

Recommendation to the Head of Department regarding  
the appointment of educators as a function  
of the governing body

by

Mosebyadi Marry Petje

*MINI-DISSERTATION*

*submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree*



EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT

in the

FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND NURSING

at the

RAND AFRIKAANS UNIVERSITY

Supervisor: Prof TC Bisschoff

October 1999

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Professor TC Bisschoff, my supervisor, for his guidance, relentless help and encouragement during the course of this project. My thanks is also extended to Professor BR Grobler for his helpful discussions. This project would not have been possible without them.

I gratefully appreciate the moral support and the financial assistance of my husband, Kgothoane, my brother Kgabo and my parents for their unconditional support and prayers.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to my children, Lerato, Tebogo and Thabang, for their tolerance and understanding throughout the trying times of this research.

Thanks are also due to Mister JG Tabane for his time in helping me with grammatical corrections. Many thanks go to my co-researchers for their constant support and encouragement.

Many thanks go to Suzette Vice for her unfailing competence in meeting the test of endless series of drafts and near impossible deadlines in committing this research essay to the computer during the late hours of the night.

Most of all, I am grateful to God the Almighty, for the health, wisdom and perseverance, without which this contribution would not have been made.

## SYNOPSIS

In chapter one an exposition of the purpose of this study was given. The problem statement was presented and demarcated into the specific research problem and overall research problem. The aims and objectives of the aforesaid problems were explained. The research methodology used in this study was also stated as a literature review and quantitative research. Concepts, which were used in this study, were clarified.

Chapter two concentrates on a literature review to establish what other theorists in three countries say about this specific function of governing bodies in South Africa namely: "make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators".

In chapter three the design of the research instrument was discussed. The questionnaire, consisting of 101 open-ended items based on research done by Bisschoff and students, was discussed. The theoretical construct, around which the function revolves, were tabulated. Questions pertinent specifically to the mentioned function of governing bodies were discussed.

Members of school governing bodies were sampled. Of the 1000 questionnaires distributed, 888 were returned in a usable format with a return rate of 88,8%.

An analysis and interpretation of the empirical data was undertaken in chapter four. The construct validity of the research instrument was investigated, using successive factor analyses. This produced six factors namely:

- ◇ co-operative governance which is composed of 33 items with a Chronbach-alpha reliability coefficient of 0,899;
- ◇ governance of non-educators, made up from 11 items with a Chronbach-alpha reliability coefficient of 0,703;
- ◇ governance of educators composed of 19 items with a Chronbach-alpha reliability coefficient of 0,836;

- ◇ governance of the community which is made up from 15 items with a Chronbach-alpha reliability coefficient of 0,766;
- ◇ governance as policy which is composed of 18 items with a Chronbach-alpha reliability coefficient of 0,766; and
- ◇ governance of learners, made up from 5 items with a Chronbach-alpha reliability coefficient of 0,65.

Hypotheses were set and multivariate statistics were used to analyse and interpret the data. Important findings and recommendations were explicated in chapter five. Literature findings revealed that it is only in South Africa where school-governing bodies should make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators. These functions could be performed effectively if governing bodies can be workshopped, capacitated and empowered. Empirical findings revealed that all respondents which took part in this research are in favour of the six factors as incorporated in governing bodies. Topics for further research were highlighted.



## OPSOMMING

In hoofstuk een is 'n uiteensetting van die doel met hierdie studie gegee. Die probleemstelling is aan die orde gestel en afgegrens tot die spesifieke navorsingsprobleem en oorkoepelende navorsingsprobleem. Die doelstelling en doelwitte van die bogenoemde probleme is verduidelik. Die navorsingsmetodologie vir hierdie studie is ook voorgestel as 'n literatuurondersoek en kwantitatiewe navorsing. Konsepte wat in die studie gebruik word, is uitgeklaar.

Hoofstuk twee fokus op 'n literatuurondersoek om vas te stel wat die mening van ander teoretici in drie lande is omtrent hierdie spesifieke funksie van die beheerliggame in Suid Afrika, naamlik om aanbevelings aan die Departementshoof te maak insake die aanstelling van opvoeders.

In hoofstuk drie is die ontwerp van die navorsingsinstrument bespreek. Die vraelys bestaan uit 101 oop-einde items wat gebaseer is op navorsing wat deur Bisschoff en sy studente uitgevoer is. Die teoretiese konstruk waarom die funksie wentel, is getabuleer. Vrae wat spesifiek betrekking het op die nagevorste funksie van die beheerliggame is bespreek.

'n Steekproef is uit lede van die skoolbeheerliggame getrek. Van die 1000 vraelyste wat versprei is, is 888 in 'n bruikbare vorm terugontvang met 'n 88,8% ontvangsratio.

In hoofstuk vier is 'n ontleding en interpretasie van die empiriese data gedoen. Die konstrukgeldigheid van die navorsingsinstrument is met behulp van opeenvolgende faktoranalises ondersoek. Ses faktore het hieruit na vore gekom:

- ◇ samewerkende bestuur – wat bestaan uit 33 items met 'n Chronbach-alpha betroubaarheidskoëffisiënt van 0,99;
- ◇ bestuur van nie-opvoeders – saamgestel uit 11 items met 'n Chronbach-alpha betroubaarheidskoëffisiënt van 0,703;
- ◇ bestuur van opvoeders – bestaande uit 19 items met 'n Chronbach-alpha betroubaarheidskoëffisiënt van 0,836;

- ◇ bestuur van die gemeenskap – wat saamgestel is uit 15 items met 'n Chronbach-alpha betroubaarheidskoëffisiënt van 0,766;
- ◇ bestuur van beleid – bestaande uit 18 items met 'n Chronbach-alpha betroubaarheidskoëffisiënt van 0,766; en
- ◇ bestuur van leerders – saamgestel uit 5 items met 'n Chronbach-alpha betroubaarheidskoëffisiënt van 0,65.

Hipoteses is gestel en multivariante statistiek gebruik om die data te ontleed en te interpreteer. Belangrike bevindinge en aanbevelings is in hoofstuk vyf uiteengesit. Bevindinge uit die literatuur dui daarop dat daar slegs in Suid-Afrika aanbevelings deur skoolbeheerliggame aan die Departmentshoof gemaak word met betrekking tot die aanstelling van opvoeders. Hierdie funksies kan effektief uitgevoer word indien beheerliggame in werksinkels toegerus en bemagtig word. Die empiriese ondersoek dui daarop dat alle respondente wat aan hierdie navorsing deelgeneem het, ten gunste is van die ses faktore wat by die funksies van beheerliggame ingesluit is. Onderwerpe vir verdere navorsing is uitgelig.



