt that the principal was not competent and they cited the following reasons that educators did not like supervision. One said that the principal lacked the courage to tell them to do their work. Two felt that supervision should be a team effort, while the rest felt that the principal did not possess skills. The majority (78%) said that it was the principal's duty to supervise them, however, he/she should establish participative structuring and that it should not be a solo effort.

4.2.2.1.9 Question 15

This question asked the respondents to state whether they agreed or not with the statement that the principal did not guide them because he/she did not understand staff development.

	%	
Strongly agreed	04	
Agreed	10	
Neutral	18	
Disagree	38	64%
Strongly Disagree	26	
No Response	04	
Total	100	

The majority (64%) of those who disagreed with the statement stated that the principal guided the, had him/herself attended workshops; had skills and thus understood staff development.

4.2.2.1.10 Question 16

This question asked the respondents to state whether they agreed or not with statement that the supervision was about finding faults with the educator.

		%
Strongly agreed		02
Agreed		06
Neutral		04
Disagree		26
Strongly Disagree		62
Total		100

	88%
--	-----

The majority (88%) disagreed with the statement, thus claiming that supervision was not about finding faults with the educator. These educators felt that supervision was about guiding, helping and developing of educators. It was of a corrective nature. It is important to note that those that agreed with the statement cited principals who used what they called traditional methods of supervision, and not that supervision per se was a fault finding exercise.

4.2.2.2 *Question 17 to 30*

These question were open-ended, and they were designed in order to give the respondents an opportunity to express their views on the questions of supervisors and staff development

4.2.2.2.1 Question 17

This question asked the respondents to state what they understood by the term "supervision" .

The majority felt that supervision was control, it was a mechanism to check the progress that educators were making. Another educator felt that it was guidance by superiors to ensure that organisational goals were achieved. Others maintained that it was a development focussed endeavour meant to overcome shortcomings identified during appraisal. Only one mentioned the point that supervision was a motivation to perform.

4.2.2.2.2 Question 18

This question asked the respondents how they felt about supervision.

The majority said that they found supervision helpful in many respects like ensuring that work was done and that standard set were maintained. Others said that it helped in identifying problem areas and also helped in overcoming those problems with a view to improving the teaching and learning situation.

Some emphasized the point that supervision must be formative in nature geared towards educator development. They all said that they hated supervision which was summative, evaluative and meant to criticise the educator.

4.2.2.2.3 Question 19

This question asked the respondents to state whether or not They were ever supervised by their principals.

	%
Yes	76
No	24
Total	100

76% were supervised by their principals . however, among those who said they were never supervised by their principals, the majority of respondents claimed that supervision was done by the Head of Department (HoD) and not the principal and that is why they said that they were not supervised by their principals . Others said that the supervision exercise was stopped by the teacher unions because principals had misused it by focussing on the negatives only.

4.2.2.2.4 Question 20

This question was divided into two section. The first section asked the respondents who had been supervised before to explain how they experienced the supervision exercise. The second section asked respondents who claimed that they were never supervised before to explain why they were never supervised before.

The majority (76%) had been supervised, and had found Supervision helpful, especially because:

- a. It was guidance orientated.
- b. It sought to correct mistakes they were making.
- c. It motivated them to do their work on time.

Some of the above said that in the beginning of the supervision exercise, they were tense and nervous, but did enjoy it later.

4.2.2.2.5 Question 21

This question asked respondents what they understood by staff development.

An overwhelming majority of respondents staff development as a planned deliberate exercise that was undertaken to analyse their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT), of all aspect of their professional work, with an objective of consolidating their strengths and opportunities and minimising or correcting the weakness, thereby uplifting and improving their teaching skills. Some characterised staff development as the sharing of ideas; it was keeping abreast of changes and new methods. It comprised meetings for upliftment or improvement.

4.2.2.2.6 Question 22

This question asked the respondents to state what role they thought the principal could play in staff development.

The responses can be divide into three categories

- a. Those who advocated a leading role by the principal, in terms of organising monitoring and assessing the progress of staff development programmes.
- b. Those who felt that the principal should give them (educators) opportunities to develop themselves through workshops and seminars and only play a supportive role and be available in case they needed his/her assistance
- c. This group is linked (b) above in that they advocated the use of in-service training within the school. They however emphasizes the utilisation of outside expertise from institutions and persons outside the school .

4.2.2.2.7 Question 23

This question asked the respondents whether or not they thought supervision could lead to staff development.

	%
Yes	82
No	08
No Response	10
Total	100

The majority of respondents (82%) believed that supervision led to staff development. They cited SWOT analysis as a needs assessment technique used during supervision to identify staff development needs.

4.2.2.2.8 Question 24

This question asked the respondents what they thought needed to be done in order for staff to develop competencies.

