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SUMMARY

The central theme throughout this research has been to investigate how governing bodies perceive the function(s) bestowed on them by the Schools Act.

The introductory chapter entailed the research problem, aims and questions guiding the study, its significance and methodology. The intention is to assist SGB's to be pro-active enough in executing the function of determining times of the school day, as the Act prescribes.

In chapter two, an in-depth literature survey was undertaken. This literature assisted in providing background as to how the SGB's (school boards / management councils) in other countries (England, Japan and Kenya) are involved in the management of their schools. The situation in South African schools was also compared and contrasted at face value to the situations in these countries.

Lastly, this literature also helped in analyzing the research data and an effort was made to expose ways in which time is not effectively used and possible strategies of using time competently were explored.

Chapter three of this research highlighted the research method and techniques used to collect data for this research. The research instrument was described regarding the design of the questionnaire and a discussion of time management in schools was also stated, based on the questions that were given to the respondents.

In chapter four an analysis and interpretation of the empirical data were discussed. Issues of reliability and validity of data were discussed and hypotheses were also given.
Chapter five interprets and analyses the research findings. The responses of participants are analysed for their implications on determining times of the school day. Lastly, this chapter provides the summary, recommendations and concluding remarks of this research.
OPSOMMING

Die sentrale tema van die navorsing is om vas te stel hoe die beheerliggame van skole hulle funksie(s) beskou, soos bepaal deur die skole wet.

Die inleidende hoofstuk behels die navorsingsprobleem, doelwitte en vrae wat die studie lei, die betekenis daarvan en die metodologie. Die doel is om beheerliggame te help om pro-aktief genoeg te wees in die uitvoering van die funksie om die tye van die skooldag te bepaal, soos deur die wet voorgeskryf.

In hoofstuk twee, word 'n in-diepte literatuursoektog onderneem. Die literatuur help om agtergrond te gee aangaande die beheerliggame (skoolrade / bestuursrade) in ander lande (Engeland, Japan en Kenia) se betrokkenheid by die bestuur van hulle skole. 'n Vergelyking met die situasie soos in Suid-Afrikaanse skole ondervind word, is getref en op sigwaarde gekontrasteer met die situasie van hierdie lande.

In die laaste plek het hierdie literatuur gehelp om die navorsingsdata te analiseer en 'n poging is aangewend om maniere waarop tyd oneffektief aangewend word bloot te stel, en moontlike strategieë is ondersoek waarop tyd doeltreffend aangewend kan word.

Hoofstuk drie van die navorsing stipuleer die navorsingsmetode en tegnieke aangewend om data te versamel. Die navorsingsinstrument is beskryf volgens die ontwerp van die vraelys en 'n bespreking van tydsbestuur in skole is beskryf, gebaseer op die vrae soos aan die respondente gestel.

In hoofstuk vier is 'n analyse en interpretasie van die empiriese data bespreek. Betroubaarheid en geldigheid van die data is bespreek en hipoteses is gemaak.
Hoofstuk vyf interpreteer en analyseer die bevindinge van die navorsing. Die reaksies van die deelnemers is geanaliseer om die implikasies daarvan op tydsbesteding van die skooldag, te beraam. Hoofstuk vyf verskaf 'n opsomming, aanbevelings en slotsom vir die navorsing.
CHAPTER ONE

ORIENTATION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This research project will focus on determining the times of the school day as one of the eleven functions prescribed for the School Governing Bodies (SGB's) by the South African Schools' Act of 1996 (SASA) (RSA, 1997:16).

Determining times of the school day constitute a unique, important factor around which schooling (learning and teaching) as a process revolves. Time management unequivocally has become a pre-requisite for effective learning and teaching to take place. This function, however, cannot be executed effectively without the governing body’s knowledge and skills as to how to determine the times of the school day.

Time has become a valuable resource in schools. Ubben and Hughes (1997:191) noted that time has to be efficiently and competently used in order to increase student performance. This is so because as Kruger (1995:176) has accentuated, “it is a very scarce resource that can neither be recycled nor renewed.” Time is perhaps the most precious commodity, which must be managed professionally and be used to its optimum. No one has ever claimed to have had enough of it!

The perception of time is the “inexplicable union in the consciousness of both change and constancy. In people's lives, there are linear time sequences with and without beginnings and endings, conditions and epochs that appear with or without warning only to pass and never come round again.” (Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, 1996:119). The main focus of time management, therefore, is to get things done more efficiently.
School governing bodies have much to accomplish in any given day and little time to waste, in order to do so. It is therefore pivotal that guidelines for training of governing bodies for capacity building, on how to determine times of the school day, receive attention.

Time management in schools is an aspect that needs to be studied thoroughly, in order to bring stability and efficiency in learning organisations. The above discussion indicates that further research on this topic is necessary. The significance of this study is that its findings may have an impact on the practice of educational management in relation to time management.

In order to have a vivid picture of the magnitude of this function, it is necessary to examine the background to the problem. The formulation of the problem-statement that follows will assist towards this pursuit.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Although the researcher has been a teacher for the past five years, at no stage in his career had the times of the school day ever been determined by the school governing body. More often than not, time is not properly managed and used sensibly by stakeholders concerned.

According to Naidu (1998:16-17) in complex organisations, like schools, absenteeism and lack of punctuality has become the norm. Many teachers are burnt-out, dejected and disillusioned. Personal goals have superseded organisational goals. A sense of urgency is diminishing and has been overtaken by laxity. The lack of time has been cited as the cause of all these problems.

From the foregoing discussion, it is evident that the way stakeholders use their time in the school, needs to be revisited and be re-examined.
In the light of the above, it appears that the problem can be summarised by means of the following questions:

- Will the governing body be able to determine the times of the school day, which must be consistent with the staff conditions of employment?

- What is the degree of accountability and commitment that is shown by the staff towards the governing body and vice versa, in respect of the utilisation and management of school times?

- How can time management promote the governing body’s efficiency and competence?

- What guidelines are necessary for a training module on school time management, which will equip governing bodies to effectively carry out this task assigned to them by the Schools Act of 1996?

Having formulated the problem, the aims of the study will now be briefly discussed.

1.3 AIMS OF THE STUDY

In view of the questions formulated above, the aims of the research are to:

- Clarify the following concepts: times of the school day and conditions of employment.

- Determine how governing bodies perceive this function.

- Set guidelines for a training model, for the effective execution of this function.
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study is of paramount importance, because after identifying the obstacles that hampers using time effectively, governing bodies will be assisted with suggestions, or a model, on how time can be effectively used. Kruger (1995:5) has put an emphasis on the optimum usage of time, which can lead to increased productivity and the effective use of resources towards the realisation of goals.

Governing bodies and school management teams are to benefit from this study, as it will serve as a remedial purpose in restoring the culture of learning and teaching services (colts.) that has been degenerating and deteriorating, especially in township schools.

In view of the preceding problem, the aim statement and the significance of the study, the method envisaged in order to research the problem, will be discussed.

1.5 RESEARCH METHOD

1.5.1 Literature study

A literature study will be conducted on the problem being investigated. This will be done with a view to establish what has been said about the topic and will avoid unintentional and unnecessary replica.

The researcher will, through the literature study, be able to relate the findings to previous knowledge and suggest further research. Both primary and secondary sources will be used in conducting this study.

To supplement and complement the preceding literature survey, empirical research will be undertaken in which governing bodies will be the population.
1.5.2 Empirical research

A structured questionnaire will be compiled, from which the researcher will obtain quantitative information. This questionnaire will comprise of, at least, ten items on this function, to determine whether the governing bodies accept ownership of the function and on how they perceive their roles in the execution of this function.

The quantitative research design is in the form of numerical data. One has to determine the statistical significance of the results. It also includes a substantial amount of literature to provide direction for the research questions or hypotheses. According to Creswell (1994:22-26) the literature is used deductively as a framework for hypotheses.

Having briefly outlined the method of research that will be used, it is now necessary to demarcate the research in question.

1.6 DEMARCATION OF THE INVESTIGATION

To be able to manage this topic well, it is necessary to demarcate it distinctly. The following demarcation will apply:

- A literature survey of the function of governing bodies in time management, in at least three countries, of which one is an African country.
- An analysis of the data to formulate guidelines for the effective execution of the function.
- To provide guidelines for a training model for members of governing bodies on this function.
1.7 CONCEPT CLARIFICATION

In order for the same interpretations to be given to concepts, it is necessary that an attempt to define them, is undertaken.

1.7.1 Times of the school day

There is really nothing earth-shattering about this function “the exigencies of syllabuses will have to be taken into account, the circumstances of learners who have to travel a long way to school can be accommodated as can the inclement winter weather” (Du Preez, 1997:155).

Time is a variable that can be used consciously with groups, to help people help themselves (Allissi and Casper, 1985:3). It involves laying-out the school year by governing body members and observing school hours and bell times, by both the educator and learners (Kruger, 1995:176).

Times of the school day must be planned in the order of importance. This literally means the development of a sense of the importance of time and becoming aware of what one does with this scarce, non-renewable resource. Time management is not about time in the abstract, it is about what one can accomplish with time (Mackenzie, 1990:25). It has no independent existence, apart from the order of events by which one measures it.

It need not be “obsessively soulless, unachievable or ethnocentric” (Mancini, 1994:25) but must involve thinking ahead and making sure that as much time as possible is spent at meeting the set priorities. The purpose of time management is to learn how to live one’s life, so that one’s important goals are accomplished (Campbell and Null, 1994:158).
High time-in-school and high learning-time represent time-on-task, the factor the research has found to correlate most often with high pupil achievement. Effective school management and orderly classrooms maximise time-on-task, so does a production ethos. Time, therefore, is defined by Smith (1994:17) as a "continuum in which events succeed one another from past through present to the future."

1.7.2 **Governing body**

The governance of public schools is vested in its governing body. Governing bodies are channels for representation and a means of ensuring accountability to stakeholders’ wishes and needs.

According to (Gamage in Thody, 1994:113-116), the term governance refers to the process of exercising power in a group. A formal group, like a school, may be said to have governance. A number of elements are common to all governance, namely:

- rules of conduct,
- sovereignty,
- legitimacy,
- jurisdiction and
- empowerment.

In governance there has to be rules of conduct to help govern the lives of people. The rules made by a group, are really decisions about matters that affect the group as a whole. The decision is designed to encourage or require certain kinds of behaviour, to discourage or forbid other kinds of behaviour by individual members.
The word 'governance' is derived from the verb 'govern' which, according to Hawkins (1993:169) means to be in charge of the public affairs of an organisation. This structure provides a basis for co-operative governance between education authorities and members of the school community.

School communities and bodies of parents are being called upon to take more responsibility for governing their schools. School governance is not just about efficiency, but it "involves stewardship, accountability, participation and empowerment." (Catholic Institute of Education, 1998:3-5).

The South African Schools' Act of 1996 stipulates that stakeholders in education must accept responsibility for the organisation and as members of the local community. They are often in the best position to know what a school really needs and the problems it experiences.

1.7.3 Conditions of employment

The governing body is responsible for recommending the appointment of teaching and non-teaching staff to the Head of the Department. This will be done in terms of the Educators' Employment Act (EEA) (1994), the Public Service Act (1994) and the Labour Relations Act (1995).

The Education Labour Relations Act (ELRA), (Act 66 of 1995) provided for the establishment of an Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) as a separate juristic person. The membership of the ELRC comprised (and still does) employer and employee organisations, including trade unions.