## LIST OF TABLES

	<i>PAGE</i>
<b>TABLE 3.1</b> ITEMS ON FUNCTION: MAKE RECOMMENDATION TO THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT REGARDING THE APPOINTMENT OF EDUCATORS .....	21
<b>TABLE 3.2</b> GENDER .....	27
<b>TABLE 3.3</b> REPRESENTATION ON THE SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY .....	28
<b>TABLE 3.4</b> AGE .....	28
<b>TABLE 3.5</b> PROVINCES .....	29
<b>TABLE 3.6</b> QUALIFICATIONS .....	29
<b>TABLE 3.7</b> RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT .....	30
<b>TABLE 3.8</b> MOTHER TONGUE .....	30
<b>TABLE 3.9</b> TYPE OF WORK .....	31

<b>TABLE 3.10</b>	
GROSS INCOME PER MONTH .....	31
<b>TABLE 3.11</b>	
TYPE OF SCHOOL .....	32
<b>TABLE 3.12</b>	
GEOGRAPHY OF SCHOOLS .....	32
<b>TABLE 3.13</b>	
YEARS INVOLVED IN SCHOOL GOVERNANCE .....	33
<b>TABLE 3.14</b>	
LEARNER ENROLMENT .....	33
<b>TABLE 4.1</b>	
SUMMARY OF FACTORS .....	36
<b>TABLE 4.2</b>	
COMPOSITE HYPOTHESES WITH MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE .....	38
<b>TABLE 4.3</b>	
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS REGARDING FACTORS .....	40
<b>TABLE 4.4</b>	
COMPOSITE HYPOTHESIS WITH THE GROUPS REPRESENTED ON GOVERNING BODIES AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE .....	42



**TABLE 4.5**  
**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE**  
**REPRESENTING GROUPS IN RESPECT OF**  
**THE FACTORS ..... 45**

**TABLE 4.6**  
**MEAN SCORES OF THE INDEPENDENT GROUP**  
**IN RESPECT OF THE SIX FACTORS OF**  
**GOVERNANCE ..... 48**



## TABLE OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Questionnaire to members of school governing bodies



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>PAGE</i>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	i
SYNOPSIS .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
1.1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM .....	2
1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND MOTIVATIONAL STUDY .....	3
1.4 AIMS OF THE RESEARCH .....	4
1.4.1 General aim of the research project .....	4
1.4.2 Aim of the research group .....	4
1.5 RESEARCH STRATEGY AND RESEARCH METHODS .....	5
1.6 CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS .....	5
1.6.1 Recommendation .....	6
1.6.2 Head of Department .....	6
1.6.3 Appointment .....	6
1.6.4 Applicable Act .....	6
1.7 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY .....	7
1.7.1 Chapter 1 .....	7
1.7.2 Chapter 2 .....	7
1.7.3 Chapter 3 .....	7
1.7.4 Chapter 4 .....	7
1.7.5 Chapter 5 .....	8
1.8 SUMMARY .....	8
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	
2.1 INTRODUCTION .....	9
2.2 ENGLAND .....	10
2.2.1 Introduction .....	10
2.2.2 People to be members of the governing body .....	11

2.2.3	Roles of the governing body in England .....	11
2.2.4	Functions of governing boards in England .....	12
2.2.5	Functions of governing boards in England in comparison with those in South Africa .....	13
2.3	PAPUA NEW GUINEA .....	14
2.3.1	Introduction .....	14
2.3.2	Roles of boards in Papua New Guinea .....	14
2.3.3	Functions of the board in Papua New Guinea .....	15
2.3.4	Functions of boards in Papua New Guinea in comparison with the functions of those in South African .....	16
2.4	TANZANIA .....	16
2.4.1	Introduction .....	16
2.4.2	Schools as economic, social, political and Intellectual tools .....	17
2.4.3	Functions of Tanzania's school committees .....	18
	Functions of governing bodies in Tanzania as compared with those in South Africa .....	19
2.5	SUMMARY .....	19
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>		
3.1	INTRODUCTION .....	20
3.2	THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT .....	20
3.2.1	The design of the questionnaire .....	20
3.2.2	Discussion of the function .....	23
3.3	THE EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION .....	27
3.3.1	Respondents .....	27
3.4	SUMMARY .....	34
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>		
4.1	INTRODUCTION .....	35
4.2	RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY .....	37
4.3	HYPOTHESES .....	37

4.3.1	Comparison of two independent groups .....	37
4.3.1.1	<i>Differences between male and female respondents relative to each of the six factors</i> .....	38
4.3.2	Comparison of three or more independent groups .....	41
4.3.2.1	<i>Differences between the various groups represented on governing bodies in respect of the six governance factors</i> .....	41
4.4	BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE DIFFERENCES IN THE FACTOR MEAN SCORES IN TABLE 4.6 .....	49
4.4.1	Co-operative governance .....	49
4.4.2	Governance of educators .....	50
4.4.3	Community governance .....	51
4.5	SUMMARY .....	53
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>		
5.1	INTRODUCTION .....	55
5.2	SUMMARY .....	55
5.3	IMPORTANT FINDINGS .....	57
5.3.1	Important literature findings .....	57
5.3.2	Empirical research findings .....	58
5.4	RECOMMENDATIONS .....	60
5.5	TOPICS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH .....	61
5.6	CONCLUSION .....	61
6.	BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	63

# CHAPTER 1

## ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

### 1.1 Introduction

South Africa is in the process of transforming its education system to a unitary and democratic system of governance. This study is an investigation of functions of school governing bodies in South Africa. It focuses on eliciting the opinion of the representatives of governing bodies with a view to come up with findings and recommendations in respect of what could be done to empower and train members of governing bodies regarding their functions.

In this study the role of the governing body will be discussed with special emphasis on the function “to make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators”.

The initial research indicated eleven functions of all governing bodies namely to

- ◇ promote the best interest of the school and ensure its development;
- ◇ adopt a constitution;
- ◇ adopt the mission statement of the school;
- ◇ adopt a code of conduct for learners at schools;
- ◇ help the principal, educators and other staff perform their professional functions;
- ◇ decide on school times, which must be consistent with the conditions of employment of the staff;
- ◇ administer and control the school's property, buildings and grounds, including school hostels;
- ◇ encourage parents, learners, educators and staff at the school to offer voluntary services to the school and to make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators;

- ◇ make recommendations to the Head of Department on the appointment of non-educators;
- ◇ at the request of the Head of Department, and under fair conditions, allow school facilities to be used for educational programmes not offered by the school;
- ◇ carry out all other functions given to governing bodies by the Schools Act; and
- ◇ carry out functions that are set out by the Member of the Executive Council in the Provincial Gazette.

This chapter specifically attempts to clarify some concepts with a view to highlight the context in which they are used in this study. It further describes the problem of the investigation, as the researcher perceives it. The motivation and the purpose of this study are also presented in this chapter.

## 1.2 Background of the problem

For some years in South African schools, school committees existed in name only. Their functions were limited and not clearly defined (Dekker and Van Schalkwyk, 1995: 484). There was a lack of collaboration between educators and school committees. They were working as separate entities.

Theorists like Badenhorst, Calitz, Van Schalkwyk, Van Wyk and Kruger (1991: 109) argued that, neither the parent nor the teacher alone can fulfil the education task completely. As allies they should collaborate in the closest possible way.

Pretorius and Lemmer (1998: 21) regard education as a shared responsibility of schools, parents, learners and members of the community.

In 1995, the old school committees were dismantled and a new structure was established as Parent-teacher-student-association (PTSA) for secondary schools and Parent-teacher-association (PTA) for primary schools. These have been revolutionised by the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 (SADTU, 1998: 7). The Act required the establishment of elected governing bodies. These bodies were to be established in all schools in South Africa in 1997; thus restoring the right of the

parents and the community to be involved in the school, serving their children. The governance of every public school has been vested in its governing body. Thus the governing body became the official mouthpiece of the parents, learners and educators of the school on all matters (Pretorius and Lemmer, 1998: 21/23).