The majority advocated for the establishment or strengthening of Subject Committees to share knowledge and skills in different subject areas and organise workshops to cover areas that needed more professional attention.

Appraisal was suggested as forming part of the supervision and staff development process. There were also noticeable responses that advocated the whole question of intensifying control and supervision activities for the purpose of improving their competencies.

4.2.2.2.9 Question 25

This question asked the respondents to state the role that they could play on programmes for improving their competencies.

The majority of respondents believed that they could be very active in organising, and preparing for staff development programmes in collaboration with other staff members. They felt that if they could be given an opportunity to express their views freely, they would generate ideas that would help

them overcome their shortcomings. What they disliked most was a programme that had been designed to share their skills and knowledge with their colleagues who lacked them.

4.2.2.2.10 Question 26

This question asked the respondents to state who they thought should play the leading role in staff development.

Four groups emerged from the responses from educators:

- a. No particular should play a leading role in staff development. Any person with necessary skills should play a leading role.
- b. It should be the principal and HoD in consultation with educators in the school who play a leading role.
- c. It should be the principal.
- d. It should be the principal and his/ her management team. The Department of Education should be heavily involved in terms of providing a framework and guidelines in how staff development should be carried out.

4.2.2.2.11 Question 27

This question asked the respondents what they thought were the benefits of supervision by principals.

The majority of responses fell into three categories.

The first group of responses said that supervision helped with SWOT analysis of educators' needs, before contemplated assistance could be given.

The second group said that supervision helped with providing therapeutic assistance to educators' detected deficiencies and improved their proficiencies.

The last group felt supervision by principals facilitated smooth achievements (good results). Very few responses mentioned the point that supervision helped in making

educators aware of new innovations in the field of education.

4.2.2.2.12 Question 28

This question asked respondents who they thought was the Most appropriate person to supervise their work.

The following table present their responses to the question:

	%	
HoD	44	90%
Hod & other Stakeholders	08	
Collegues	18	
All Stakeholders	20	
Principal alone	00	
No Response	10	
Total	100	

The above statistics tell us two things. Firstly, the overwhelming majority (90%) wanted inclusivity of all role players including the principal. Secondly, no-one wanted the principal to single handedly supervise his/her work.

4.2.2.2.13 Question 29

This question asked respondents whether or not they thought that educators had negative attitude towards supervision and why they had thoughts like that.

	%
Yes	66
No	26
No Response	08
Total	100

66% felt that educator did have negative attitude towards supervision. The reasons they cited for educators to have such negative attitudes were, inter alia, the perception that supervision was wrongly conducted, it was a fault finding exercise and that was oppressive. That was the view of the majority of respondents; however, other responses were that educators had no confidence in themselves; they were not properly guided by their HoD's and also that their HoD's had no planning regarding supervision and that educators therefore ended up not planning their work.

It is interesting to note that the 26% respondents that said that educators did not have a negative attitude towards supervision as such, maintained that what educators wanted and needed was fairness in the conduction of the supervision exercise.

4.2.2.2.14 Question 30

This question asked respondents who had responded affirmatively to question 29, what they thought could change those negative attitudes.

The majority of responses echoed the sentiments if

supervision could be conducted correctly, attitude could change. By "correct", it was meant that supervision should not be policing spying or criticising them in the name of supervision. It should be conducted in an objective manner, not to favour some educators at the expense of others. They felt that supervision should aim at enhancing the educators' professional skills and confidence. Another important view expressed by educators was that educators should be developed first before they can be supervised.

Those respondents who felt that educators did not have negative attitudes towards supervision were asked if they had found supervision to be helpful in their teaching.

Two major views emerged. The first one said that supervision had been helpful in detecting mistakes timeously and those mistakes were immediately attended to. Those corrective measures resulted in the improvement of teaching and the learning situation.

The second group of responses found supervision to be helpful in developing them and making them contribute positively in professional development seminar or subject meetings. They felt that the above mentioned scenario's had an impact in raising their self confidence, thus improving the standard of teaching and learning.

4.3 THE PRINCIPALS' INTERVIEWS

4.3.1 Section A

4.3.1.1 Presentation of data on general information

The first Section A was on general information pertaining to age, sex and experience of principals in those positions.

Table A POSITION HELD BY EDUCATORS

Ranges (Years)	%
21-30	00
31-40	40
41-50	60
51-60	00
	100

The ages of principals surveyed ranged between 31 and 50, as in the case with teachers this indicated that all of them (100%) were in the prime of their teaching careers, they were still energetic and could change and introduce changes and contribute in the transformation in the field of education as they still had time ahead of them.