The members of the ELRC could reach agreements binding on each other and the Minister of Education could by notice in the Government Gazette, make the agreement binding on all employers and employees in education. The ELRA was repealed by the LRA, but the ELRC (Act 66 of 1995) still exists in the dispensation provided by the LRA.
1.8 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

The study will follow the following order in its attempt to achieve the aims of this research:

- Chapter one (Orientation) introduces the topic and provides the background of the research, it describes the problem to be studied and the method that is to be used in the research. Finally, it elaborates on the demarcation of the investigation and clarifies concepts to be used.

- Chapter two (Literature Survey) reviews the literature so as to lay a rock-solid framework for the detailed study of time management, with the emphasis on effective time management by the members of governing body.

- In chapter three (Research Methodology) the focus is on the method of research and the research design, as well as the questionnaire.

- An analysis of the data will be done in chapter four (Analysis and Interpretation of Empirical Data).

- Chapter five (Findings and Recommendations) presents a training model and recommendations.

1.9 CONCLUSION

Parent and school communities are nevertheless urged to get involved and in the interest of their children and the nation, to take all steps possible to demonstrate that they will not be treated as "toy telephones". To do this they must organise themselves at local, regional, provincial and national level.
Governing bodies must use their power (given in prevailing legislation) to join representative bodies, in order to gain muscle and a loud voice, which cannot be ignored or brushed aside. Apathy will improve nothing, but rather contribute to deterioration.

Pressure, the law and the constitution must be utilised to show that incompetence, chaos, harassment and bureaucratic tyranny will not be tolerated. There must be a concerted and ongoing campaign for spontaneous evolution, as opposed to uniform and controlled evolution, for maximum autonomy in school management, and a free hand to bring about the highest level of excellence possible at each school.

The basic mission of education should lie in conveying to the next generation the cultural assets developed by their ancestors, and also in rearing people who can carry the future of the nation on their shoulders.

In order to realise this mission, education must aim at the full development of personality and strive to rear people, sound in mind and body. An ultimate goal of all educational efforts must be to develop good harmony among the moral, intellectual and physical elements affected by restructuring of schools.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE SURVEY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The school governing bodies which were put in place through democratic elections in April – May, 1997, have ushered a new era in the governance of schools. The move to set up school governing bodies is about "placing schools as centres and pillars of change, as well as laying the foundation for the democratisation of South Africa." (Gauteng Department of Education, District C3, 1998).

It is about placing schools in the hands of the school community. This is based on the understanding that decisions on school matters should be made by those who best understand the needs of the students and the local community. The school governing bodies serve as a platform for the community, to participate in and own the education process.

School governing bodies are vehicles to be used by the community, to ensure that the school curriculum reflects its values, aspirations and interests. This structure needs to manage the immediate- and short-term needs of the collaborative structure. It needs to think long-range in ways that facilitate the redressing process and in assessing progress.

To put plans into action is a mammoth task, which should not be left to the governors alone, but must be a co-operative effort, whereby all stakeholders should be proactively involved.
This chapter will start with an overview of school time management, referring to its meaning and what it entails. The second aspect will be to study how England, Kenya and Japan have dealt with, or are dealing with time management in decision making processes in their schools.

In studying these countries, the research will look at three issues, namely control and administration of education, governing bodies’ composition and their functions.

2.2 OVERVIEW OF SCHOOL TIME MANAGEMENT

Time has become a scarce resource, in the sense that any future allocation thereof is diminished by the amount allocated to present activities, since the number of activities that can be simultaneously tended to is limited. Time spent on one activity results in neglect of others (Sergiovanni; Burlingame; Coombs & Thurston, 1992:209).

Planning the use of time is essential for effective time management. If time has to be used effectively in schools, Davies (1981:322) is of the opinion that it is important that a sense of priority be communicated to interested parties. Time is a uniquely personal concept and learning to manage time requires personal commitment.

Time spent in planning is rarely wasted because to have a written, internalised plan often forces the mind to deal with the issues by providing an inherent structure. This written plan serves as a constant source of reference, to long and short-term intentions and governors will not waste time constantly having to remember (Moyles, 1992:115).
While emphasising the need for governors to plan, Nelson (1995:19), Kruger (1995:10), Everand and Morris (1990:125) suggest the use of a diary. This should be reviewed periodically, at least weekly. A daily action sheet is also recommended whereby things that need to be done on a particular day are written down. The previous day's list is reviewed and anything not done is carried forward.

One popular approach to time management is to make a list of the things that need to be done that day. Items on the list have to be grouped into three categories, that is: critical activities - that must be performed; important activities - that should be performed and optimal or trivial things - that can be delegated or postponed (Moorhead & Griffin, 1995:220).

Time management pays dividends in terms of improving standards of achievement in the school situation. If time is managed accordingly, more work can be done within a short spell of time and there will be more time available for important tasks (Dunham, 1995:110-111). The more time one spends on planning a project, the less total time is required for it.

It is therefore important that governors should know how school time is allocated, they need to include it in the planning and execution of their tasks. The flow of time during the school day has to be understood, governors should be informed of what other stakeholders expect from them and as such, have to double their effort in obtaining the resources required.

In organising non-teaching tasks, Nelson (1995:41) suggests that governors do one job/task at a time. Trying to do several tasks at once will result in several half-done tasks. They should at all times encourage co-operative efforts and planning with stakeholders, as this will help them discover the most fruitful ways of using time.
Regarding meetings, governors should convene a meeting when a real need arises and not as a matter of routine (Kruger, 1995:107). Clear objectives should be set and an agenda has to be in place for each meeting, with time limits set for discussing the various items.

One needs to take into consideration the fact that there is a big difference between important tasks and urgencies. Some tasks are never going to be urgent, even though they may be extremely vital. Other tasks may never be important, but will be urgent.

2.3 CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND

2.3.1 Structure of control and administration of education in England

Control and administration of education in England used to be decentralised to a large degree - in keeping with the English spirit of local self-determination. Later, steps were taken to establish a more centralised system to ensure that the principle of equal education for all is maintained, since the decentralised system affected this principle (Mallison, 1980:12).

Due to decentralised systems, many schools ended up not providing education to all, but to a few individuals who could afford to pay for it. Education in England has two divisions of control, namely central and local control. Central control of education consists of three divisions, namely political, administrative, and advisory divisions.
The political division is responsible for decision-making and educational planning which also includes policy decisions and political ideology formulation (Goodey in Dekker & Van Schalkwyk, 1995:184).

The administrative division is responsible for the political division and the basic functioning of the national education system.

The advisory division serves as the bridge between the political and administrative divisions and the institutions of education and the staff itself. Furthermore, at the political division, the minister has authority and almost complete control of the education system.

The minister is assisted by the Department of Education and Science (DES) (Mann, 1979:27). The minister was later given the status of political head and the secretary of state was given the status of the administrative head in 1964 (Goodey in Dekker & Van Schalkwyk, 1995:185).

For advisory purposes, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate (HMI) is responsible for the task of bridging the gap between the political and administrative divisions within the institutions of education. This body comprises a number of eminent academics and professionals.

Their task is to advise the political and administrative divisions, including the schools themselves. They are also supposed to be available for consultation with the three divisions (Goodey in Dekker & Van Schalkwyk, 1995:185-186).
The local control of education is divided between the Local Education Authorities (LEA) and the school governing boards. The LEA’s are expected, under the 1944 Act, to provide education at the primary, secondary and higher levels of education, and ensure that education at these levels meet the needs of the population it is serving (Bell; Fowler & Little, 1973:2).

They also have to administer and control funds from the state, build schools, appoint and pay teachers, and ensure the health and safety of learners and teachers at educational institutions (Mann, 1979:70).

However, LEA’s do not have any control over universities (Goody in Dekker & Van Schalkwyk, 1995:186). Universities are independent and self-governing bodies, this despite the fact that three-quarters of their income comes from public funds (Dent, 1982:151).

2.3.2 School governing bodies

The Elementary Education Act of 1944 instituted the school governing boards. Before the implementation of this Act, schools did not have their own boards of governance. The people of England wanted their schools to have their own control systems to avoid being attacked as government properties during times of war (Second World War).

However, these feelings diminished in thin air during the course of the war, only to arise again in its aftermath with the implementation of the Elementary Education Act of 1944. This revival of the idea was based on the fact that the Act stated that secondary schools should have discretion regarding management of the schools (Baron, 1981:82).
Because the Act did not specifically require schools to have their own governing bodies, this idea was ignored. Thus, setting up one governing body for all schools that fall under its jurisdiction, was very simple for LEA's. Efforts were made by the school managers to establish these governing bodies, but their efforts proved fruitless because they lacked the parents' and teachers' support.

Finally in 1970, the pressure for the establishment of school governing boards increased, because teacher unions became members of trade unions and parents were starting to show interest in the education of their children (Baron, 1981: 87-88).

To counter this increasing pressure, the government presented the Education Bill of 1974. The Bill proposed that parents should have a greater say in the governing boards of public schools.

The Taylor Committee was later instituted to look into the matter (Dent, 1982:51). The Taylor Report recommended that each school should have its own governing body as a representative structure of parents, teachers, members of the local communities and the members of the LEA (Dent, 1982:52-53 and 69).

The government accepted the recommendations of the Taylor Committee, but with some changes. It agreed that governing bodies should be established and parents and teachers should be represented. However, the LEA was given the latitude to appoint more members to the governing body.
The government also moved away from defining the powers of the governing bodies (Baron, 1978:187). Finally, the 1986 Education Act (No.2) made provision for equal powers for parents and removal of political control from governing boards (Gordon; Aldrich & Dean, 1991:99-100). It should be noted that there was great lobbying for parental involvement in these bodies (Stillman in Halstead, 1994:24-25).

The number of the people who are supposed to serve on the governing body varies from one school to another, as it is based on the enrolment number of learners at each school. This is the reason why there is no act that sanctions the participation and election of learners into governing bodies of public secondary schools in England (Regan, 1979:62).

The National Commission on Education, 1993, has recommended considerable powers for the governing bodies to have "teeth" (Thody, 1994:8). Hence Section 15 of the Education Reform Act (ERA) makes Governors responsible for deciding the times of the school day.

In country- and controlled schools for example, "Governors set the times of the school sessions while in aided schools, governors decide both the term dates and times of sessions and they must ensure that the school runs for at least 380 half-days in a year." (Wragg and Partington, 1995:41).

Governing bodies are responsible for the appointment of head teachers. They help establish, with the head, the aims and policies of schools. They are also responsible, together with the head, for deciding how to spend a school budget. Their accountability is to the school and community and also to the LEA.
### Political Division
- Decision-making
- Education planning
- Policy decisions
- Political ideology

### Administrative Division
- Functioning of education system
- Advise the political division

### Advisory Division
- Link the administrative and the political divisions to the schools and other educational institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Education and Science (DES)</th>
<th>Her Majesty Inspectorate (HMI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Minimum standards</td>
<td>- Interpretation and the application of education policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Control funds</td>
<td>- Give advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher assessment</td>
<td>- Inspect schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Co-operation of organisations involved in education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Education Authorities</th>
<th>Governing Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Control and administer funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Build and close schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appoint and pay teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appoint inspectorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Link LEA's with each school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintain discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Set curricular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1 Control and administration of education in England
The greater part of this innovation, pressure and stress stems from implementation of the role of the head. Head teachers and their staff should allow governors a general responsibility for the effective management of the school, but they are not expected to take detailed decisions about the day to day running of the school.