Governing bodies have been granted extensive powers, including the function: "make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators" (RSA, 1996: 9).

### **1.3 Statement of the problem and motivational study**

With the promulgation of the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996, eleven functions were allocated to all governing bodies of South African public schools. For effective teaching and learning to take place, it is essential that governing bodies be empowered to execute these functions (see 1.2) effectively.

It has become a problem for governing bodies to execute their functions effectively, because many of them are illiterate and ignorant. Criteria to follow were not stipulated. In the proposed Education Bill of 1996, Members of the Executive Council of Education (MEC's) were obliged to establish a programme of capacity building to empower governing bodies (Republic of South Africa, 1996: 8). Up to now in some provinces, governing bodies have not yet been trained. In most schools, school committees are still existing and are still working according to the old rules. Their contribution to the school is small whereas some schools are without school committees or governing bodies.

This project hopes to produce guidelines and training modules for capacity building. The overall research problem of the project is to determine the perception of governing bodies on the eleven functions all governing bodies of the South African public schools must execute in accordance with the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996.



There is a widespread quest for improvement of the culture of teaching and learning which has declined due to lack of partnership in education. To improve partnership, governing bodies must be trained in order to execute their stipulated functions effectively in schools.

The specific research problem of this mini dissertation is: How do governing bodies perceive the following function?

“20.(1) Subject to this body of a public schools must –

1) “recommend to the Head of Department regarding 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)).”

## 1.4 Aims of the Research

### 1.4.1 General aim of the research project

The general aim of this research project is to detect how governing bodies perceive their functions as listed in the introduction of this research essay (see 1.1). It will further be to clarify the following concepts: “recommendations”; “Head of Department”; “appointment” and “applicable Acts”.

### 1.4.2 Aim of the research group

To achieve the general aim of the research project, the aim of the research group is to:

- ◇ determine to what extent the governing body accepts ownership for this function;
- ◇ determine the perceived role of governing body in the execution of this function;
- ◇ set guidelines for the effective execution of this function; and
- ◇ develop a training module for members of the governing body on this function.

## **1.5 Research strategy and research methods**

All research uses a variation of one or more techniques to collect data. No single technique is best (McMillian and Schumacher, 1993: 40). However for this study, a literature survey of this function: “make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators” will be done in three countries of which one will be an African country. The three countries will be England, Papua New Guinea and Tanzania.

McMillian and Schumacher (1993: 238) maintain that the questionnaire is the most widely used technique for obtaining information from subjects. They further regard a questionnaire as relatively economical, has standardised questions and ensure anonymity. Therefore a combined questionnaire on the function: “make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators” will be used to determine whether governing bodies accept ownership of the function and how they see their roles in the execution of this function. Questionnaires will be sent out for completion to members of governing bodies of all provinces.

Research techniques can be classified as either quantitative or qualitative (McMillian and Schumacher 1993: 40). For this study the quantitative method will be used as it emphasises a priori categories to collect data in the form of numbers. It also provides statistical descriptions, relationships and explanations (McMillian and Schumacher 1993: 41). A training module for members of governing bodies in this function will be compiled.

## **1.6 Clarification of concepts**

There are certain concepts that are used in this research essay. The concepts are clarified as follows:

### **1.6.1 Recommendations**

Sinclair (1979: 1295) defines the word “recommendation” as a letter representing someone as suitable for a job, while Kirkpatrick (1992: 1116) defines it as a letter recommending a person for an appointment. Both definitions mean that the governing body must indicate, by means of a written document to the Head of Department, that the person they have presented is really suitable for appointment.

### **1.6.2 Head of Department**

It means the head of the education department in a province. The Head of Department is a person in the education department following the Member of the Executive Council (MEC) in governance. The Member of the Executive Council delegates duties to him and the Head of Department presents reports from the Education Department to the (MEC). The Head of Department has some responsibilities to render to governing bodies as stipulated in the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 (RSA, 1996: 17). These responsibilities are to:

- ◇ approve or turn down an application of a governing body for extra function;
- ◇ take away a function from governing body; and
- ◇ appoint people to perform the functions of a governing body if it fails to perform its function.

### **1.6.3 Appointment**

Sinclair (1979: 73) defines appointment as an act of placing a person in a job or position of responsibility. It means the governing body should recommend a suitable educator to a position of responsibility according to the needs of the school.

### **1.6.4 Applicable Act**

Applicable means being appropriate, relevant or fitting to a particular position (Sinclair, 1979: 73) whilst Act is a law made by parliament or by a provincial legislature (RSA, 1996: vii). It means that when a governing body makes

recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators, they must follow relevant criteria from the National or Provincial government.

## **1.7 Outline of the study**

This study consists of five chapters:

### **1.7.1 Chapter 1**

This is an orientation chapter wherein the topic is introduced and it provides the background of the problem. The problem to be studied is stated and motivation and aims are presented. Research strategy and methodology are discussed and concepts that are used in the study are explained and elaborated.

### **1.7.2 Chapter 2**

Chapter two of this research study focused on a literature review to establish what other theorists in other countries wrote about this specific function of the governing body being: "to make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators".

### **1.7.3 Chapter 3**

Chapter three concentrated on the research design, the development of the research instrument and empirical investigation.

### **1.7.4 Chapter 4**

Chapter four exposed the empirical findings. The findings are analysed, tabulated and interpreted.

## 1.7.5 Chapter 5

Chapter five dealt with a summary of all the chapters, empirical research findings, literature findings as well as recommendations. Avenues for further research are also suggested.

## 1.8 Summary

In this chapter the functions of all governing bodies were stated with special reference to this function: “make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators”. The research problem and aims were stated. The research methodology and concepts were clarified.

In chapter two a literature review was done to establish what theorists in other countries wrote in respect of the research problem.



## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Introduction

The first chapter of this research essay has provided the background and motivation for a study on governing bodies with regard to their functions and specifically the function of making recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators.

In a democratic country like South Africa, schools should be in partnership with all stakeholders such as parents and internal and external environments. The stakeholders need to form a relationship with educators and be accountable in whatever decision they take within the school.

According to Macbeth (1989: 128 / 129) parents have been legally delegated responsibility of being responsible for their individual children's education and therefore they are stakeholders on behalf of their children. As parents, they must take part in the school. On the other hand Macbeth (1989: 129) maintains that members of the community have an interest in school matters as local resident, tax payers, rate payers, local politicians, potential employers and so forth. These people can therefore learn and hear everything concerning the school through school governance.

Macbeth (1989: 128) defines school governance as stakeholders having an influence on major school-level decisions about the school and about its relations with others as well as having educational responsibilities. He (1989: 127) is also of the opinion that governors can develop co-operatively and individually if they are given the right information. He said that if they can be empowered then they can view the school's self-evaluation critically and fully. Furthermore this author (1989: 126) also assumed that the presence of parents on a governing body constitutes liaison between the school and the families it serves.

School governors, parents and educators need to form a relationship of mutual trust and understanding so that they can work as partners to the benefit of the school and learners (Lemmer, 1994: 101).