TABLE B SEX OF RESPONDENTS

Sex	%
Male	70
Female	30
	100

Although the majority of schools surveyed were primary schools, with the teaching staff predominantly females, when it came to management position, the majority of managers were males.

**TABLE C EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS
IN THEIR POSITIONS**

Experience (year)	%
1-5	90
6-10	10
11-15	-
16-20	-
	100

All principals surveyed (100%) were below 10 years experience as principals. This experience did not take into account their experiences as educators. The fact that these principals were not very old in their positions could suggest that they were more amenable to innovations that could be introduced to education in terms of new styles and strategies of management of schools.

4.3.2 Section B

4.3.2.1 Data on supervision and staff development

This section asked the principal for information that would help reveal their understanding of supervision and staff development.

4.3.2.2 Presentation of data supervision and staff development

Question 1-19 were open-ended and were designed to give the respondents an opportunity to express their views on the question of staff development and supervision of educators.

4.3.2.2.1 Question 1

This question asked the respondents what they understood by supervision.

The majority of respondents viewed supervision as a control mechanism to check if educators were doing their work in accordance with agreed upon standards. It entailed evaluation at regular intervals with an aim of developing teachers. Many of them regarded supervision as an all embracing process that linked planning, designing and implementation of policies and strategies with the achievement of goals and objectives.

Only one respondent felt that supervision involved first and foremost role modelling to subordinates on what the principal stands for, for example punctuality and discipline. These virtues must be exemplified by the way the principal behaves.

4.3.2.2.2 Question2

This question asked respondents whether or not they accepted that it was their duty as principals to supervise their staff.

They all confirmed that it was their duty to supervise their colleagues in the rank of teacher. Amongst the reasons they believed it was their duty to supervise were the following:

It was their duty to supervise; they needed to

develop and correct the problem areas; keeping of standards and to support and guide their subordinates without making the process a fault finding mission.

4.3.2.2.3 Question 3

The question asked the respondents what they thought was the role of supervision in schools.

The majority of respondents thought that supervision played the role of ensuring that the school's goal and objectives were achieved, and that educators were developed and appraised.

4.3.2.2.4 Question 4

This question asked the respondents to indicate the methods of supervision that they used to supervise their staff members.

The majority said that they used persuasion and dialogue with educators as they could not have access to teachers' records (files/schemes and preparation document) because of teacher unions' objections to these practices.

Some had established all-inclusive participative management structures that sought agreement on how educators' performances could be assessed and appraised, without the educators' right and conditions of service being negatively affected by such supervisory behaviours.

They were all in agreement in saying that walking around the school yard to observe order or lack thereof. Was all that was left for them in this interim period, because they do not have access to both educators' and learners' written work.

They all claimed that they maintained control of administrative aspect of schools management, like controlling punctuality (time-books); class attendances (attendance time tables); school attendance (leave registers).

4.3.2.2.5 Question 5

This question asked the respondents what their staff reactions were to the supervision behaviours of principals.

The majority claimed that their reactions were positive given the fact that the department was gradually introducing the appraisal system in schools. However, confusion was still reigning in most schools regarding mechanism of managing supervision and staff development programmes during this period of transition, in the light of teacher unions' alleged suspension of principals' free access to educators' work books.

There were other reported cases of educators being against any form of supervision, except administrative ones that have been mentioned in the previous questions.

4.3.2.2.6 Question 6

This question asked the respondents to indicate if there had been any change in the educators reactions to supervision.

Many respondents linked the resistance of educators to supervision with the struggle for liberation period of the 1980's. The advent of democracy in South Africa in 1994 brought

with it more demands by educators for their right and challenged the principal each time they felt their rights were being infringed upon. Now that normality was being brought back in the field of education through various legislations and guidelines on appraisal, restructuring to salary payment and so on, their attitudes are gradually changing in anticipation of the appraisal systems that will be implemented soon.

4.3.2.2.7 Question 7

This question asked the respondents to indicate the name of the highest and the lowest qualifications of their staff members, as well as the number of educators holding those qualifications.

1,3% of educators had Master's degrees while 5,2% had P.T.C.(Primary Teacher Certificate) M+1. The rest had M+3 up to M+5 qualifications.

Qualification	%
Maters	1.3
M+2=> M+5	93.5
P.T.C	5.2
Total	100

4.3.2.2.8 Question 8

This question asked the respondents to state and explain how motivated their staff was to develop each other.

Most respondents claimed that their staff members were motivated to develop one another. This was backed up by the fact that most educators were upgrading their professional qualifications despite the fact that there was no monetary incentive any longer. They were also attending a number of workshops covering a wide range of professional and co-curricular areas, especially in light of the introduction of curriculum 2005. The question of rationalisation and redeployment however had had a negative effect on the motivation levels of educators in the ranks of teacher.