2.4 CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN JAPAN

2.4.1 Structure of control and administration

Control and administration of education in Japan is divided among the three levels of control, namely central, district and municipal levels. This decentralised control and administration of education came about with the democratisation of the education system of Japan after the Second World War.

This was done to allow local communities and parents a say in the education of their children (White, 1987:70-71).

The central control of education has the minister of education as the head, who is appointed by the prime minister. The minister of education is assisted by the parliamentary vice-minister and a permanent vice-minister.

The ministry formed bureaux to deal with particular aspects of control. The bureau for higher education deals with planning and oversees the universities. The bureau of social education deals with social and audio-visual education and the instruction of women and young people.
Apart from these bureaux, the ministry is assisted by twelve permanent advisory boards. Members of these boards are appointed by the minister. Most of these members are people who are professionally and academically acclaimed (Thomas & Postlethwaite, 1983:65-66).

Monbusho is responsible for the budget, policies, legislation, control of higher education institutions, and the establishment and control of the private schools (Leestma & Walberg, 1992:12-13).

The district level is divided into forty-seven local administrative districts called prefectures. Prefectures have assemblies and governors and all members of each prefecture board of education are appointed by the governor. Each board appoints its own supervisors and social education officers.

Each board is responsible for establishing and managing educational institutions in the prefecture and is also responsible for supervising the local level school boards, appointing and paying teachers and issue certificates to teach (Holmes, 1985:220).

Each municipality maintains a three- to five-member board of education whose major functions are to: (1) establish and manage municipal educational institutions, (2) administer personnel matters in such institutions, and (3) adopt textbooks for municipal elementary and lower-secondary schools (Thomas & Postlethwaite, 1983:67).

2.4.2 School governing bodies

Control and administration of public secondary schools in Japan is pyramidal and hierarchical. Based on this hierarchical structure, public schools in Japan do not have their own governing bodies.
All public schools are supervised by the municipal boards. The board of education in each prefecture is responsible for upper-secondary schools and schools for disabled learners. The board is also responsible for public libraries, museums, and other education centres in the prefecture (Thomas & Postlethwaite, 1983:67).

Elementary and lower-secondary schools are under the control of the local school boards, which fall under the jurisdiction of the municipal board. The local school boards are responsible for establishment, maintenance and closure of schools, teacher-training, appointment and dismissal of teachers, curriculum construction and provision of material to schools.

Teachers have their own organisation which is called the Japanese Teacher’s Union (Nikkyoso). Nikkyoso has a great following by teachers in Japan’s schools. Teachers are also members of the PTA (Parents Teachers Association) which is active at every school in Japan. This association is also represented at the municipal, prefectural and the national level.

The PTA only has powers regarding minor activities in the school, like raising funds for the school. Based on the hierarchical structure of control of education in Japan, the PTA does not participate fully in decision-making processes in the schools. Therefore, their participation in control and administration of education is minimum, if not non-existent (Brameld, 1968:20 and 238).

Determining times of the school day was never mentioned as one of the functions bestowed on the local school boards or any organisation whatsoever.
### CENTRAL LEVEL
- Determine standards and curricular
- Approve textbooks
- Provide direction to prefectoral and municipal boards
- Establish and control colleges and universities
- Supervise private institutions
- Investigate problems arising from these institutions

### DISTRICT LEVEL
- Appoint district superintendent
- Supervise activities of schools within the prefecture
- License teachers
- Provide advise and funds to municipalities
- Train teachers
- Promote social education and protect cultural assets

### MUNICIPAL LEVEL
- Supervise activities of municipal primary and lower primary schools
- Choose books from the compulsory list of approved books
- Make recommendations on teacher appointment and dismissals

Figure 2.2 Control and administration of education in Japan
The Japanese are highly critical of their education, despite its remarkable accomplishments that are envied in other parts of the world. Japanese reformers are interested in eliminating rigid uniformity and standardisation - a mark of centralised control - by the Ministry of Education (Leestma & Walberg, 1992:3).

Neither centralisation nor decentralisation works. Centralisation errs on the edge of over-control, decentralisation errs towards chaos. Therefore, both top-down and bottom-up strategies are necessary (Fullan, 1994:37).

Japanese schools and Japanese parents are both fully engaged in children's social and moral conduct, as well as in their academic progress. Schools provide active assistance in integrating their graduates into the next phase of life.

When unemployment occurs between graduation from school and the first attempt to secure employment, it is often misinterpreted as inefficiency by the school itself. Japanese parents, according to White (1987:178) want schools to be supportive and caring, but they do not want a school to become a place where idiosyncrasy is encouraged.

2.5 CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KENYA

2.5.1 Structure of control and administration

Although parents have a say at primary and secondary schools, especially at the schools they financially assist, education in Kenya is generally centralised (Raju, 1973:86). Education is controlled by the government through the minister of education, appointed by the president (Knowles, 1977:380).
At the central level there are two ministers who are appointed by the president. The first minister is amenable for basic education, which is concerned with pre- and primary schools. The second minister is responsible for higher education, which is concerned with secondary schools, colleges and universities (Raju, 1973:90-94).

These two ministers are also liable for policy making. A third minister can be distinguished, who is responsible for adult education. This minister falls under the ministry of housing and social services (Bondesio in Dekker & Van Schalkwyk, 1995:382).

At the provincial level, the ministerial structure consists of a provincial education officer, the provincial inspector and the education officers. The provincial education officer is responsible for the overall administrative duties of the province. The provincial inspector is responsible for all professional matters, including examinations.

There are three education officers who serve as assistants to the provincial education department. The first education officer functions as the assistant to the provincial education officer. The second education officer acts as the examination officer, while the last education officer is in charge of women’s education.

At the district level, control of education falls directly under the ministry of basic and higher education. For the day-to-day administration of secondary schools, teacher training colleges and universities, boards of governors have been established. Members of the ministry constitute the board of governors.
The manager of each institution of basic and higher education is the secretary of his/her respective board. The school manager is supposed to administer his/her institution on behalf of the board (Raju, 1973:92). These boards are responsible for control of staff and they also have discretionary powers over a small sum of money.

Boards of governors are however not responsible for the appointment of staff (Cameron & Hurst, 1983:154). The chief inspectorate of the school is assisted by the team of secondary school subject inspectors. Subject inspectors are responsible for the inspection and maintenance of standards in all public secondary schools (Raju, 1973:91-92).

It is interesting to note that it was only in 1979 that non-Kenyan Africans were appointed to the positions of provincial education officers (Cameron & Hurst, 1983:153).

2.5.2 School governing bodies

All state (public) schools in Kenya, including those subsidised by the state (private), have management councils. These councils are constituted by the people from the communities in areas around the school, who are supposed to plan and promote the development of their respective schools (Husen & Postlethwaite, 1985:287).

They are responsible for the management of their respective schools and are allowed to have control over their staff. However, they do not have a say regarding the appointment of the teaching staff. They also have limited control over school funds, as they only have limited discretionary powers and authority to make decisions on financial matters.
They can only make financial decisions where small amounts of money are involved (Cameron & Hurst, 1983:154). To enable parents to participate in the management of the education of their children, the government decided that each school should have a parent organisation, and this should be done in both secondary and primary schools.

The education system in Kenya is generally centralised. Funding of education is centralised, and the standard and content of education are also determined at a central level. Examination is the only aspect of education control in Kenya that is not centralised.

Based on the centralisation of education in Kenya, even the school committees of each school do not have much authority. Their powers are greatly limited, especially regarding financial matters. Cameron and Hurst (1983:156) clearly state that school councils have limited discretionary powers and authority to take decisions on financial matters.

Although Kenya's education is highly centralised, parents do have a say, but those who have greater say are those who are greatly financing the schools where their children are studying. This mostly happens at private schools and Harembee schools (Bondesio in Dekker & Van Schalkwyk, 1995:392).

Education in Kenya is in transition because society itself is under rapid change. Kenya still decides which African strands in the cultural pattern it wants to strengthen, which European elements it will accept or reject and whether components of both can be merged into a new and unique pattern.
### Minister of Basic Education
- Responsible for pre-schools
- Accountable for primary schools

### Minister of Higher Education
- Responsible for secondary schools, poly-technical colleges and universities

### Minister of Housing and Social Services
- Responsible for adult education, pre-primary education, housing and social services

### Provincial Education Officer
- Responsible for all administrative duties

### Provincial Inspector
- Accountable for all professional matters
- Responsible for examinations

### Education Officers
- Three officers serve as supporting personnel to the provincial education officer
  - 1st serve as assistant provincial education officer
  - 2nd serve as examination officer
  - 3rd is in charge of women's education

- 39 districts responsible for primary schools
- *Mombasa* with administrative personnel and responsible for schools
- *Nairobi* with administrative personnel and responsible for schools

Figure 2.3 Control and administration of education in Kenya
School committees have little say as far as time management is concerned. Parents too, do not have much say, apart from the private schools where they contribute two-thirds of the school funds.

Schools are used to create national unity and education is an agent for the shaping of a new society.

2.6 SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa is the exception of the three countries studied, because SASA prescribes to the governing bodies that they should determine the school times of public schools. Based on the changes envisaged in South Africa, school time management is fast becoming an important aspect in schools.

In South Africa, the educational scene is changing rapidly. This change is being caused by a complexity of factors, which include the re-examination of present educational provision against a background of changing social, political and economic policies, new forms of testing and assessment and local management of schools that involve greater parental participation.

As the educational process is concerned with every aspect of our lives and our society, both now and in the future, it is of vital importance that all teachers, teachers-in-training, administrators and educational policy-makers are made aware of, and be informed about, current issues in education.
2.7 CONCLUSION

Despite numerous and serious problems encountered so far, South Africa's education system has taken an important, drastic step forward. One unequivocal achievement of the new government has been the abolition of separate racially and ethnically based educational administrations, which existed in the 'old order'.

These have been streamlined into one national/central and nine provincial departments of education. In helping the school manager with this colossal task, South Africa Schools' Act prescribes that each school should have its own governing body. The same applies to England where there is a strong tradition of allowing the head teacher to run his school in his own way.

In Kenya and Japan school governing bodies do exist, but their powers are very limited, unlike South Africa and England. In Kenya, governing bodies of public secondary schools are "toothless" due to the centralisation of control and administration of education in that country.

In Japan, powers of the governing bodies of public schools are limited because of the pyramidal structure of control and administration of education. South Africa is the only one of the three countries dealt with in this study, that has a law that sanctions time management as one of functions of the governing bodies.
In this chapter an attempt was made to explain school time-management. A literature survey on time management and the role of governors therein was given for the four countries, including South Africa. The literature survey revealed that South Africa is the only country where parents' participation in governing bodies of public schools is sanctioned by law.

The next chapter will explain and illustrate the methods this research will follow. It will also explain the research instruments that will be used and the procedure that will be followed in this study. The justification of the research method and instruments, the reliability and validity of the research method and instruments will also be dealt with in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH AND DATA GATHERING

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The first two chapters of this research have illustrated the need to research the interpretation of the South African Schools Act by SGB's. The focus of this interpretation is "determining times of the school day" as one of the eleven functions prescribed to the SGB's by the School's Act has to be accentuated.