In South Africa, the South African Schools Act has made a provision for all schools to have a formally constituted governing body that should be fully involved in the overall management of the school (RSA, 1996: 11). The school governing body has been given wide powers and responsibilities for the management of the school in association with the principal and staff (Lemmer, 1994: 101).

The functions of all governing bodies in South Africa have been stipulated in the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 (see 1.1)(RSA, 1996: 31 / 32).

The purpose of the literature review is to enable the researcher to have a clear concept on these specific functions of the governing body in South Africa namely “make recommendations to the Head of Department (HOD) on the appointment of educators” as compared to functions of governing bodies in three countries being:

- ◇ England
- ◇ Papua New Guinea
- ◇ Tanzania (an African country)

## 2.2 England

### 2.2.1 Introduction

England is known as the largest of four political divisions that make up the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland (The World Book Encyclopedia, 1996: 261). England is known as one of the countries in the world which has the finest educational system (The World Book Encyclopedia, 1996: 268).

The education system of England and Wales is the same and it is run by their own department of education which works closely with local elected education authorities (The World Book Encyclopedia, 1996: 268).

The Education Act in England has ensured that each school has its own governing body. The Local Education Authorities (LEAs) have been delegated considerable power of controlling education at a local level. According to Dekker and Van Schalkwyk (1989: 131) each local education authority (LEA) has to appoint its own local education committee of which the majority should be parents.

### **2.2.2 People to be members of the governing body**

Parents, teachers, members of the LEA and others with an interest can be chosen as members of the governing body. The 1986 Education Act No. 2 made provision for equal powers for parents and the removal of political control from governing boards (Dekker and Van Schalkwyk, 1989: 132).

### **2.2.3 Roles of the governing body in England**

School governing boards provide a link between the Local Education Authority (LEA) and individual schools. They are responsible for the general direction of their particular school (Dekker and Van Schalkwyk, 1980: 132). Governing boards, according to Munn (1993: 88) are the employers of school staff.

However, governing boards in England have some weaknesses and resolutions to the weaknesses (Munn, 1993: 88). The weaknesses are as follows:

- ◇ it is an extreme form of decentralisation of education;
- ◇ the danger of radical control of LEAs by political activists who exploit education for revolutionary objectives.
- ◇ resolutions to the weaknesses were as follows:
- ◇ the Education Reform Act in England has changed the relative roles of LEAs, head teachers and governors so that head teachers should work with the governing bodies differently from those of the past; and



- ◇ a mutual trust and respect between the governors and the head teachers were to be established so that they can work co-operatively (Dean, 1995: 201).

Local control of education has been put in the hands of parents and political control of governing boards was abolished.

To bring a balance between decentralisation and centralisation, schools were given a greater say in financial matters and they had to choose whether to operate under LEAs or not (Dekker and Van Schalkwyk, 1989: 132).

#### 2.2.4 The functions of governing boards in England

These functions are as follows:

- ◇ the responsibility for admission and exclusion of pupils;
- ◇ budget approval;
- ◇ discretionary teacher pay and determination of head teacher salaries;
- ◇ sex education;
- ◇ policy on charging for optional activities; and
- ◇ hiring and firing of staff (Munn, 1993: 88).

Dean (1995: 202) views the functions of governing boards in England as follows:

- ◇ reconciling the aims and objectives of the school with the head teachers and staff;
- ◇ drawing the budget;
- ◇ reaching agreement on policies and ensuring that they are implemented;
- ◇ the National curriculum and its relation to LEA policy;
- ◇ health and safety;
- ◇ sex education;
- ◇ religious education; and
- ◇ drawing policies regarding inter alia:
- ◇ public relations;

- ◇ admission and exclusion of pupils;
- ◇ equal opportunities;
- ◇ discipline;
- ◇ charging;
- ◇ receiving and acting upon inspection reports;
- ◇ making arrangements for staff development;
- ◇ making provision for school evaluation;
- ◇ appointing and firing staff;
- ◇ dealing with staff disciplinary cases;
- ◇ ensuring that governors are trained for their responsibilities;
- ◇ evaluating their own work; and
- ◇ paying educators.

### **2.2.5 Functions of governing boards in England in comparison with those in South Africa**

Comparison of functions of the two countries will be based specifically on this function: "make recommendations to the Head of Department (HOD) regarding the appointment of educators".

In England, according to Munn (1993: 88) and Dean (1995: 202), governing boards hire and fire staff. This function differs from the South African function in that in England governing boards do not make recommendations to the LEAs when hiring and firing staff. The governing boards have been delegated powers of hiring and firing staff if the staff's service does not satisfy the community. (Munn, 1993: 88).

In South Africa governing bodies cannot hire and fire educators, but make recommendations to the Head of Department who must come up with the final approval on the appointment of an educator.

## **2.3 Papua New Guinea**

### **2.3.1 Introduction**

Papua New Guinea is an independent country located in the Pacific Ocean, North of Australia. It was formerly the Australian Territory of Papua and New Guinea. It is the second largest island in the world (The World Book Encyclopedia, 1996: 140).

Schools in Papua New Guinea are run by the government and churches. Education is not compulsory (The World Book Encyclopedia, 1996: 148). The community of Papua New Guinea was also playing a vital role in educational decision making under the Ordinance of 1952. The District Advisory Boards were established in each district under the Ordinance of 1952. The function was to advise the administration concerning matters relating to education (Maha, 1997: 180).

The Education Act of 1970 upgraded the District Advisory Boards to District Education Boards (DEBs). The District Education Boards delegated some specific powers to exercise, such as the establishment of governing bodies in all the institutions within the National Education System. Governing bodies are called boards. The Education Act of 1983 changed the District Education Boards to Provincial Education Boards (PEBs)(Maha, 1997: 181).

### **2.3.2 Roles of boards in Papua New Guinea**

Maha (1997: 188) suggested the following roles of the boards, namely to


- ◇ take the pressure off the principal for the responsibility for student discipline;
- ◇ act as a “watchdog” to ensure that the principal and staff perform their duties;
- ◇ ensure that school rules and regulations are adhered to by students;
- ◇ ensure that students are disciplined fairly and justly and are not victimised;
- ◇ look after the welfare of staff and students;
- ◇ allow community participation in school decision making at local level;
- ◇ be the legal identity of the school;
- ◇ be the voice of the school and its environment to the education authorities;

- ◇ be the forum for discussion and matters concerning the school; and to
- ◇ generate a sense of seriousness in ensuring discipline and good behaviour.

### 2.3.3 Functions of the board in Papua New Guinea

- ◇ building and maintenance of school buildings;
- ◇ making of school rules;
- ◇ disciplining of students by suspension;
- ◇ setting of aims and goals of school;
- ◇ accounting for finances;
- ◇ engagement and control of ancillary staff;
- ◇ enrolment of students; and
- ◇ appointment of a committee to be responsible for the appointment of teachers.