4.3.2.2.9 Question 9

This question asked the respondents to explain their roles in the motivation levels of educators.

Most principals said that they had had a positive influence on their staff in terms of making them see the need to further their qualifications and attending relevant workshop that would help them in coping with their curricular challenges during this stage of transformation.

One had invited an outside expert to address teachers in motivation, stress management and the legal implications of the interactions with learner.

4.3.2.2.10 Question 10

This question asked respondents to state what they viewed the general atmosphere of their schools to be.

Although many respondents claimed that the general atmosphere was positive with no

tensions and factionalism, many indicated that most teachers were pretending to be happy, because in most schools surveyed educators needed to be pressured to go to their classes and teach. Some principals attributed this state of affairs to the fact that many of the educators who were reluctant to attend their classes are the same ones who do not want to have their work assessed, and further more that they started teaching in the 1990's when political change seemed imminent and the perceived oppression was disappearing .

4.3.2.2.11 Question 11

This question asked the respondents to indicate if they were familiar with the concept of staff development and what they understood by it.

All respondents responded in the affirmative and supported their understanding by stating

that they understood staff development to include personal and professional development of the teaching staff. They agreed that it involved keeping abreast of the latest development in the field of education, that is to expose educators to experiences that would help them grow professionally so that they could understand their learners better providing them with appropriate learning experiences thereby improving the teaching and learning situation. Some did mention appraisal as forming part of staff development which they all agreed was a process and not an unplanned, haphazard act.

4.3.2.2.12 Question 12

This question asked the respondents to explain

how they encourage their staff to improve their teaching skills.

Many mentioned various strategies and action plans like subject committees, workshops and team teaching. The most important aspect which posed a threat to their endeavours was the fact that they could not find out if educators lacked certain skills because they did not have access to their work. Principals only discover if there had been some problems in certain classes after results had been released at the end of the year. It is only then that they discuss learner performance and begin to devise some means of addressing the problem.

4.3.2.2.13 Question 13

This question asked the respondents whether or not they viewed it their duty to ensure that educators improved their teaching methods.

They unanimously agreed that it was their duty because as heads of schools, they had to ensure that the learners were taught effectively, that standards were maintained, that they supported educators with their development needs and that the image of the school was maintained.

4.3.2.2.14 Question 14

This question asked respondents if their staff shared their views.

There were two respondents who felt that their staff members did not share their views because there were still some mistrust between the principal and the teacher (Level 1 educator) regarding supervision, and that educators owed

their allegiance first and foremost to their teacher unions.

4.3.2.2.15 Question 15

This question asked the respondents if they thought supervision and staff development were related.

They all agreed that the two concept were related . They all felt that staff development should come first and then supervision. Some felt that progress should be checked, and problems and shortcomings identified before corrective measures are taken, thus improving educators' teaching skills. Some thought that supervision could be linked with the achievement of school goals. This implies close linkage between supervision and staff development.

4.3.2.2.16 Question 16

This question asked the respondents to state what their future plans regarding staff development were.

Most principals mentioned the establishment of goals driven staff development which would include whole school development covering many areas like school governance, finance and stress management, educator appraisal systems and fund-raising as major areas that needed immediate attention in the light of current transformation of education in particular and the whole of South African society in general.

4.3.2.2.17 Question 17

This question asked the respondents to state

what they foresaw as major stumbling blocks to the realisation of their dreams.

They all cited financial constraints as a major obstacle which inhibited their schools from acquiring enough physical and human resources. The economic conditions prevailing in areas where these schools were located made it impossible to raise funds for the school. The security situation in the schools localities made investments in such areas very difficult, and that resulted in those schools remaining heavily under-resourced. Lastly, the current rationalisation and redeployment exercise by the department, was one of the obstacles that undermined educators' morale levels.

4.3.2.2.18 Question 18

This question asked respondents to indicate the strategies they would use to overcome the said problems.

Most respondents viewed workshops focussing on whole school development (W.S.D) as an important solution. Whole school development would include such topic as finance and stress management, school governance, staff development, appraisal, fund-raising skills, to name but a few. Skilled people from outside the school will be utilised. Fund-raising projects will be re-investigated in order for the school to be able to resource itself, independent of the department.

4.4 DISCUSSION

The discussion of the data presented will follow a pattern which puts the results against the objectives of the study. In other words, each objective of the study will be presented as well as the results of the study regarding that particular objective.