The literature study in the previous chapter (2) has formed the framework for the empirical study. Therefore, a brief discussion on the design of the research instrument will now follow:

3.2 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

3.2.1 The design of the questionnaire

The design of the empirical investigation was a structured questionnaire consisting of 101 open-ended items (see appendix A). These items were based on the South African Schools' Act 84 of 1996. The Act clearly indicates eleven functions all school governing bodies (SGB's) must adhere to. In the section to follow, GBR refers to Governing Body Regulations. A governing body must:

- Promote the best interest of the school and strive to ensure its development by providing quality education for all learners (SASA, Section 20 [1][a]; GBR, Regulation 47[d];
- Adopt a constitution (SASA, Section 20 [1][b]; GBR, Regulation 46 [c]);

- Adopt the mission statement of the school (SASA, Section 20 [1][c]; GBR, Regulation 47 [b]);

- Adopt the code of conduct for learners at the school (SASA, Section 20 [1][a]; GBR, Regulation 46 [c]);

- Help the principal, educators and other staff to perform their professional functions (SASA, Section 20 [1][e]; GBR, Regulation 48 [a]);

- Decide the times of the school day which must be consistent with staff conditions of employment (SASA, Section 20 [1][f]; GBR, Regulation 48[c]);

- Administer and control the school's property, buildings and groups, including hostels, if applicable (SASA, Section 21[1][g]; GBR, Regulation 57 [1][e]);

- Encourage parents, learners, educators and other staff to offer voluntary services (SASA, Section 20 [1][h]; GBR, Regulation 57[f]);

- Recommend to provincial heads of departments on the appointment of educators at the school, subject to the Educators' Employment Act, 1994 (Proclamation No. 138 of 1994) and the Labour Relations Act, 1995 (Act No. 66 of 1995);

- Recommend to provincial heads of departments on the appointment of non-educating staff at the school, subject to the Public Services Act, 1994 (Proclamation No. 103 of 1994) and the Labour Relations Act, 1995 (Act No. 66 of 1995);
Allow school facilities to be used for educational programmes not offered by the school, if requested by the provincial head of department (SASA, Section 20 [1][k], GBR, Regulation 47[f]).

Subsequently, a group of M. Ed students were assigned with the task of choosing one of the eleven functions and to investigate it. This resulted in the design of 101 questions to obtain the perceptions of members of SGB’s on the eleven functions.

This mini-dissertation investigates the following function: determining the times of the school day consistent with any applicable conditions of staff at the school. All the questions that are formulated and relevant to time management are to be tabled below.
Table 3.1  **Items associated with time management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>STD Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q.10</td>
<td>Learners who come late for school must sit in detention during breaks for that specific day.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.11</td>
<td>The governing body must fine educators who come late on a regular basis.</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.17</td>
<td>The governing body must determine the times of the school day.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.18</td>
<td>The parents must determine the times of the school day.</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.35</td>
<td>The management team of the school must determine times of the school day.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.40</td>
<td>Student organisations (in the case of the secondary school) must be allowed to have meetings during school hours</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.82</td>
<td>Will empower the governing body to decide on the school terms.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.93</td>
<td>The governing body must take measures to ensure that learners attend school regularly.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having displayed the various items involved in school time management, it is imperative to discuss each one of them in a nutshell.

3.2.2 Discussion of time management as a function of the governing body

Each question was formulated in such a way that the respondents could indicate as to what extent a particular behaviour should be demonstrated, for example:

To what extent would you agree to a proposal that:

Q.10 Learners who come late for school must sit in detention during breaks for that specific day?

The mean score seems to indicate that more than half of the respondents agree to an extent that learners who come late for school, must sit detention during breaks for that specific day.

From the mode, one can argue that the response occurring the most is 5, that is, they definitely agree that learners who come late for school must sit in detention during breaks for that specific day.

From the above, one can deduct that the school governing bodies agree that learners who are not punctual need to be punished in one way or the other.
In the next question the respondents were asked to give their opinions as to what extent they would agree that:

**Q.11 The governing body must fine educators who come late on a regular basis?**

The mean score seems to indicate that the respondents partially disagree to an extent that the governing body must fine educators who come late on a regular basis.

From the mode, one can argue that the response occurring the most is 1, that is, they definitely disagree that governing bodies must fine educators who come late on a regular basis.

One can therefore deduct that the school governing bodies disagree that educators should be fined for coming late.

The next question asked the respondents if they would agree that:

**Q.17 The governing body must determine the times of the school day.**

The mean score seems to indicate that more than half of the respondents agree to an extent that the governing body must determine the times of the school day.

From the mode, one can argue that the response occurring the most is 5, that is, respondents definitely agree that the governing body must determine the times of the school day.

One can deduce from the above that the governing bodies accept ownership of this function. This function forms the nucleus of this research program, it is the gist around which this investigation revolves.
Respondents had to say to what extent they would agree to a proposal that:

Q.18 The parents must determine the times of the school day.

The mean score seems to indicate that the respondents partially disagree as to the extent that the parents must determine the times of the school day. From the mode, one can argue that the response occurring the most is 1, that is, respondents definitely disagree that the parents must determine the times of the school day.

One can deduce from the above that the governing bodies as a representative structure of the stakeholders, not parents as an entity, should perform this task(s).

This question asked the respondents as to what extent would they agree to a proposal that:

Q.35 The management team of the school must determine the times of the school day.

The mean score seems to indicate that more than half of the respondents agree to the proposal that the school management team (SMT) must determine the times of the school day.

From the mode, one can argue that the response occurring the most is 5, that is, respondents definitely agree to the proposal that the SMT must determine the times of the school day.

One can deduct that the respondents agree that the SMT is much closer to the nitty-gritty of the school than any other structure.
In the next question, respondents were asked if they would agree to a proposal that:

*Q.40 Student Organisations (in secondary schools) be allowed to have meetings during school hours?*

The mean score seems to indicate that more than half of the respondents disagree to the proposal that student organisations (in case of Secondary Schools) be allowed to hold meetings during school hours.

From the mode, one can argue that the response occurring the most is 1, that is, respondents definitely disagree that student organisations should be allowed to have meetings during school hours.

One can deduce from the above that the respondents want the culture of learning and teaching services (colts) to be restored in schools, therefore school times need to be used to its optimum.

Last, but not least, the question was posed to the respondents as to what extent they would agree in:

*Q.82 Empowering the governing body to decide on school terms.*

The mean score seems to indicate that more than half of the respondents partially agree to an extent that governing bodies need to be empowered to decide on school terms.

From the mode, one can argue that the response occurring the most is 5, that is, respondents definitely agree that the governing body needs to be empowered to decide on school terms.
One can deduce from the above that the respondents really feel that deciding on school terms should be intertwined with determining the times of the school day. The two functions are symbiotic and inseparable, therefore governing bodies need to be empowered to tackle this function succinctly.

In the last question, respondents were asked to what extent would they agree to a proposal that:

Q.93 The governing body must take measures to ensure that learners attend school regularly.

The mean score seems to indicate that the respondents partially disagree to the proposal that the governing body must take measures to ensure that learners attend school regularly. From the mode one can argue that the response occurring the most is 1, that is, respondents definitely disagree to the proposal that governing bodies must take measures to ensure regular attendance of learners.

One can deduce from this discussion that the respondents feel that it is the duty of every individual stakeholder not only to be informed about school happenings, but to be deeply engaged in these happenings. Without their interventions, schools will become static and unresponsive to changing community and societal needs.

Having discussed all of the questions on determining times of the school day, as one of the eleven functions of School Governing Bodies, it is now necessary to describe an empirical investigation.
3.3 THE EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION

3.3.1 Respondents

The student involved in the research project distributed the questionnaires to members of the SGB's. The respondents chosen were rank and file members of the SGB's and they came from all walks of life. Although they differed in background and societal status, all of them have one thing in common: a commitment to the upliftment of education for the youth of this country, in order for it to gain momentum so that it can be a force to be reckoned with.

3.3.2 Biographical details

The following tabulation of biographical details was drafted:

Table 3.3.2.1 Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>48,1</td>
<td>48,1</td>
<td>48,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>51,9</td>
<td>51,9</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>99,9</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>148,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3.2.2 Representation on the SGB's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>12,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>44,5</td>
<td>44,6</td>
<td>56,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-educators</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>63,0</td>
<td>63,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11,6</td>
<td>11,6</td>
<td>74,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>21,2</td>
<td>21,2</td>
<td>95,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-opted members</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>99,8</td>
<td>156,9</td>
<td>345,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.2.3 Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-20</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>8,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>16,2</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>24,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>41,2</td>
<td>41,2</td>
<td>65,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-61</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>33,4</td>
<td>33,4</td>
<td>99,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>99,9</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>297,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.3.2.4 Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>48,2</td>
<td>48,2</td>
<td>48,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>14,9</td>
<td>14,9</td>
<td>63,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Province</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>13,6</td>
<td>13,6</td>
<td>76,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwa-Zulu Natal</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>88,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>376,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.3.2.5 Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Grade 9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>7,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 &amp;11</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11,6</td>
<td>11,6</td>
<td>19,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>31,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary qualifications</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>68,4</td>
<td>68,4</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>159,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.3.2.6 Religious commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious commitment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>91,2</td>
<td>91,2</td>
<td>94,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>198,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3.2.7 Mother tongue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td>20,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotho</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>41,6</td>
<td>41,6</td>
<td>62,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsonga</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11,6</td>
<td>11,6</td>
<td>74,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>26,0</td>
<td>26,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>257,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.8 Type of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government sector</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>66,1</td>
<td>66,1</td>
<td>66,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>76,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9,0</td>
<td>9,0</td>
<td>85,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>14,7</td>
<td>14,7</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td>327,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.9 Gross income per month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-R1000</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>22,3</td>
<td>22,4</td>
<td>22,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1001-R3000</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>21,4</td>
<td>21,5</td>
<td>43,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3001-R5000</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>34,5</td>
<td>34,7</td>
<td>78,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;R5000</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>21,3</td>
<td>21,4</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>99,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>244,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3.2.10 Type of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>43,6</td>
<td>43,6</td>
<td>43,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>56,3</td>
<td>56,4</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>99,9</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>143,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.2.11 Geography of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>49,5</td>
<td>49,8</td>
<td>49,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>12,1</td>
<td>61,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>37,8</td>
<td>38,1</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>99,4</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>211,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.2.12 Years involved in school governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>31,3</td>
<td>31,6</td>
<td>31,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>19,7</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>51,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>20,6</td>
<td>20,9</td>
<td>72,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>27,2</td>
<td>27,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>98,8</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>255,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3.2.13  Learners' enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-400</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-800</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;801</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.3 The research group

Questionnaires were distributed to the members of SGB's in Gauteng, North West, Northern Province and Kwa-Zulu Natal. SGB's from other provinces were also involved. Schools were selected on the grounds of their accessibility to members of the research team. Principals, as heads of the schools and ex-officio members of the SGB's were approached amicably in order to obtain their full co-operation. The questionnaires were handed to principals by a member of the research team and personally collected after completion. Co-operation in most instances was magnificent and this enabled a good return of questionnaires to be obtained.

3.3.4 Return of questionnaires

The following figures summarise the information relevant to the questionnaires:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HANDED OUT</th>
<th>RETURN-USEABLE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION RETURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaires were then sent to the statistical consulting service of the Rand Afrikaans University where the data was transcribed and processed.
3.5 SUMMARY

In this chapter (3) a description of the empirical investigation was provided. This was done in order to show the appropriateness of quantitative research design for this study. This chapter also discussed how the data for this study was collected and recorded, that is, through a questionnaire which was thoroughly discussed.

The course of this research was briefly indicated. In the next chapter (4) the following aspects will receive much attention.