However, there were some weaknesses encountered by the board which were discouraging the board to execute its functions effectively. These weaknesses are as follows:

- 
- ◇ lack of support from the Provincial Education Boards (PEBs);
  - ◇ decisions were delayed due to poor and inconsistent attendance at board meetings;
  - ◇ the Provincial Education Boards (PEBs) took no action at all on the recommendations made to it by the board, it quite often overrules the board decisions;
  - ◇ the board spends less time on the appointment of a committee to be responsible for the appointment of teachers; and
  - ◇ principals complained that lack of a working relationship between the board and the (PEB) often puts them in conflict with the Assistant Education Secretary who is the chairperson of the Provincial Education Board (PEB) and their immediate superior.

Maha (1997: 189) maintains that these weaknesses have been caused by the vagueness of the way the Education Act was worded. It did not clarify the exact role which the PEBs should play in the matters referred to it by the Board.

### **2.3.4 Functions of boards in Papua New Guinea in comparison with the functions of those in South Africa**

The governing body in South Africa makes recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators whilst in Papua New Guinea, the board is not involved in the function of appointing educators but in the appointment of a committee which will in turn appoint educators. This function of appointing a committee by the board is one of the functions according to Maha (1997: 188), which takes less time to execute and therefore delays the process of appointing educators due to lack of an appointment committee.

The South African functions differ a great deal from those of Papua New Guinea. In South Africa, governing bodies have been delegated powers to make recommendations to the Head of Department on the appointment of educators: In Papua New Guinea boards have been denied powers to appoint educators but have been delegated powers to appoint a committee to be responsible for the appointment of educators.

## **2.4 Tanzania**

### **2.4.1 Introduction**

Tanzania is an African country in the far North of South Africa. The name Tanzania, according to Vos and Brits (1990: 175), is derived from the two names being Tanganyika and Zanzibar which existed as separate territories until April 1964. In 1961 Tanganyika gained independence from Britain and Zanzibar. The Musomo Resolution (1974) stipulated that theory and practice of education in work are supposed to complement each other with the intention of preparing its people for the service of the nation. Education is intended to be used as a tool for economic, political, social and intellectual progress of all levels (Vos and Brits, 1990: 176).

## 2.4.2 Schools as economic, social, political and intellectual tools

### ◇ *Schools as economic tools*

Schools are expected to work together with communities surrounding the school in order to uplift the economy of Tanzania. Educators, learners and all other workers within the school should work together in various projects which will benefit in improving the Tanzanian economy. Schools according to Vos and Brits (1990: 176) are expected to integrate outside activities with classroom activities.

### ◇ *Schools as social tools*

The school is expected to constitute a social unit where educators, learners and other workers live and work as parents and children. The social unit is expected to be characterised by familial relations of respect, dignity, love, harmony and freedom of expression. The school in turn should provide an intentionally inviting climate for all participants. The social unit among educators and learners promotes a climate conducive to learning (Vos and Brits, 1990: 176).

### ◇ *Schools as political tools*

The school is expected to encourage participatory decision making among all its members. The school should train learners on the techniques of intelligent decision making because they will in turn participate in various school committee's activities. Learners are supposed to be creative, take part in planning, implement and manage all issues relating to the school. Learners are supposed to work hand in glove with educators (Vos and Brits, 1990: 177).

### ◇ *Schools as intellectual tools*

Tanzanian schools are expected to promote intellectual skills such as an inquiring mind, the ability to learn selectively and basic confidence in one's abilities. Tanzanian education is intended to promote skills for economic advancement, social skills for harmonious living with others and intellectual skills for further self-


development ability and to learn from various experiences. School learning emphasises skills rather than knowledge to the learners (Vos and Brits, 1990: 177).

The type of education needed by Tanzania encouraged the introduction of Education for self-reliance in March 1967 by President Nyerere. Education for self-reliance demanded an educational revolution in the light of Tanzania's needs and social objectives. It also demanded the school to work together with communities surrounding the school (Vos and Brits, 1990: 176).

Demand for self-unit has encouraged the birth of school committees and parent associations. The two bodies function as the link between the school and the community. School committees are democratically elected by parents (Vos and Brits, 1990: 180).

#### **2.4.3 Functions of Tanzania's school committees**

These functions are

- 
- ◇ facilitate the full integration of the school and the community;
  - ◇ assist educators in solving disciplinary problems such as uniforms, attendance and land of farming;
  - ◇ supervise the proper use of school farm produce;
  - ◇ demonstrate to parents better farming methods through open day functions; and
  - ◇ apprise the District Education Officer with minutes of the school committee for appropriate action.

The school committee has delegated this function by the Ministry of Education through Regional officers. Other functions are delegated to a hierarchy of officers at district and divisional levels (Vos and Brits, 1990: 180). The functions are as follows:

- ◇ implementation of government policy;
- ◇ siting of schools;

- ◇ appointment of educators; and
- ◇ observance of the curriculum.

#### **2.4.4 Functions of governing bodies in Tanzania as compared with those in South Africa**

In Tanzanian education, school committees are still in existence whilst in South Africa school committees have been replaced by governing bodies. School committees have delegated functions which do not deal on professional matters concerning the school. The specific function of making recommendations to the Head of Department on the appointment of educators as a function of governing body in South Africa differs from the function of school committees in Tanzania. The difference is that, in Tanzania, the appointment of educators is done by a hierarchy of officers both at district and divisional levels not the school committees.

#### **2.5 Summary**

The function of the governing body of making recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators as a South African function differs from the function of governing bodies in the three countries namely England, Papua New Guinea and the African country, Tanzania.

In England the governing body hires and fires educators, in Papua New Guinea, the board is not responsible for appointing educators but they are responsible for appointing a committee which will be responsible for the appointment of educators. In Tanzania also, school committees do not appoint educators, but a hierarchy of officers from district and divisional level are responsible for the appointment of educators. In all the three countries cited in this discussion none of their school governing bodies or equivalents send their recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators. This system only applies in South Africa.

In chapter three a discussion of the research instrument, questions regarding the functions of governing bodies and the empirical investigation will be undertaken.



## CHAPTER 3

### EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

#### 3.1 Introduction

The literature study in chapter two formed the basis for the empirical study. With the promulgation of the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996, eleven functions were allocated to all governing bodies of public schools. The specific function to “make recommendations to the Head of Department (HOD) regarding the appointment of educators”, will be discussed in this chapter.

Items concerning this specific function have been formulated. This was done in order to determine the perceptions of governing bodies on this function.

A brief discussion of the design of the research instrument now follows:

#### 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 must perform (see 1.1).

The eleven functions were mentioned in chapter one of this essay (see 1.1).

Subsequently, a group of MEd 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 school governing bodies (SGBs) on the eleven functions.

This dissertation investigates the following function:

“Make recommendations to the Head of Department (HOD) regarding the appointment of educators.”

**Table 3.1** Items on Function: Make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators.

Item No	Description	Mean Score	Median	Mode	Rank order	Standard deviation
B59	To what extent would you agree to a proposal that will lead to the suspension of an educator who is guilty of misconduct.	3,78	4,00	5	45	1,45
B4	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.	3,60	4,00	5	53	1,56
B68	To what extent would you agree to a proposal that will lead to the suspension of an incompetent principal.	3,53	4,00	5	56	1,52
B64	To what extent would you agree to a proposal that will lead to the dismissal of an incompetent educators.	3,23	3,00	5	78	1,53

Item No	Description	Mean Score	Median	Mode	Rank order	Standard deviation
B5	The governing body must appoint a specific person as an educator if it is in a non-departmental post.	3,21	4,00	5	81	1,67
B61	To what extent would you agree to a proposal that will lead to the termination of the services of educators if their services are no longer required.	2,77	3,00	1	91	2,28

Having displayed the various items involved in the function: "Make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators", all items will be discussed in short for the purpose of this mini dissertation.