4.4.1 OBJECTIVE 1: TO ASSESS THE PRINCIPAL'S UNDERSTANDING OF HIS/HER ROLE IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Principals understood their roles in staff development that of control as a mechanism for checking the progress educators were making. They understood their roles as that of giving guidance, support and guidelines to educators to ensure that development contemplated during the planning stage was consistent with the goals and objectives of the school. However, results revealed that there was and support. Many educators indicated that principals were competent to supervise them, but in practice this was not happening. Result also showed that some principals lacked courage to tell educators what to do while other principals lacked skills. The above mentioned point was observed by the researcher in some of the schools visited where some principals seemed to lack confidence and self esteem and showed anxiety in approaching educators under their care. While they seemed to have an understanding of their roles in staff development, it was quite evident that the know how of it was lacking.

4.4.2 OBJECTIVE 2: TO ASCERTAIN THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PRINCIPAL'S SUPERVISION STRATEGIES ENHANCED EDUCATORS' PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Supervision strategies used by principals did not enhance educator's professional development. Result of this study have revealed that there was no clear strategy of supervising educators. Most of them were only engaged in administrative work like time book keeping.

4.4.3. OBJECTIVE 3: TO OBTAIN AN UNDERSTANDING OF EDUCATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISION AS AN ASPECT OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT.

Educators had an idea of supervision, but not staff development, if they regarded it as part of staff development. They failed to relate their perceptions of supervision to the real situation. The researcher had an impression that somebody somewhere had been telling them what staff development was but not telling them how it is done. I found contradictions in their thinking. They accepted the role that the principal can play while at the same time rejecting him/her as a supervisor.

4.5 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, collected data was presented and analysed. Results were highlighted for the purpose of advancing discussion and analysis. The next chapter will present details pertaining to findings and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER 5

5 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This study sought to assess the principals' understanding of their role in staff development. It succeeded in getting an insight into what principals understood staff development to be. Secondly, it sought to ascertain the extent to which the principals' supervision strategies enhanced educators' professional development. Thirdly, it aimed to obtain an understanding of educators' perceptions regarding supervision as an aspect of staff development. In this chapter, findings are tabled and recommendations suggested.

5.2 FINDINGS

The following findings were recorded after data had been analysed.

5.2.1 To assess the principal's understanding of his/her role in staff development

Principals had the desire to play a constructive role in the professional development of their teaching staff, but unfortunately they seemed to lack the capacity to do it.

5.2.2 To ascertain the extent to which the principal's supervision strategies, enhanced educators' professional development.

Principals' supervision strategies as currently employed were found not to be enhancing educators' professional development. There needs to be a way to restore dignity, trust and confidence among principals and educators. There is a long way to go before this can

happen. As the discussion showed, there was resistance to supervision by principals. Nothing has changed in schools in spite of claims by the department that management have been empowered.

- 5.2.3 To obtain an understanding of educators' perceptions regarding supervision as an aspect of staff development

Educators did not have a clear understanding of supervision as an aspect of staff development. They were found to have a confused idea of staff development and supervision. They did not understand the role that the principal should be playing by accepting the role in a school situation.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings after data had been collected, presented and analysed, the following recommendations are suggested

- 5.3.1 To assess the principals understanding of his/her role in Staff development.

Principals are aware of their role in staff development , however, they lack capacity to implement their knowledge. They did not know how to apply it . They therefore need capacity building. They should be exposed to training in how supervision and staff development should be applied. Instead of taking principals away from school to attend workshops, this training should take place within schools where problems are being experienced.

- 5.3.2 To ascertain the extent to which principals' supervision strategies enhanced educators' professional development.

Linked with the above recommendation, principals can (with their confidence restored) sit down with

their staff and discuss ways of designing and implementing staff development programmes. Transparent, democratic structures should be created, with full participation of educators, to monitor the implementation of such programmes. Time frames should be built-in as well as mechanisms of appraising the programmes.

- 5.3.3 To obtain an understanding of educators' perception regarding supervision as an aspect of staff development.

The results of this study have proved that educators know what they want, they know they need supervision and they need to develop, however, confusion persists with regard to aligning their views on supervision and reality. It is therefore recommended that educators and principals hold discussions about aims and procedures of supervision.

Both principals and educators need workshops on the two concepts of supervision and staff development.

5.4 CONCLUSION

This study was about seeking an understanding of the role of the principal in staff development. It sought to establish the understanding that the principal had about his/her role in staff development. Whether or not principals' supervision strategies were impacting on staff development was one of this research's prime concerns. It also wanted to find out what perception educators had regarding supervision and staff development with specific focus on supervision as an aspect of staff development. Before the investigation was undertaken, literature was reviewed to gain insight into the diversity of views held by different stakeholders on the question of supervision and staff development. The three basic assumptions postulated in Chapter One were confirmed by the results presented in Chapter Four.