- Reliability and validity of the instrument, and

- Some aspects of the data flowing from the statistical analysis will be examined, tabulated and interpreted.
CHAPTER 4

A SELECTED ANALYSIS OF AN INTERPRETATION OF THE EMPIRICAL DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Due to the limitations of a mini-dissertation, a detailed discussion of the various statistical techniques is impossible. Hence the discussion will be limited to the following:

- A discussion of the validity and reliability of the research instrument;

- A comparison of one of the independent pairs by stating appropriate hypotheses and interpreting the statistical tests involved;

- A comparison of one of the independent groups containing three or more groups by stating the hypotheses and analysing the appropriate statistical data; and

- A brief discussion of the differences in the factor mean scores of the various independent groups in respect of the six factors.
### A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE DIFFERENCES IN THE FACTOR MEAN SCORES OF THE VARIOUS INDEPENDENT GROUPS ON EACH FACTOR.

(Refer to table 4.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Items (see questionnaire)</th>
<th>Alpha Cronbach Reliability coefficient</th>
<th>Mean factor score #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Co-operative governance</td>
<td>2; 33; 37; 42; 43; 46; 47; 49; 50; 51; 53; 54; 55; 56; 58; 67; 72; 73; 74; 77; 78; 79; 80; 85; 86; 87; 88; 89; 90; 91; 92; 93; 96.</td>
<td>0.899 (all 33 items)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Governance of non-educators</td>
<td>14; 20; 29; 35; 36; 39; 44; 45; 48; 52; 67</td>
<td>0.703 (all 11 items)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>General governance of educators</td>
<td>1; 7; 10; 11; 12; 16; 32; 40; 69; 71; 75; 76; 82; 83; 84; 98; 99; 100; 101</td>
<td>0.836 (all 19 items)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.841 (17 items excluding items 10 &amp; 40).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Governance of the community.</td>
<td>5; 27; 31; 34; 59; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 68; 81; 94; 95.</td>
<td>0.766 (all 15 items)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.775 (12 items excluding 27; 31; 34).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Governance as policy</td>
<td>3; 4; 6; 8; 9; 13; 15; 19; 21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30; 38; 41.</td>
<td>0.835 (all 18)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.840 (17 items excluding 9).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Learner governance</td>
<td>17; 18; 60; 70; 97.</td>
<td>0.65 (all items)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# The mean score is on a five-point scale:

To what extend would you agree or disagree with a proposal that...
1. Disagree
2. Partially disagree
3. Non-committal
4. Partially agree
5. Agree

**Items on F1 (Co-operative Governance)**

There are more items in this factor than in any other factor. This is a clear indication that schools are not a "one man show" but organisations that are made by the people for the people. These items show that communities are getting more and more involved in the governance of these institutions.
Items on F2 (Governance of non-educators)

The mean score factor indicates that members of the School Governing Bodies (SGB’s) (respondents) are willing to involve anyone who can make a difference to schools’ effectiveness and improvement – hence most of the schools have members of the “ground-staff” who are either co-opted or elected to SGB’s.

Items on F3 (General governance of educators)

Educators form the backbone of teaching and learning, therefore it is wise that they have to conduct themselves professionally and be responsible and accountable. Although educators are being regarded as “curriculum executors” it is also wise that they are pro-actively involved in the management of their schools.

Items on F4 (Governance of the community)

The mean factor score indicates that schools are community organisations – hence open-systems. Communities must be empowered to “air” their views through the right structure, that is the school governing body.

Items on F5 (Governance as policy)

The functions on this factor indicates that governing bodies need to be educated on how to draft policy-documents for various disciplines in schools.

Items on F6 (Learner governance)

Although this factor comprises of very few items, learners as the Act prescribes, need to be at the forefront in shaping the education of this country. They just need to be guided to acquire more experience in decision-making processes.
4.3 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

According to Krefting (1991:220) validity and reliability are effective strategies in establishing the credibility and accuracy of data representing subjective human experiences. Data for this study has been carefully and deliberately examined so that evidence can be tabulated and categorised.

**Reliability**

According to Le Compte and Preissle (1993:332) reliability refers to the "extent to which studies can be replicated." Thus, reliability deals with the extent to which a researcher can repeat a study on the same subject using the same methods as the first research and obtain the same results as the first study.

**Validity**

Hammersley (1990 as quoted by Silverman, 1994:149), interprets validity as the "extent to which an account accurately represent the social phenomena to which it refers." In simple terms, Baker (1988:119) points out that validity addresses the question: "Am I measuring what I think I am measuring?"

To ensure content validity, the items were designed using the functions for all governing bodies of public schools as prescribed in the South African Schools Act, 84 of 1996. Several experts in the research field from the Department of Educational Sciences and from the Statistical Consulting Service (STATCON) also reviewed the questionnaire to judge the relevancy of each item. The questionnaire was also given to 44 educators to complete as part of a pilot survey. The suggestions received, resulted in a number of adjustments in order to clarify the wording in the questionnaire.

The construct validity of the instrument was determined by means of successive first and second order factor analytic procedure performed on the 101 items. The 101 items were reduced to six factors (refer to table 4.1). All six scales are thus valid and reliable and could thus serve as a basis for determining to what extent members of governing bodies accept ownership of these functions. Now that the validity and reliability of the instrument has been established, the appropriate statistical analysis can be discussed.
### Table 4.2 Composite hypotheses with male and female respondents as the independent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences at the multivariate level.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>HoT</td>
<td>There is no statistically significant difference between the vector mean scale scores of male and female respondents in respect of all six governance factors taken together.</td>
<td>Hotelling $T^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaT</td>
<td>There is a statistically significant difference between the vector mean scale scores of male and female respondents in respect of the six governance factors taken together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>There is no statistically significant difference between the mean scale scores of male and female respondents in respect of each of the factors taken separately, namely:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences at the univariate level.</td>
<td>Hot1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-operative governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-professional governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learner governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hat</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scale scores of male and female principals in respect of each of the factors taken separately, namely:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hat1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-operative governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hat2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-professional governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hat3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hat4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hat5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hat6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learner governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 HYPOTHESES

Hypotheses were formulated in respect of all the independent groups. The comparison of independent groups will follow.

#### 4.4.1. Comparison of two independent groups

At the multivariate level two groups can be compared for possible statistical differences by means of Hotelling’s $T^2$ test. This implies that the vectors of the mean scale scores of the two groups are compared in respect of the six factors taken together.
Should a significant difference be found at this multivariate level, then the Student t-test is used in respect of each of the variables taken separately.

Possible differences between the opinions of male and female respondents (members of governing bodies) in respect of the six second order factors representing school governance will not be discussed.

4.1.1.1 Differences between male and female respondents relative to each of the six factors. (Refer to table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Significance of differences between male and female respondents regarding the following factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Factor Average</th>
<th>p-Value (Hotelling)</th>
<th>p-value (Student)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative governance</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.2788</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.1693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional governance</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.4638</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.4700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional governance</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.1255</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.8983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community governance</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.4807</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.2484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and policy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.8787</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.5966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Governance</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.3817</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.1893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N1(M)=404  
N2(F)=413  
**: Significant on the 1-%-level of statistical significance.
Tables 4.2 and 4.3 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the vector mean scale scores of male and female respondents in respect of the six factors considered together. The null hypothesis Hot is thus rejected and the alternative hypothesis Hat is supported.

In respect of difference at the single variable level between the two groups a statistical significant difference between the mean scores of male and female respondents in respect of five of the six factors are also present. The null hypothesis hot is thus rejected and the alternative hypothesis hat is supported. From this, one may possibly conclude that male members of governing bodies more readily support proposals enabling them to govern the school.

In respect of each factor considered separately the average mean score of the male respondents is significantly higher than that of the female respondents in respect of five factors (F1, F3, F4, F5 & F6). Thus Hot1, Hot3, Hot4, Hot5 and Hot6 are rejected in favour of Hat1, Hat3, Hat4, Hat5 and Hat6. Only in the case of F2 is the null hypothesis accepted in favour of the alternative hypothesis. From this, one may probably conclude that male and female members of governing bodies support functions related to non-professional staff to the same extent. Although not statistically significant, it is interesting to note that females only recorded a higher mean score in this factor. In all the other factors the male respondent held a more positive perception as to the extent that the governing body should perform the functions investigated.

4.4.2 Comparison of three or more independent groups

In respect of three or more independent groups multivariate differences are investigated by means of MANOVA (multivariate analysis or variance) in respect of the six factors considered together.
The vector mean scores are compared and should any difference be revealed at this level, then ANOVA (analysis of variance) and the Scheffé or the Dunnett $T^3$ tests are used to investigate this difference at the single variable level.

As an example of difference between three or more groups, the groups represented on the governing bodies are considered.

4.4.2.1 Differences between the various groups represented on the governing bodies in respect of the six governance factors (Refer to table 4.4.).
Table 4.4  Composite hypotheses with the groups represented on the governing bodies as the independent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension at the multivariate level</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences at the multivariate level</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>HoM</td>
<td>There is no statistically significant difference between the vector mean scores of the five groups represented on the governing bodies in respect of the six governance factors taken together.</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaM</td>
<td>There is a statistically significant difference between the vector mean scores for the five groups represented on the governing bodies in respect of the six governance factors taken together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences at the single variable level</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences at the single variable level</td>
<td></td>
<td>HoA</td>
<td>The average scale scores of the five representative groups do not differ in a statistically significant way from one another in respect of the following factors taken separately, namely:</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HoA1</td>
<td>Co-operative governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HoA2</td>
<td>Non-professional governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HoA3</td>
<td>Professional governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HoA4</td>
<td>Community governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HoA5</td>
<td>Governance and policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HoA7</td>
<td>Learner governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA</td>
<td>The average scale scores of the five groups represented on the governing bodies do differ in a statistically significant way from one another in respect of the following factors taken separately, namely:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA1</td>
<td>Co-operative governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA2</td>
<td>Non-professional governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA3</td>
<td>Professional governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA4</td>
<td>Community governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA5</td>
<td>Governance and policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA6</td>
<td>Learner governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HoS</td>
<td>There is no statistically significant difference between the average scale scores of the five representative groups compared pair-wise in respect of the following factors, namely (this table continues on the next page)</td>
<td>Scheffé or Dunnett T³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Pairs of representing groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>A vsB</th>
<th>A vsC</th>
<th>A vsD</th>
<th>A vsE</th>
<th>B vsC</th>
<th>B vsD</th>
<th>B vsE</th>
<th>C vsD</th>
<th>C vsE</th>
<th>D vsE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences at the single variable level</td>
<td>HoS.AB1</td>
<td>HoS.AC1</td>
<td>HoS.AD1</td>
<td>HoS.AE1</td>
<td>HoS.BC1</td>
<td>HoS.BD1</td>
<td>HoS.BE1</td>
<td>HoS.CD1</td>
<td>HoS.CE1</td>
<td>HoS.DE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional governance</td>
<td>HoS.AB2</td>
<td>HoS.AC2</td>
<td>HoS.AD2</td>
<td>HoS.AE2</td>
<td>HoS.BC2</td>
<td>HoS.BD2</td>
<td>HoS.BE2</td>
<td>HoS.CD2</td>
<td>HoS.CE2</td>
<td>HoS.DE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional governance</td>
<td>HoS.AB3</td>
<td>HoS.AC3</td>
<td>HoS.AD3</td>
<td>HoS.AE3</td>
<td>HoS.BC3</td>
<td>HoS.BD3</td>
<td>HoS.BE3</td>
<td>HoS.CD3</td>
<td>HoS.CE3</td>
<td>HoS.DE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community governance</td>
<td>HoS.AB4</td>
<td>HoS.AC4</td>
<td>HoS.AD4</td>
<td>HoS.AE4</td>
<td>HoS.BC4</td>
<td>HoS.BD4</td>
<td>HoS.BE4</td>
<td>HoS.CD4</td>
<td>HoS.CE4</td>
<td>HoS.DE4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and policy</td>
<td>HoS.AB5</td>
<td>HoS.AC5</td>
<td>HoS.AD5</td>
<td>HoS.AE5</td>
<td>HoS.BC5</td>
<td>HoS.BD5</td>
<td>HoS.BE5</td>
<td>HoS.CD5</td>
<td>HoS.CE5</td>
<td>HoS.DE5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner governance</td>
<td>HoS.AB6</td>
<td>HoS.AC6</td>
<td>HoS.AD6</td>
<td>HoS.AE6</td>
<td>HoS.BC6</td>
<td>HoS.BD6</td>
<td>HoS.BE6</td>
<td>HoS.CD6</td>
<td>HoS.CE6</td>
<td>HoS.DE6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Differences at the single variable level | HaS.AB1 | HaS.AC1 | HaS.AD1 | HaS.AE1 | HaS.BC1 | HaS.BD1 | HaS.BE1 | HaS.CD1 | HaS.CE1 | HaS.DE1 |
| Co-operative governance        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Non-professional governance    | HaS.AB2 | HaS.AC2 | HaS.AD2 | HaS.AE2 | HaS.BC2 | HaS.BD2 | HaS.BE2 | HaS.CD2 | HaS.CE2 | HaS.DE2 |
| Professional governance        | HaS.AB3 | HaS.AC3 | HaS.AD3 | HaS.AE3 | HaS.BC3 | HaS.BD3 | HaS.BE3 | HaS.CD3 | HaS.CE3 | HaS.DE3 |
| Community governance           | HaS.AB4 | HaS.AC4 | HaS.AD4 | HaS.AE4 | HaS.BC4 | HaS.BD4 | HaS.BE4 | HaS.CD4 | HaS.CE4 | HaS.DE4 |
| Governance and policy          | HaS.AB5 | HaS.AC5 | HaS.AD5 | HaS.AE5 | HaS.BC5 | HaS.BD5 | HaS.BE5 | HaS.CD5 | HaS.CE5 | HaS.DE5 |
| Learner governance             | HaS.AB6 | HaS.AC6 | HaS.AD6 | HaS.AE6 | HaS.BC6 | HaS.BD6 | HaS.BE6 | HaS.CD6 | HaS.CE6 | HaS.DE6 |