Each question was formulated in such a way that the respondents could indicate whether he / she agrees, disagrees or somewhere in between, for example (see appendix A). A five-point scale has been used.

The three measures of centrality mean, median, mode and the rank order will be defined before discussing the items.

The mode is the allocated score with the highest frequency in the distribution. Whenever scores are arranged into intervals, the midpoint of the interval with the highest frequency is taken as the mode (Mulder, 1993: 16). McMillian and Schumacher (1993: 200) define the mode as the scores that occur most frequently in a distribution. The mode is sometimes misleading.

The median is that point that divides a rank ordered distribution into halves that have an equal number of scores. Fifty percent of the scores lie below the median and another fifty percent of the scores lie above it (McMillian and Schumacher, 1993: 201). Vockell and Asher (1995: 159) define a median as the midpoint in a set of scores.

The mean is simply the arithmetic average of all the scores and is calculated by summing all the scores and dividing the sum by the number of scores (McMillian and Schumacher, 1993: 200). Vockell and Asher (1995: 159) define a mean as an arithmetic average obtained by adding all the scores together and dividing by the number of scores that went into computing the total.

Rank order is the arrangement of items according to merit of its value that means according to how important and least important the respondents regarded the aspect of the proposal.

### 3.2.2 Discussion of the function

*Item no. B59: To what extent would you agree to a proposal that will lead to the suspension of an educator who is guilty of misconduct?*

The mode of item no. B59 is 5, which is the highest score in the five-point scale, and indicates agree. Five has appeared most frequently in the set of scores. Therefore it indicates that the respondents appear to be totally in favour of the proposal that the governing body must suspend an educator who is guilty of misconduct.

Item no. B59's median is 4, which is more than the midpoint. According to this median, the respondents appear to be in favour of the proposal that the governing body should suspend an educator who is guilty of misconduct.

The mean scores of item no. B59 is 3,78 which is more than the average. This indicates that the respondents appear to agree to the proposal that the governing body should suspend an educator who is guilty of misconduct.

The rank of order of item no. B59 is 45 out of 101. Forty five is less than fifty therefore this item is considered quite high in importance. Thus this indicates that the respondents appear to regard this item as more valuable and vital.

It can thus be concluded that both the three measures of centrality and the rank order tend to correspond that the governing body should suspend an educator who is guilty of misconduct.

*Item no. B4: The governing body must recommend a specific person to the Head of Education Department to be appointed as an educator if it is a departmental post.*

The mode of item no. B4 is 5, which means five has appeared most frequently in a number of scores. The mode seems to indicate that the respondents agree to the proposal that the governing bodies should recommend the appointment of a specific person as an educator to the Head of Department if it is a departmental post. The median of the same item no. B4 is 4,00 which is more than the midpoint. The median for this item compels one to argue that the respondents seem to agree to the proposal of item no. B4.

The mean shown in Table 3.1 is 3,60 one may assert that item no. B4 has been responded to by many respondents because 3,60 is more than the average. Item no. B4 has been ranked 53 out of 101, which indicates that half of the respondents are in favour of the proposal that the governing body should recommend a specific person to the Head of Education Department if it is a departmental post. The rank order agrees with the proposal as half the respondents regarded this item as vital.

It can thus be concluded from both the rank order and the measures of centrality that members of the governing body must recommend a specific person to the Head of Department to be appointed as an educator if it is a departmental post.

*Item no. B68: To what extent would you agree to a proposal that will lead to the suspension of an incompetent principal?*

The mode of item no. B68 is 5, which has appeared frequently in the number of scores. This mode reveals that the respondents seem to agree to the proposal that the governing body must suspend an incompetent principal. Four is the median of this item. Four is more than the midpoint and therefore this indicates that the respondents seem to agree to the proposal of this item.

Item no. B68's mean score is 3,53, which is more than the average. According to this mean score it appears the respondents agree to the proposal that the governing body must suspend an incompetent principal. Its rank order is 56 out of 101, which will be considered quite high in importance to a certain extent. Therefore this indicates that half the respondents tend to regard this item as valuable.

It can thus be concluded that all three measures of centrality and the rank order regard item no. B68 as important and favourable.

*Item no. B64: To what extent would you agree to a proposal that will lead to the dismissal of an incompetent educator?*

The mode of item no. B64 is 5 i.e. the number which has the highest frequency in the distribution. This mode seems to indicate that the respondents agree to the proposal that the governing body must dismiss an incompetent educator. The median of the same item is 3, which is the midpoint in a set of scores. Therefore the median indicates that half of the respondents seem to agree to the proposal that the governing body must dismiss an incompetent educator while another half of the respondents seem to disagree with the proposal that the governing body must dismiss an incompetent educator.

Item no. B64's mean score is 3,23, which is more than the average. Therefore this indicates that the respondents seem to agree to the proposal that the governing body must dismiss an incompetent educator. The rank order of the same item is 78 out of 101, which tends to be considered least important. This rank order indicates that the respondents regarded this item as least valuable.

Therefore one can conclude that the rank order differs from the three measures of centrality in which the respondents appear to agree to the proposal of item no. B64.

*Item no. B5: The governing body must appoint a specific person as an educator if it is in a non-departmental post.*

The mode of item no. B5 is 5, which seems to indicate that the respondents agree to the proposal that the governing body must appoint a specific person as an educator in a non-departmental post. The same item has a median of 4,00, which is more than the midpoint. The respondents, according to this median, indicate that the respondents seem to agree to the proposal of item no. B5.

According to item no. B5, its mean score is 3,21 which is more than the average. One can argue that the respondents seem to agree to the proposal that the governing body must appoint a specific person as an educator if it is in a non-departmental post. The rank order of item no. B5 is 81, which is considered least important in value. This rank order appears to indicate that the respondents regard this item as least important.

Therefore one can conclude that the rank order differs from the three measures of centrality concerning this item.

*Item no. B61: To what extent would you agree to a proposal that will lead to the termination of the services of educators if their services are no longer required?*

The mode of item no. B61 is 1, which stands for disagreement. The mode of this item appears as if there is a strong feeling from the respondents to reject the proposal that the governing body must terminate the services of an educator whose

services are no longer required. Its median is 3, which is the midpoint. This indicates that half the respondents appear to agree to the proposal, while another half seem to disagree to the proposal of item no. B61.

Item no. B61 has a mean score of 2,77, which is less than the average. According to this mean score, the respondents appear to disagree to the proposal that the governing body must terminate the service of an educator whose service is no longer required. The rank order of this item is 91 out of 101, which tends to be considered least important in value. From the rank order one can argue that the respondents seem to disagree to the proposal that the governing body must terminate the service of an educator who's services are no longer required.

Therefore one can conclude that both the three measures of centrality and the rank order tend to correlate that the respondents appear to disagree to the proposal of item no. B61.

### 3.3. The empirical investigation



#### 3.3.1 Respondents

The students involved in the research project distributed the questionnaire to members of school governing bodies. Of the 1000 questionnaires distributed 888 were returned in a usable format. The return rate was 88,8%.