REFERENCE LIST

1. ALFONSO, R.J., FIRTH, G.R. and NEVILLE, R.F (1981) INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION. A BEHAVIOUR SYSTEM, Boston : Allyn & Bacon.
2. BARNHART, R.K.(Editor)(1995) WORLD BOOK DICTIONARIES, Volume 24, Chicago : World Book/Inc.
3. BELL, L. and DAY, C. (Editor) MANAGING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS, Philadelphia : Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
4. BURKE, P.J. and FESSELER, R. (1993) A COLLABORATE APPROACH TO SUPERVISION (Articles) Clearing House, Volume 57, No 31. November 1983.
5. CAWOOD, J. and GIBBONS, J. (1981) EDUCATION LEADERSHIP STAFF DEVELOPMENT, Cape Town : Nasou Limited.
6. CLOETE, J.J.N. (1985) PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION J.L., Pretoria : van Schaik (Pty)Ltd .
7. COHEN, L. and MANION, L. (1989) (3rd Edition) RESEARCH METHODS IN EDUCATION, London : Rautledge.
8. DALE, E.L (1982) WHAT IS STAFF DEVELOPMENT : EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP? (Journal0 Volume 40 (i)
9. DILLON-PETERSON, B. (Editor) (1981) STAFF DEVELOPMENT ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE, Alexandra, Virginia.
10. GLOVER, D and LAW, S. (1996) MANAGING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION:

- ISSUES IN POLICY AND PRACTICE, London : Kogan Page Limited.
11. JACOBSON, P.B., LONGSON, J.D. and WIEGMAN, R.R. (1973) THE PRINCIPALSHIP : NEW PERSPECTIVES, New Jersey : Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
12. JOHNSON, D. (1994) RESEARCH METHODS IN EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT, London : Longman Publishers.
13. KYDD, L., CRAWFORD, M. and RICHES, C. (1997) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT. Buckingham, Philadelphia : University Press.
14. MAIN, A. (1985) EDUCATIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT, Beckenham, Kent, UK : Groom Helm Limited.
15. MASON, E.T. and BRAMBLE, W.T., (1978) UNDERSTANDING AND CONDUCTING RESEARCH : APPLICATION IN EDUCATION AND BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES, New York : McGraw-Hill.
16. MONLY, G.J. (1978) EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH: THE ART AND SCIENCE OF INVESTIGATING, Boston : Allyn & Bacon.
17. NSELE, S. (1994) AN INVESTIGATION OF PROFESSIONAL INDUCTION OF NEWLY APPOINTED TEACHERS IN POST-PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN THE KWAMSHU CIRCUIT OF KWAZULU DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE (Med. Dissertation), Natal University , Durban.
18. OLIVA, P.F (1989) SUPERVISION FOR TODAY'S SCHOOLS, New York : Longmans.
19. OPPENHEIM, A.N. (1996) QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND

ATTITUDE MEASUREMENT, London : Heineman.

20. POWENEY, J. and WATTS, M. (1987) INTERVIEWING IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, London :Routledge and Kegan.
21. RUE, L.W and BYARS, L.L. (1990) SUPERVISION KEY LINK TO PRODUCTIVITY (2nd Edition), Boston : Irwin.
22. SEYFARTH, J.T. (1996) PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT FOR EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS, (2nd Edition), Boston : Allyn & Bacon.
23. SOER, J.W.A. (Cmpiler) (1997) RESEARCH METHODOLOGY,National Higher Diploma: Educational Manegement (Notes), Azaliah College of Futher Education, Pretoria.
24. THURLEY, K. and WERDENIUS, H.(1973) SUPERVISION A REAPPAISAL, London : Heinemann.

25. VAN DER VYVER, J. (Editor) (1998) TEACHER DEVELOPMENT IN A CHANGING SOCIETY, Southern African Society for Education Conference held at Mount Beach Hotel, October 1998.
26. WEBB, G (1996) UNDERSTANDING STAFF DEVELOPMENT, Buckingham, Philadephia: University Press.
27. WILES, J. and BONDI, J. (1991) SUPERVISION-A GUIDE TO PRACTICE (3rd Edition), New York: Macmillan Company.

The Registra (Academic)
(ATT-Prof. R.G.P. Ngcongco)
University of Zululand
Durban-Umlazi Campus
Private Bag x 10
Isipingo
4110
05/08/1999

The Regional Chief Director
North Durban Region
Private Bag x 54323
Durban
4000

Dear Sir

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO SCHOOLS TO CONDUCT EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

I am conducting an educational research project. The study is carried out in schools in the Inanda, KwaMashu and Ntuzuma areas. Schools that are covered by the study fall under KwaMashu and Inanda Districts. This study investigates the role that the principal plays in the professional development of the teaching staff. Major objectives of the study are the following:

- (a) To seek the principal's understanding of his/her role in staff development.
- (b) To ascertain of the principal's supervision strategies do enhance the teacher's professional development.
- (c) To seek an understanding of educator's perceptions, regarding supervision as an aspect of staff development. My supervisor is Prof. N.Gawe.