A = 101 principals
B = 368 educators
C = 78 others (non-educators & co-opted members)
D = 96 learners
E = 173 parents
Table 4.5  **Significance of difference between the five representative groups in respect of the following factors.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Factor average (Five point)</th>
<th>p-Value (MANOVA)</th>
<th>p-Value (ANOVA)</th>
<th>Scheffe / Dunnett T³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=agree 5=disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.4017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.2171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.1465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.0698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.2529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.3879</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.3651</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.5455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.7330</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.5423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.8530</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.8136</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.2517</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.5367</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.1317</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.5162</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.2187</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.4974</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.5146</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.4701</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.9571</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.6393</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.6795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.7598</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.8259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0755</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.3385</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.4438</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.5434</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F1 = Co-operative governance  ** Statistically significant at the 1%-level**
F2 = Non-professional governance  * Statistically significant at the 5%-level
Using tables 4.4 and 4.5, it follows that the H₀M is rejected at the 1%-level of significance. A statistically significant difference thus exists between the vector mean scores of the five groups in respect of the six factors taken together.

On the single variable level, the deduction can be made that there is a statistically significant difference between the average scale scores of the five representative groups (A-E) in respect of all six factors. The null hypotheses H₀A₁ – H₀A₆ are thus rejected in favour of the alternative hypotheses HₐA₁ – HₐA₆.

- Regarding the pair-wise comparison of the groupings the following conclusions can be made:

On co-operative governance (F₁) there is a statistically significant difference at the 1%-level between the principals and the educators and the principals and the learners. H₀S.AB₁ and H₀SAD₁ are thus rejected in favour of HₐS.AB₁ and HₐSAD₁. Principals agree more than educators and learners with proposals that favour co-operative governance.
On non-professional governance (F2) there is a statistically significant difference of the 1%-level between educators and learners. \( H_0 S.BD2 \) is thus rejected in favour of \( H_a S.BD2 \). Learners agree to a greater extent than educators do with proposals that favour the governance of non-professional staff. On this same factor there is also a statistically significant difference on the 5%-level between principals and learners. \( H_0 S.AD2 \) is thus rejected in favour of \( H_a S.AD2 \). Learners agree to a greater extent than principals do with proposals that favour the governance of non-professional staff.

On professional governance (F3) there is a statistically significant difference at the 1%-significance level, between the principals and the others, between the principals and the learners, between the educators and the others, between the educators and the learners, between the educators and the parents, and between the learners and the parents. \( H_0 S.AC3, H_0 S.AD3, H_0 S.BC3, H_0 S.BD3, H_0 S.BE3 \) AND \( H_0 S.DE3 \) are thus rejected in favour of \( H_a S.AC3, H_a S.AD3, H_a S.BC3, H_a S.BD3, H_a S.BE3 \) AND \( H_a S.DE3 \).

- From \( H_a S.AC3 \) it follows that the others (non-educators and co-opted members) agree to a greater extent than principals do with proposals that favour professional governance.
- From \( H_a S.AD3 \) it follows that the learners agree to a greater extent than principals do with proposals that favour professional governance.
- From \( H_a S.BC3 \) it follows that the others (non-educators and co-opted members) agree to a greater extent than educators do with the proposal that favour professional governance.
- From \( H_a S.BD3 \) it follows that the learners agree to a greater extent than educators do with the proposal that favour professional governance.
- From \( H_a S.BE3 \) it follows that the parents agree more than educators do with the proposal that favour professional governance.
From $H_a S.DE3$ it follows that the learners agree to a greater extent than parents do with proposals that favour professional governance.

On community governance ($F4$) there is a statistical significant difference at the 1% significant level between the principals and educators, educators and learners, and educators and parents. $H_0 S.AB4$, $H_0 S.BD4$ and $H_0 S.BC4$ are thus rejected in favour of $H_a S.AB4$, $H_a S.BD4$ and $H_a S.BC4$.

- From $H_a S.AB4$ it follows that the principals agree to a greater extent than educators do with the proposal that favour community governance.
- From $H_a S.BD4$ it follows that the learners agree to a greater extent than educators do with the proposal that favour community governance.
- From $H_a S.BC4$ it follows that the others (non-educators and co-opted members) agree more than educators do with the proposal that favour community governance.

On this same factor there is also a statistically significant difference on the 5% level between educators and others. $H_0 S.BC4$ is thus rejected in favour of $H_a S.BC4$. Others (non-educators and co-opted members) agree more than educators do with proposals that favour the governance of the community.

On governance and policy ($F5$) there is a statistically significant difference at the 1%-level between the principals and educators. $H_0 S.AB5$ is thus rejected in favour of $H_a S.AB5$. Principals agree to a greater extent than educators do with proposals that favour governance and policy.

On learner governance ($F6$) there is a statistically significant difference at the 1%-level between the educators and parents. $H_0 S.BE6$ is thus rejected in favour of $H_a S.BE6$. Parents agree to a greater extent than educators do with proposals that favour learner governance.
On this same factor there is also a statistically significant difference at the 5%-level between educators and learners. $H_0:S.BD6$ is thus rejected in favour of $H_a:S.BD6$. Learners agree to a greater extent than educators do with proposals that favour learner governance.

Table 4.6  Mean scores of the independent group in respect of the six factors of governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>4.2114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Province</td>
<td>4.1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.3946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North-West Province</td>
<td>4.2831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>4.2714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3001 - R4000</td>
<td>4.2589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;R5000</td>
<td>4.3391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>4.2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography of Township</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>4.2223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4.1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of School</td>
<td>&lt;400</td>
<td>4.2121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400 - 600</td>
<td>4.2778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;800</td>
<td>4.2262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 DEDUCTIONS FROM MEAN SCORES

It is necessary to briefly explain the differences in the factor mean scores obtained by the various independent groups as summarised in Table 4.6. In order to facilitate the discussion, factors are considered separately:

**F1 (Co-operative governance)**

One has better co-operative governance with:

- **Province:**
  - The other provinces (not including Gauteng, Northern Province, North-West province or KwaZulu-Natal)

- **Qualifications:**
  - Persons holding a tertiary qualification

- **Income:**
  - Persons with a monthly income above R5000,00

- **School type:**
  - Secondary schools

- **Geography of school:**
  - Schools in suburban areas

- **Size of school:**
  - Schools with between 400 – 600 learners
F2 (Non-professional governance)

One has better non-professional governance with:

- **Province:**
  - In Gauteng than any other provinces

- **Qualifications:**
  - Persons holding a secondary education

- **Income:**
  - Persons with a monthly income of less than R1000,00

- **School type:**
  - Secondary schools

- **Geography of school:**
  - Schools in suburban areas

- **Size of school:**
  - Schools with more than 800 learners

F3 (Professional governance)

One has better professional governance with:

- **Province:**
  - Gauteng
Qualifications:
➢ Persons holding a secondary qualification

Income:
➢ Persons with a monthly income of less than R1000,00

School type:
➢ Secondary schools

Geography of school:
➢ Schools in townships

Size of school:
➢ Schools with between 601 - 800 learners

F4 (Community governance)

One has better community governance with:

Province:
➢ The other provinces (excluding Gauteng, Northern Province, North-West or KwaZulu-Natal)

Qualifications:
➢ Persons holding a secondary qualification

Income:
➢ Persons with a monthly income of less than R1000,00
School type:
> Secondary schools

Geography of school:
> Schools in suburban areas

Size of school:
> Schools with more than 800 learners

F5 (Governance and policy)

One has better governance and policy with:

Province:
> The other provinces

Qualifications:
> Persons holding a secondary education

Income:
> Persons with a monthly income above R5000,00

School type:
> Secondary schools

Geography of school:
> Schools in suburban areas

Size of school:
> Schools with between 400 – 600 learners
F6 (Learner governance):

One has better learner governance with:

- **Province:**
  - North-West province

- **Qualifications:**
  - Persons holding a secondary education

- **Income:**
  - Persons with a monthly income of less than R1000.00

- **School type:**
  - Secondary schools

- **Geography of school:**
  - Schools in rural areas

- **Size of school:**
  - Schools with less than 400 learners

The discussion of the differences between the factor mean scores of the various independent groups is now followed by a brief summary of this chapter.
4.6 SUMMARY

In this chapter an analysis and interpretation of some of the empirical data was undertaken. The statistical analysis of the research was rationed to a comparison of one example of two independent groups and one example of three or more independent groups.

Hypotheses were set and multivariate statistics were used to analyse and interpret the data.

An instrument which has construct validity should also be able to distinguish between groups which are known to differ from one another.

It can be seen from the data in Table 4.6 that many of the groups which one expects to differ significantly from one another do indeed differ in their perceptions as to the extent that the governing body should perform the functions being investigated.

These differences were discussed and possible reasons for the differences in factor mean scores were postulated.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The main aim of the research was to investigate times of the school day, consistent with any applicable conditions of employment of staff at the school, by the SGB's.