Table 3.2 Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Male	427	41,1	48,1	48,1
Female	460	51,8	51,9	100,0
Total	887	99,9	100,0	
Missing	1	00,1		
Total	888	100,0		



According to table 3.2 females have responded more than males. The perception is that females are more active in the education of their children than males.

**Table 3.3 Representation on the school governing body**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Principals	109	12,3	12,3	12,3
Educators	395	44,5	44,6	56,9
Non-educators	54	6,1	63,0	
Learners	103	11,6	11,6	74,6
Parents	188	21,2	21,2	95,8
Co-opted member	37	4,2	4,2	100,0
Total	886	99,8		
Missing	2	00,2		
Total	888	100,0		

The educators, according to table 3.3, have responded more than the principals, non-educators, learners, parents and co-opted members. The perception is that educators need transparency and to be involved in the development of education in school. Educators are in majority compared to principals.

**Table 3.4 Age**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
-20	74	8,3	8,3	8,3
21 – 30	144	16,2	16,3	24,6
31 – 40	366	41,2	41,2	65,8
41 – 60	297	33,4	33,4	99,2
61 -	7	00,8	00,8	100,0
Total	888			

According to table 3.4 the middle age respondents have responded more than other age groups. People who are below 20 years are still learners and those from 61 years old are old aged therefore they cannot be active in governance. The active respondents seem to be those from 21 years to below 60 years.

**Table 3.5 Province**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Gauteng	426	48,2	48,2	48,2
North-West	132	14,9	14,9	63,1
Northern Province	121	13,6	13,6	76,6
Kwazulu-Natal	108	12,0	12,0	88,7
Others	101	11,3	11,3	100,0
Total	888			

In table 3.5 Gauteng Province respondents have responded more than other provinces. The perception is that Gauteng is urban area while Kwazulu –Natal is rural area. People in Gauteng seem to be educated and can read and write, while those at Kwazulu-Natal are illiterate and semi-illiterate.

**Table 3.6 Qualifications**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
≤Grade 9	70	7,9	7,9	7,9
Grade 10 & 11	103	11,6	11,6	19,5
Grade 12	108	12,2	12,2	31,6
Tertiary qualifications	607	68,4	68,4	100,0
Total	888	100,0	100,0	

There were more respondents with tertiary qualifications than respondents with grade 9. The perception is that respondents with tertiary qualifications understand the importance of governing bodies in schools more than those with grade 8 qualifications.

**Table 3.7 Religious commitment**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
None	32	3,6	3,6	3,6
Christians	810	91,2	91,2	94,8
Others	46	5,2	5,2	100,0
Total	888	100,0	100,0	

According to table 3.7 more Christians have responded than Non-Christians. The perception is that the Non-Christians are in minority. In South Africa the majority of people are Christians and that is why more Christians have responded more than non-Christians.

**Table 3.8 Mother tongue**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Zulu	185	20,8	20,8	20,8
Sotho	370	41,6	41,6	62,4
Tsonga	103	11,6	11,6	74,0
Others	230	26,0	26,0	100,0
Total	888	100,0	100,0	

There were more Sotho speaking respondents than Tsonga speaking respondents. The perception is that in the Provinces where the research was conducted, the majority of people are Sotho speaking. Tsonga speaking people are only in a small area, therefore they are in minority.

**Table 3.9 Type of work**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Government sector	587	66,1	66,1	66,1
Learner	91	10,2	10,2	76,3
Unemployed	80	9,0	9,0	85,3
Others	130	14,7	14,7	100,0
Total	888	100,0		

According to table 3.9, respondents working in government sectors have responded more than people who are unemployed. People in the government sectors are professionals and seem to understand the importance of engaging governing bodies in schools.

**Table 3.10 Gross income per month**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
0 – R1000	198	22,3	22,4	22,4
R1001 – R3000	190	21,4	21,5	43,9
R3001 – R5000	306	34,5	34,7	78,6
> R5000	189	21,3	21,4	100,0
Total	883	99,5		
Missing	5	00,5		
Total	888	100,0		

Respondents earning an income of R3 001 to less than R5 000 have responded more than those who are unemployed. People who have responded more appear to be educated and are in need of security and the rights of their children in schools.

**Table 3.11 Type of School**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Primary	387	43,6	43,6	43,6
Secondary	500	56,3	56,4	100,0
Total	887	99,9	100,0	
Missing	1	00,1		
Total	888	100,0		

Secondary schools' respondents have responded more than respondents in primary schools. The perception is that in secondary schools, learners form part of school governing bodies as Learner Representative Council (LRC) while in primary schools learners are not included in governing bodies.

**Table 3.12 Geography of schools**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Township	440	49,5	49,8	49,8
Suburban	107	12,0	12,1	61,9
Rural	336	37,8	38,1	61,9
Total	883	99,4	100,0	
Missing	5	00,6		
Total	888	100,0		

Township respondents have responded more than suburban respondents. In South Africa many people live in townships and rural areas, than in suburban. The

perception is that township people out numbered suburban people in governing bodies.

### 3.13 Years involved in school governance

Years	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
0	278	31,3	31,6	31,6
1	175	19,7	20,0	51,6
2	183	20,6	20,9	72,5
More than 2	241	27,2	27,5	100,0
Total	877	98,8	100,0	
Missing	11	1,2		
Total	888	100,0		

Respondents who are not members of school governing bodies have responded more than those who have one year in governance. The perception is that those who are not members of governing bodies, always complain that the present governing bodies do not perform their functions effectively while those with one year experience are not sure of what they are doing because of lack of training.

Table 3.14 Learner enrolment

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
1 – 400	138	15,5	15,6	15,6
401 – 600	130	14,6	14,7	30,3
601 – 800	211	23,8	23,9	54,2
> 801	405	45,6	45,8	100,0
Total	884	99,5		
Missing	4	00,5		
Total	888	100,0		

Schools with an enrolment greater than 801 learners have responded more than those with enrolment less than 400 learners. The perception is that schools with >801 learners have more members of governing bodies while those with few learners have five to six members only. Number of members of governing bodies in schools depend on the enrolment of the school (RSA 1996: 18).

### 3.4 Summary

In this chapter a description of the empirical investigation was provided. The items involved on functions of governing bodies were interpreted and analysed. It could thus be concluded that both the three measures of centrality and the rank order indicates that the respondents are generally in favour of the items (see table 3.1).

The total number of respondents who took part in this research show that many people have responded to the questionnaires with a return rate of 88,8 (see table 3.2 / 3.14).