I have to interview principals of schools that were selected for the study. I also have a questionnaire schedule to conduct among post level one educators during their spare time. The study will not disrupt the smooth running of target schools. Schools that have been selected for the study, are the following:

KwaMashu District

- (1) Nkulisabantu L.P.School
- (2) Isibonelo High School
- (3) Thandukwazi S.P School
- (4) Hilda Makhanya J.P School
- (5) Sondelani S.P School

Inanda District

- (1) Inanda Secondary School
- (2) Sifunimfundo Primary School
- (3) Imbaliyamazulu Primary School
- (4) Ohlange High School
- (5) Bhakilanga L.P School

I hope that this study will contribute towards an understanding of the concept of staff development and supervision of teachers by principals , as well as the understanding of the role that the principal can play in the professional development of the teaching staff.

I will be very grateful if my request to access to educators in your region, for the purpose of conducting this study, is accepted.

Yours Faithfully
Thamsanqa Thulani Bhengu (Researcher)



The Registra (Academic)
(ATT-Prof. R.G.P. Ngcongco)
University of Zululand
Durban-Umlazi Campus
Private Bag x 10
Isipingo
4110
05/08/1999

The Regional Chief Director
North Durban Region
Private Bag x 54323
Durban
4000

Dear Sir

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO SCHOOLS TO CONDUCT EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

I am conducting an educational research project. The study is carried out in schools in the Inanda, KwaMashu and Ntuzuma areas. Schools that are covered by the study fall under KwaMashu and Inanda Districts. This study investigates the role that the principal plays in the professional development of the teaching staff. Major objectives of the study are the following:

- (a) To seek the principal's understanding of his/her role in staff development.
- (b) To ascertain of the principal's supervision strategies do enhance the teacher's professional development.
- (c) To seek an understanding of educator's perceptions, regarding supervision as an aspect of staff development. My supervisor is Prof. N.Gawe.

I have to interview principals of schools that were selected for the study. I also have a questionnaire schedule to conduct among post level one educators during their spare time. The study will not disrupt the smooth running of target schools. Schools that have been selected for the study, are the following:

KwaMashu District

- (1) Nkulisabantu L.P.School
- (2) Isibonelo High School
- (3) Thandukwazi S.P School
- (4) Hilda Makhanya J.P School
- (5) Sondelani S.P School


Inanda District

- (1) Inanda Secondary School
- (2) Sifunimfundo Primary School
- (3) Imbaliyamazulu Primary School
- (4) Ohlange High School
- (5) Bhekilanga L.P School

I hope that this study will contribute towards an understanding of the concept of staff development and supervision of teachers by principals , as well as the understanding of the role that the principal can play in the professional development of the teaching staff.

I will be very grateful if my request to access to educators in your region, for the purpose of conducting this study, is accepted.

Yours Faithfully
Thamsanqa Thulani Bhengu (Researcher)



PROVINCE OF
KWAZULU-NATAL

ISIFUNDAZWE
SAKWAZULU - NATAL

PROVINSIE
KWAZULU-NATAL

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AND CULTURE

UMNYANGO YEMFUNDO
NAMA (IKO)

DEPARTEMENT VAN
ONDERWYS EN KULTUUR

ADDRESS: TSHALI: ADRES:	TRURO HOUSE 17 VICTORIA EMBANKMENT ESPLANADE DURBAN	PRIVATE BAG: ISIKHAWA SEPOSTI: PRIVAATSAK:	X54323 DURBAN 4000	TELEPHONE: UCINGO: TELEFOON:	(031) 3606911
ENQUIRIES: INCIBUZO: NAVRAE:		REFERENCE: INKOMBEA: VERWYSING:	031-3606090	DATE: USUKU: DATUM:	(031) 374251

31 August 1999

T.T. Bhengu
c/o University of Zululand
D.U.C
Private Bag x 10
Isipingo
4110

Dear Sir

PERMISSION TO ADMINISTER QUESTIONNAIRE AMONG EDUCATORS

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 05 August 1999.
I am pleased to say that permission to conduct research as per request is hereby granted.

We wish you luck in your project.

Yours Faithfully



G N MSIMANGO
ACSEM: INANDA

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EDUCATORS

The aim of this questionnaire is to obtain information from educators about the perception that they have regarding supervision and staff development. There are no correct or wrong answers. Respondents are requested to be as honest as they possibly can.

INSTRUCTIONS

Make an X in the appropriate block in response to each question. To elaborate please use space that has been provided for that.