It was essential for this topic to be researched, as it has a great impact on effective school management. If time is not managed well in schools, it is the learner who suffers in the end.

The conditions in schools will continue to degenerate if time is not managed well and used competently by all parties (stakeholders) concerned. Stakeholders often complain that they do not have much time to cover their work, forgetting the fact that in practical terms no one has enough time for everything.

Bearing this fact in mind, the effectiveness of time management in schools should be investigated, and if not, the causes should be established, and attempt should be made to offer appropriate suggestions in order to rectify the situation.

In the previous chapter (4), the findings of this research were presented. This being the final chapter (5), it is necessary to recapitulate the salient facts of this research project under the following headings:

- Summary
- Important findings
- Recommendations
- Concluding remarks
5.2 SUMMARY

The central theme throughout this research has been to investigate how governing bodies perceive the function(s) bestowed on them by the Schools' Act.

The introductory chapter entailed the research problem, aims and questions guiding the study, its significance and methodology. The intention is to assist SGB's to be pro-active enough in executing the function of determining times of the school day, as the Act prescribes.

In chapter two, an in-depth literature survey was undertaken. This literature assisted in providing background as to how the SGB's (school boards / management councils) in other countries (England, Japan and Kenya) are involved in the management of their schools. The situation in South African schools was also compared and contrasted at face value to the situations in these countries.

Lastly, this literature also helped in analyzing the research data and an effort was made to expose ways in which time is not effectively used and possible strategies of using time competently were explored.

Chapter three of this research highlighted the research method and techniques used to collect data for this research. The research instrument was described regarding the design of the questionnaire and a discussion of time management in schools was also stated, based on the questions that were given to the respondents.

In chapter four an analysis and interpretation of the empirical data were discussed. Issues of reliability and validity of data were discussed and hypotheses were also given.
This chapter (the final one) interprets and analyses the findings of this research. The responses of participants are analysed for their implications on determining times of the school day. Lastly, this chapter provides the summary, recommendations and concluding remarks of this research.

5.3 IMPORTANT FINDINGS

5.3.1. Findings from the literature survey

5.3.1.1 Time management

- Planning, effective use of a diary and a daily action-sheet are some of the essential tools the SGB’s can use in order to manage time effectively. This is in view of the fact that they enable one to find out where one’s time go and if some of it is used ineffectively, in order to rectify mistakes.

- Co-operative governance can help SGB’s to save much needed time in schools as it go hand-in-glove with delegation of tasks.

- Because learner achievement is influenced by the time devoted to instruction and exposure to content, SGB’s need to ensure that time-masters do not become a hindrance in ways which time is being used.

5.3.1.2 Governing bodies of public schools

a. In England, for example, governors are responsible for deciding the times of the school day. But neither the head nor the governing body is capable of acting without the fullest co-operation of, and consultation with the other.

The decision can be the governors’ but all the expertise necessary to inform that decision lies with the head – partnership is bound to work!
b. In Japan, unlike most countries studied in this research, parents do not have a representative structure. Despite this fact, they are actively involved in the schooling of their children. Lack of SGB’s in this country can be attributed to the fact that the control and administration of public schools is pyramidal and hierarchical.

c. In Kenya, management councils are partially involved in the management of their schools. They have limited control over school funds, they do not even have a say regarding the appointment of teaching staff, let alone in determining times of the school day.

d. Amongst the four countries studied, South Africa has its own uniqueness. In South Africa, schools’ SGB’s are sanctioned by law to be totally and actively involved in schools.

5.3.2 Important empirical findings

> The governance of public schools comprises of six factors, namely:

- Co-operative governance which is composed of 33 items with an Alpha Cronbach Reliability Coefficient of 0.899.

- Governance of non-educators, consisted of items with an Alpha Cronbach Reliability coefficient of 0.703.

- General governance of educators, made up from 19 items with an Alpha Cronbach Reliability Coefficient of 0.836, 0.841 on 17 items.

- Governance of the community, comprised of 15 items with an Alpha Cronbach Reliability Coefficient of 0.766 and 0.775 on 12 items.
Governance as policy, consisted of 18 items with an Alpha Cronbach Reliability coefficient of 0.835 and 0.840 on 17 items.

• Learner governance made up from five items with an Alpha Cronbach Reliability Coefficient of 0.6.

➢ In respect of all six factors of governance, significant statistical differences were found between the perception of the respondents (SGB members) in the mean factor score of the following groups:

• Province, qualifications, income, school type in which one is currently the governor, school geography and its size.

➢ In respect of all six factors of governance, the opinions of the following groups of respondents (school governors) divulged significant differences:

• Province, qualifications, income, school type, school geography and school size.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

The main aim of this research project was an investigation into the importance of time management in schools. In order to realize this aim, a literature review was undertaken and this served as a foundation upon which an empirical investigation could be based.

The literature review also provided a conceptual framework, which guided the study. The findings of this research are now amalgamated by the following recommendations:
5.4.1 Recommendations pertaining to the literature review

Goldstein (1995:279) offers what he calls best practices to academic learning time. He suggests that contingencies for school attendance and punctuality be established by minimizing interruptions and maintaining academic focus at all cost.

- SGB’s therefore, need to be trained to use time management tools effectively. It is highly recommended that “communities should take it upon themselves to be actively involved in the education of their children by doing something against teachers who arrive late at schools or those who spend precious time in shopping malls, especially in month-ends.” (Mphaki, 1999:2).

- SGB’s should help teachers and learners use time effectively and judiciously by creating and sustaining conditions. SGB’s need to be time-conscious when executing their duties.

➢ Election / Co-option of (a) person(s) with time management skills

An effective SGB should work in partnership with the staff of the school towards a common set of aims and objectives.

- Research data has shown that SGB’s can have realistic objectives on paper, but if it lacks time management skills and expertise, its plans are bound to be shattered. It is recommended that the SGB’s should have someone with the skills and who is an expert in the field of time management.
> Availability of the Act to SGB's

The findings of this research project reflect that some SGB members do not have copies of the relevant acts at their disposal.

They only got copies when the researcher confronted them for the purpose of this research. Chances are that they might never have had copies if the researcher did not provide them with copies.

- It is highly recommended that all governing body members should have a copy of the Schools Act, Educators' Employment Act, Public Service Act and the Labour Relations Act.

SGB’s should attend workshops and seminars in order to be knowledgeable and acquainted on:

- The formulation of acts.

- The relevance of the above mentioned acts in the learning organisations.

- Guiding their actions to act within the parameters of educational law.

5.4.2 Recommendations pertaining to educative competence

SGB's should rekindle the community's ownership of the education process and the interest of the society in its entirety must be represented and well catered for.

- SGB's must show professional commitment, create order and discipline, and should have an ability to reflect and have an ethical educational foundation as its source.
5.4.3 Recommendations pertaining to collaborative competence

Collaborative competence is characterised by mutual trust, shared work values and co-operation. As a construct, it is related to aspects like trust, support, open communication, learning on the job, getting results and job satisfaction.

- It is recommended that collaborative competence forms part of the educational framework for any school.

5.4.4 Topics for further research

This area of SGB's involvement in the management and administration of public schools has its own ramifications, which has not received much attention.

The transformation process dictates that this area needs to be thoroughly researched. It is recommended that the focus of further research should investigate:

➤ The link between time management and pupils' achievement.

➤ How SGB's manage their time in practice.

➤ How principals, educators and learners use their time.

5.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The purpose of this study has been the desire to help improve the quality and effectiveness of SGB's in dealing with determining times of the school day.
The researcher hopes that this research will encourage SGB's to develop good working relations with all the stakeholders concerned. Although the SGB's are constituted by people/persons from all walks of life, their individual goals must be superseded by organizational super-ordinate goals.

For this structure to have "teeth", it needs people who are committed, diligent and responsible.

The intention of this research has not been to be prescriptive but to provide a framework for SGB's in dealing with the demands placed on them by the Schools Act.

Training needs to be given to SGB's on how to use time management tools or strategies. This training will then enable SGB's to become competent time managers, which is the main purpose of this study.

The conclusion arrived at after looking at the empirical results, indicates that although SGB's in other circles try their best in managing times of the school day, laxity still prevails in other areas.
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Dear Madam/sir

The effective functioning of governing bodies affects us all in this country. It is vital that we obtain your opinion regarding the functions of governing bodies to ensure effective education.

A questionnaire is one of the most reliable ways of gathering data for scientific research.

Please bear the following in mind when you complete the questionnaire:

- Do not write your name on the questionnaire - it remains anonymous.
- There are no correct or incorrect answers in section B. We merely require your honest opinion.
- Your first spontaneous reaction is the most valid.
- Please answer all questions.
- Please return this questionnaire to the person from whom it was received, after having completed it.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours faithfully

Tom Bisschoff
Professor of Educational Management
& eleven MEd students
SECTION A - PERSONAL INFORMATION

Circle the applicable code or fill in the number where necessary

EXAMPLE FOR COMPLETING SECTION A
If you are a male encircle 1

QUESTION 1: YOUR GENDER?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Who do you represent on the governing body? Choose one option only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-educators</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-opted member</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How old are you (in complete years)?
   e.g. if you are 35
   
   
   

   3 | 5
4. In which province is your school situated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern province</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West province</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Your highest educational qualification?
   Choose only one option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower than Grade 9 (Std. 7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 or grade 11 (Std. 8 or 9)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12 (Std. 10)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post school certificate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post school diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree or higher diploma</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Which is your religious commitment?
   Choose one option only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Which language do you regard as your mother tongue? Choose one option only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndebele</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sotho</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sotho</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swati</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsonga</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What work do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government sector</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal sector</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What is your gross income? If you feel you cannot answer this question skip it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R0-R500 per month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R501-R1 000 per month</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1 001-R2 000 per month</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 001-R3 000 per month</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 001-R5 000 per month</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than R5 000 per month</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. How would you classify your school? Choose only one option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How would you classify your school? Choose only one option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How many years have you been involved in school governance (PTSA’s/management councils and other similar bodies)?
e.g. If two years write: 0|2
If it is less than one year write: 0|0

13. What is the learner enrolment of your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-200</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-400</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-800</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-1 000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B.

REMEMBER THIS IS NOT A TEST OF YOUR COMPETENCE. WE ARE INTERESTED IN YOUR OPINION.

MARK YOUR OPINION BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER ON THE SCALE PROVIDED FOR EACH QUESTION.

GIVE YOUR OPINION ON A 5 POINT SCALE WHERE:

1 MEANS YOU DISAGREE
5 MEANS YOU AGREE
2 - 4 IS SOMEWHERE IN BETWEEN

For example if you partially agree with this statement:

The governing body must undertake class visits.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

1. The governing body must undertake class visits.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

2. The governing body must inspect the school buildings and grounds.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

3. The governing body must draw up a mission statement for the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

4. The governing body must recommend a specific person to the head of the education department to be appointed as an educator if it is a departmental post (the department will pay the teacher).
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

5. The governing body must appoint a specific person as an educator if it is in a non-departmental post (the governing body will pay the educator).
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE
6. The governing body must appoint a specific person as a gardener if it is a departmental post (the department will pay the gardener).

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE

7. The governing body must receive regular reports from the principal on the performance of educators.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE

8. The members of the governing body must be reimbursed from school funds for expenses they incurred.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE

9. The members of the governing body must be paid for services they have rendered to the school.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE

10. Learners who come late for school must sit in detention during breaks for that specific day.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE

11. The governing body must fine educators who come late on a regular basis.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE

12. The governing body must be informed if an educator does not prepare for a lesson.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE

13. The governing body must adopt a constitution.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE

14. The school principal must appoint the cleaning staff.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE

15. The governing body must present the mission statement for the school to the parents for final approval.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE

16. The governing body must monitor the performance of the principal.

DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5

AGREE
TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

17. The governing body must determine the times of the school day.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

18. The parents must determine the times of the school day.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

19. The governing body must draw up a constitution.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

20. The school management team should appoint the cleaning staff.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

21. The governing body must draw up the job description of all non-educator staff
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

22. The governing body must draw up criteria for measuring the performance of non-educator staff
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

23. The governing body must appraise the performance of non-educator staff
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

24. The governing body must provide a programme for the training and development of non-educator staff
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

25. The governing body must determine the conditions of service for non-educator staff
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

26. A register of all the assets of the school must be kept on behalf of the governing body.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

27. A political party be allowed to train party members on party policy in the school hall.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE
TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

28. The governing body must present a constitution to the parents for final adoption.
   
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

29. The SRC (in the case of a secondary school) must develop a mission statement for the school.
   
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

30. The control of the school's property is the responsibility of the governing body.
   
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

31. A group of concerned parents be allowed to train adults in basic skills in the classrooms after hours.
   
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

32. The principal must report regularly to the governing body on the professional performance of the educators.
   
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

33. The governing body should encourage educators to render voluntary services to the school.
   
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

34. The education department be allowed to use classrooms after hours as a community college.
   
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

35. The management team of the school must determine the times of the school day.
   
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

36. The governing body must present a constitution to the SRC (in the case of a secondary school) for final adoption.
   
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

37. The governing body must encourage learners to render voluntary services to the school.
   
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5  AGREE
TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

38. The governing body must be responsible for policy-making in the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

39. The parents must develop a mission statement for the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

40. Student organisations (in the case of a secondary school) be allowed to have meetings during school hours.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

41. The governing body must draw up the mission statement for the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

42. Learners must be encouraged to clean the classrooms.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

43. Teacher unions be allowed to conduct training programmes for their members in classrooms after school hours.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

44. The educators must develop a mission statement for the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

45. The SRC (in the case of a secondary school) must develop a code of conduct for learners.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

46. Parents must be invited to do voluntary paintwork at the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

47. The governing body must formulate action plans to achieve the vision and mission of the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

48. The management team of a school must develop the mission statement of the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE
TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

49. The governing body must provide resources to the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

50. The governing body must strengthen the link between the school and the community.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

51. Educators must be encouraged to render voluntary coaching services (sport) to the learners.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

52. A new gardener be appointed if it is a proposal from the principal.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

53. The governing body must take responsibility for the school's performance.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

54. The governing body must evaluate the performance of the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

55. Will promote teamwork in the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

56. Will allow learners to be involved in decision-making.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

57. The governing body must recommend to the head of the education department to appoint a new gardener if it is a proposal from the principal.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

58. Will promote open communication between the governing body and the community.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREE

59. Will lead to the suspension of an educator who is guilty of misconduct.
TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

60. The parents must draw up a code of conduct for learners.

61. Will lead to the termination of the services of teachers if their services are no longer required.

62. Will lead to the appointment of a new secretary if it is a proposal from the chairman of the governing body.

63. Will lead to the reasonable educational use, under fair conditions of the facilities of the school, at the request of the Head of Department.

64. Will lead to the dismissal of an incompetent teacher.

65. Will lead to the reasonable non-educational use, under fair conditions of the facilities of the school, at the request of the Head of Department.

66. Will lead to the reasonable political use, under fair conditions of the facilities of the school, at the request of the Head of Department.

67. The governing body must protect learners from substance abuse.

68. Will lead to the suspension of an incompetent principal.

69. Will allow the governing body to play a major role in the elections of the SRC in a secondary school.

70. The governing body must draw up a code of conduct for
TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

71. Will allow for the governing body to assist the principal in the appraisal of the educators.

72. Will allow the governing body to decide on the type of punishment for those learners that contravene the school rules.

73. Will lead to the expulsion of a learner that is guilty of misconduct.

74. Will ensure that the governing body will determine the admission policy of the school.

75. All written complaints about educators must be submitted to the governing body.

76. Will give the governing body the authority to decide which teacher union will be recognised in the school.

77. Will encourage learners to feel a sense of ownership for the school.

78. Will encourage learners to be more tolerant towards one another.

79. Will empower the governing body to act against learners that disrupt the school programme.

80. Will ensure that the governing body takes responsibility for the order and discipline in the school.
81. Will abolish all political activities in the school.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

82. Will empower the governing body to decide on the school terms.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

83. Will enable educators to administer corporal punishment.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

84. Will allow members of the governing body to visit teachers at anytime to ensure productivity.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

85. Will ensure financial accountability from the principal.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

86. The governing body must take full responsibility for the school’s budget.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

87. The governing body must propose the amount of school fees to a parent forum for ratification.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

88. The governing body must take full responsibility for any fund raising projects.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

89. Will encourage the community to get involved in the school’s activities.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

90. Will encourage co-operation with other governing bodies in the area.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

91. Will encourage donors to “adopt” the school.

   DISAGREE  1 2 3 4 5  AGREE

92. Will encourage parents to assist the educators in the classroom.
TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

93. The governing body must take measures to ensure that learners attend school regularly.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREED

94. The governing body must pay voluntary workers from the community a small amount.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREED

95. Will lead to the termination of the services of non-educator staff if their services are no longer required.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREED

96. The governing body must discipline learners who carry dangerous weapons to school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREED

97. The governing body should draw up a code of conduct for learners.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREED

98. The governing body must draw up the job description of educators at the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREED

99. The governing body must draw up criteria for measuring the performance of educators at the school.
   DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREED

100. The governing body must appraise the performance of educators at the school.
    DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREED

101. The governing body must provide a programme for the training and development of educators at the school.
    DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 AGREED
The annual report from the Governing Body

The principal report

Written Reports

Meetings and Committees

The Governing Body must be a parental

The principal's role is to ensure that the school is managed effectively and efficiently. The principal is responsible for the education and welfare of the students, and for ensuring that the school is run in accordance with the policies and procedures established by the Governing Body.

The Governing Body is the body that is responsible for the management of the school. It is made up of parents and other members of the community, and is appointed by the Board of Education. The role of the Governing Body is to ensure that the school is run in the best interests of the students, and that the education and welfare of the students is protected.

The principal is responsible for the day-to-day running of the school, and for ensuring that the school is run in accordance with the policies and procedures established by the Governing Body. The principal is also responsible for the education and welfare of the students, and for ensuring that the school is run in the best interests of the students.

The principal is responsible for the management of the school, and for ensuring that the school is run in accordance with the policies and procedures established by the Governing Body. The principal is also responsible for the education and welfare of the students, and for ensuring that the school is run in the best interests of the students.

The principal is responsible for the management of the school, and for ensuring that the school is run in accordance with the policies and procedures established by the Governing Body. The principal is also responsible for the education and welfare of the students, and for ensuring that the school is run in the best interests of the students.

The principal is responsible for the management of the school, and for ensuring that the school is run in accordance with the policies and procedures established by the Governing Body. The principal is also responsible for the education and welfare of the students, and for ensuring that the school is run in the best interests of the students.

The principal is responsible for the management of the school, and for ensuring that the school is run in accordance with the policies and procedures established by the Governing Body. The principal is also responsible for the education and welfare of the students, and for ensuring that the school is run in the best interests of the students.
The chairperson's functions include:

- Facilitating the expression of opinions and discussion among members of the governing board.
- Handling correspondence, reports, and other matters requiring attention.
- Representing the governing board in matters of the school district.
- Coordinating the work of the governing board.
- Maintaining discipline and order in the school district.
- Ensuring that the financial and administrative policies of the school district are carried out.

The chairperson also has the authority to:

- Call meetings of the governing board.
- Appoint committee chairs and members.
- Sign official documents on behalf of the governing board.

Who does what?

- The chairperson and the governing board.
- The treasurer and secretary.

The roles of the chairperson, treasurer, and secretary include:

- The chairperson is responsible for chairing meetings and ensuring that the governing board operates efficiently.
- The treasurer is responsible for managing the financial affairs of the school district.
- The secretary is responsible for maintaining records and correspondence.

The governing board meets to discuss and make decisions about:

- School policies and programs.
- Financial matters.
- Long-term planning and budgeting.

The treasurer and secretary are also responsible for:

- Preparing and maintaining financial records.
- Issuing financial reports.
- Assisting the chairperson in managing the school district's financial affairs.
The five greatest meetings are the morning, noon, evening, and bedtime meetings.

The morning meeting should be organized in advance, with the agenda set for the day. The noon meeting should be a quick check-in to ensure tasks are being completed. The evening meeting should be a wrap-up session, with any necessary actions or decisions recorded. The bedtime meeting should be a reflective session, focusing on personal growth and development.

The Secretary's role is to ensure that all meetings are efficiently run, with any necessary actions or decisions recorded. The Secretary should also ensure that the agenda is prepared in advance and that all necessary materials are available.

When setting the agenda, consider the following:
- Relevant topics
- Adequate time allocation

The Secretary should also ensure that any necessary actions or decisions are recorded and followed up on.

The Secretary's responsibilities include:
- Preparing the agenda
- Ensuring all necessary materials are available
- Recording any necessary actions or decisions
- Following up on any necessary actions or decisions
A few more pointers for successful meetings

1. Vary the seating arrangement to keep everyone engaged.
2. Encourage active participation from all members.
3. Use visual aids to reinforce points.
4. Keep the meeting focused on the agenda.
5. Be open to feedback and suggestions.

Also very helpful:

- Know when to move on a sense of humor.
- Encourage participants to lead the discussion.
- Keep the meeting relaxed and fun.
- Use technology to enhance the meeting experience.
- Ensure everyone is aware of the meeting's purpose.

Discussion and debate

- Encourage a free flow of ideas.
- Allow time for questions and answers.
- Summarize key points at the end of the meeting.

Note: This guide is a summary of best practices for meeting facilitation.
Government bodies may be granted extra functions as a policy about uniform. A policy about uniform is a code of conduct, including government bodies are also granted to adopt a condition that the government bodies are expected to follow. It is to be noted that every government body is to follow a policy about uniform. A policy about uniform is a code of conduct, including government bodies are also granted to adopt a condition that the government bodies are expected to follow.

Why do schools need governing bodies?

The following information can be read to compile a type of government bodies or a policy about uniform. A policy about uniform is a code of conduct, including government bodies are also granted to adopt a condition that the government bodies are expected to follow. It is to be noted that every government body is to follow a policy about uniform.
Who can be on a governing body?

A governing body consists predominantly of parents of pupils at the school. These parents must be elected by the parent body. The teaching staff, the non-teaching staff, and high school pupils, also elect representatives. The Principal is automatically a member, and other members may be co-opted if the need arises.

What qualities do you need to be a member of a governing body?

Ordinary people can be governing body members. You need to have enthusiasm, time, interest in the school, common sense, a readiness to accept responsibility and commitment.

Will members of governing bodies be paid?

All members of governing bodies are volunteers, but can be paid for any expenses related to their duties.

What happens if the governing body does not do its work?

The Head of the Education Department can appoint people to carry out the tasks for a period of three months.

Who provides support for governing bodies?

Local education departments are obliged by the Act to offer support and will soon be in a position to do so.