SECTION A : GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name : _____
2. School : _____
3. Position held at school : _____
4. Number of years on the position :

1 - 5		01
6 - 10		02
11 - 15		03
16 - 20		04
21 - 25		05
26 - 30		06
ABOVE 30		07

5. Sex :

MALE		01
FEMALE		02

6. Age group :

20 -30		01
31 - 40		02
41 - 50		03
51 - 60		04
ABOVE 60		05

SECTION B : SUPERVISION AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

- (a) Place a mark (X) in the space next to the most appropriate rating that best describe your experience.
 (b) Give reasons for your choice in the space provided.
 (c) Respond to all items.

7. There is no programme for staff development in your school.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Give reasons for your answer:

8. The principal is the main person responsible for staff Development.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Give reasons for your answer:

9. There is no collaboration among educators to build each other up.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Give reasons for your answer :

10. There is no need for staff development if one is well qualified

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Give reasons for your answer :

11. Supervision has nothing to do with staff development.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Give reasons for your answer:

12. Staff development is for junior staff only.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Give reasons for your answer:

13. Supervision means that you, as an educator, are incompetent.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Give reasons for your answer:

14. The principal is not competent to supervise you.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Give reasons for your answer:

15. The principal does not guide you because he/she does not understand staff development.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Give reasons for your answer:

16. Supervision is about finding fault with the educator.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Give reasons for your answer:

17. What do you understand by supervision?

18. How do you feel about supervision?

19.(a) Were you ever supervised by you principal?

YES	
NO	

19(b) If yes, how was that experience: Explain.

19(c) If no, why not ? elaborate

20. What do you understand by staff development?

21. What role do you think the principal can play in staff development?

22(a) Do you think supervision can lead staff development?

YES	
NO	

22(b) Why do you think like that?

23. What do you think needs to be done in order for staff to develop their competencies?

24. What role can you play in such a programme?

25. Who do you think should play the leading role in staff development?

26. What do you think are the benefits of supervision by the principal?

27. Who do you think is the most appropriate person to supervise your work?

Place an X in the box next to the person of your choice.

(a)	Yourself	
(b)	Your Colleagues	
(c)	Principal	
(d)	Your HOD	
(e)	Your SEMC Superitendant Education Management	

Give reasons for your answer: _____

28(a) Do you think that educators have a negative attitude towards supervision?

YES	
NO	

If no

(d) Why do you think like that? Explain.

(e) If yes, what do you think can change those attitudes?

29(a) Have you found supervision to be helpful in your teaching?

YES	
NO	

(b) If yes, in what way is supervision helpful?

(c) If no, why have you found it unhelpful? Explain

If you have comment on staff development, write them in the space provided below.

Thank you for your co-operation.

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES FOR PRINCIPALS

The main aim of this interview is to selait information that will reveal the approach that the respondents uses to supervise his/her staff .Secondly this instrument strives to gain insight into ways in which principals encourage staff development.

SECTION A : GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name : _____
2. School : _____
3. Position held at school : _____
4. Number of years in the position :

Experience in year

1 - 5 YEARS	
6 - 10 YEARS	
11 -15 YEARS	
16 -20 YEARS	
ABOVE 20 YEARS	

5. Sex :

MALE	
FEMALE	

6. Age group

21 -30 YEARS	
31 -40 YEARS	
41 -50 YEARS	
51 -60 YEARS	
ABOVE 60	

SECTION B: SUPERVISION AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

7. What do you understand by supervision?

8(a) Do you accept that as principal, it is your duty to supervise educators?

YES	
NO	

(b) Why do you think like that?

9. What do you think is the role of supervision in schools?

10. What methods of supervision do you use to supervise Educator in your school?

11. How does your staff react to supervision?

12.(a) Have they always reacted like this?

YES	
NO	

(b) If yes, why?

(c) If no, why?

13. What are your highest and lowest qualifications of your staff?

- (a) Name the highest qualification and number of educators with that qualification.
- (b) Name the lowest qualification and the number of Educators with that qualification.

	Qualifications	Number
Highest		
Lowest		

14. How motivated is your staff develop themselves?

Explain:

15. What low your role been in this regard?

16. What is the general atmosphere of your school? Elaborate.

17. Are you familiar with the concept of staff development?

YES	
NO	

18. How do you encourage your staff to improve their teaching Skills? Explain

19(a) Do you regard it your duty as principal to see to it that staff develop their teaching methods?

YES	
NO	

(b) If yes, why?

(c) If no, why?

20(a) Does your staff share your views?

YES	
NO	

(b) Elaborate on your answer.

21. What do you see as major benefits of staff development?

22. Do you think supervision and staff development are interrelated?

YES	
NO	

(b) Why do you think so?

23. What do you see as major stumbling blocks to your dreams?

24. What strategies will you use to deal with these problems?

Thank you for your time.