In chapter four, the following aspects will receive 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 AND INTERPRETATION OF THE EMPIRICAL DATA

#### 4.1 Introduction

Due to the limitations on the length 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 score of the various independent groups in respect of the six factors:



**Table 4.1: Summary of the factors**

Factor	Name	Items	Alpha cronbach reliability coefficient	Mean factor score #
F1	Co-operative governance	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; 90; 91; 92; 93; 96	0,899 (All 32 items)	4,2
F2	Governance of non-educators	14; 20; 29; 35; 36; 39; 44; 45; 48; 52; 67	0,703 (all 11 items)	3,5
F3	Governance of educators	1; 7; 10; 11; 12; 16; 32; 40; 69; 71; 75; 76; 82; 83; 84; 98; 99; 100; 101	0,836 (all 19 items) 0,841 (17 items excluding items 10 & 40)	3,0
F4	Governance of community	5, 27, 31, 34, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 81, 94, 95	0,766 (all 15 items) 0,775 (12 items excluding 27; 31; 34)	3,4
F5	Governance as policy	3; 4; 6; 8; 9; 13; 15; 19; 21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30; 38; 41	0,834 (all 18 items) 0,840 (17 items excluding 9).	3,7
F6	Governance of learners	17; 18; 60; 70; 97	0,65 (all 4 items)	3,3

# The mean score is on five point scale

To what extent would you agree or disagree with a proposal that .....

1. disagree
2. partially disagree
3. non-committal
4. partially agree
5. agree

## 4.2 Reliability and validity

To ensure content validity the items were designed using the functions for all governing bodies of public schools as prescribed in the SA 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 (see 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 except ownership for these functions.

Now that the validity and reliability of the instrument has been established, the appropriate statistical analysis can be discussed.

## 4.3 Hypotheses

### 4.3.1 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 now be discussed.

4.3.1.1 Differences between male and female respondents relative to each of the six factors.

Table 4.2 Composite hypotheses with male and female respondents as the independent variable

Dimension	Variable	Symbol	Description	Test
Differences at the multivariate level	Gender	HoT	There is no statistically significant difference between the vector mean scale scores of the male and female respondents in respect of all six governance factors taken together.	Hotelling T <sup>2</sup>
		HaT	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.	
		Hot	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:	Student t-test
		Hot1	Co-operative governance	
		Hot2	Governance of non-educators	

Table 4.2 continued

		Hot3	Governance of educators	
		Hot4	Governance of the community	
		Hot5	Governance as policy	
		Hot6	Governance of learners	
		Hat	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:	
		Hat1	Co-operative governance	
		Hat2	Governance of non-educators	
		Hat3	Governance of educators	
		Hat4	Governance of the Community	
		Hat5	Governance as policy	
		Hat6	Governance of learners	

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

Factors	Group	Factor average	p-Value (Hotelling)	p-Value (Student)	
Co-operative governance	M	4,2788	0,0000**	0,007**	
	F	4,1693			
Governance of non-educators	M	3,4638			0,908
	F	3,4700			
Governance of educators	M	3,1255			0,000**
	F	2,8983			
Governance of the community	M	3,4908			0,000**
	F	3,2484			
Governance as policy	M	3,8787		0,000**	
	F	3,5966			
Governance of learners	M	3,3817		0,006**	
	F	3,1893			

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  $H_0T$  is thus rejected and the alternative hypothesis  $H_aT$  is supported.

In respect of differences 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 the five of the six factors is also present. The null hypothesis  $H_0t$  is thus rejected and the alternative hypothesis  $H_at$  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 respondents held a more positive perception as to the extent that the governing body should perform the functions investigated.

#### **4.3.2 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 of 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 tests are used to investigate this difference at the single variance level.

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

##### **4.3.2.1 Differences between the various groups represented on the governing bodies in respect of the six governance factors**

**Table 4.4 Composite hypotheses with the groups represented on the governing bodies as the independent variable**

Dimension	Variable	Symbol	Description	Test
Differences at the multi-variate Level	Representation	HoM	There is no statistically significant difference between the vestor mean scores for the five groups represented on the governing bodies taken together.	MANOVA
		HaM	There is a statistically significant difference between the vestor mean scores for the five groups represented on the governing bodies taken together.	
Differences at the single variable level		HoA	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:	ANOVA
		HoA1	Co-operative governance	
		HoA2	Governance of non-educators	
		HoA3	Governance of educators	
		HoA4	Governance of the community	
		HoA5	Governance as policy	
		HoA7	Governance of learners	
		HaA	The average scale scores of the five groups represented on the governing bodies do differ in a statistically significant way from one another in	

Dimension	Variable	Symbol	Description	Test
			respect of the following factors taken separately, namely:	
		HaA1	Co-operative governance	
		HaA2	Governance of non-educators	
		HaA3	Governance of educators	
		HaA4	Governance of the community	
		HaA5	Governance as policy	
		HaA6	Governance of learners	
		HoS	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)	Scheffé Or Dunnnett



Factors		Pairs of representing groups								
Differences at the single variable level		Representation	HoS	There are no statistically significant differences between the average scale scores of the five representing groups when compared paid-wise in respect of the following factors, namely:						
Co-operative governance Governance of non-educators Governance of educators Governance of the community Governance of policy Governance of learners	HoS.AB1	HoS.AC1	HoS.AD1	HoS.AE1	HoS.BC1	HoS.BD1	HoS.BE1	HoS.CD1	HoS.CE1	HoS.DE1
	HoS.AB2	HoS.AC2	HoS.AD2	HoS.AE2	HoS.BC2	HoS.BD2	HoS.BE2	HoS.CD2	HoS.CE2	HoS.DE2
	HoS.AB3	HoS.AC3	HoS.AD3	HoS.AE3	HoS.BC3	HoS.BD3	HoS.BE3	HoS.CD3	HoS.CE3	HoS.DE3
	HoS.AB4	HoS.AC4	HoS.AD4	HoS.AE4	HoS.BC4	HoS.BD4	HoS.BE4	HoS.CD4	HoS.CE4	HoS.DE4
	HoS.AB5	HoS.AC5	HoS.AD5	HoS.AE5	HoS.BC5	HoS.BD5	HoS.BE5	HoS.CD5	HoS.CE5	HoS.DE5
	HoS.AB6	HoS.AC6	HoS.AD6	HoS.AE6	HoS.BC6	HoS.BD6	HoS.BE6	HoS.CD6	HoS.CE6	HoS.DE6
Differences at the single variable level		Representation	HaS	There are no statistically significant differences between the average scale scores of the five representing groups when compared paid-wise in respect of the following factors, namely:						
Co-operative governance Governance of non-educators Governance of educators Governance of the community Governance as policy Governance of learners	HaS.AB1	HaS.AC1	HaS.AD1	HaS.AE1	HaS.BC1	HaS.BD1	HaS.BE1	HaS.CD1	HaS.CE1	HaS.DE1
	HaS.AB2	HaS.AC2	HaS.AD2	HaS.AE2	HaS.BC2	HaS.BD2	HaS.BE2	HaS.CD2	HaS.CE2	HaS.DE2
	HaS.AB3	HaS.AC3	HaS.AD3	HaS.AE3	HaS.BC3	HaS.BD3	HaS.BE3	HaS.CD3	HaS.CE3	HaS.DE3
	HaS.AB4	HaS.AC4	HaS.AD4	HaS.AE4	HaS.BC4	HaS.BD4	HaS.BE4	HaS.CD4	HaS.CE4	HaS.DE4
	HaS.AB5	HaS.AC5	HaS.AD5	HaS.AE5	HaS.BC5	HaS.BD5	HaS.BE5	HaS.CD5	HaS.CE5	HaS.DE5
	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 representing groups in respect of the following factors:**

Factors	Groups	Factor average Five point scale 1 = disagree 5 = agree	p-value (MANOVA)	p-value (ANOVA)	Scheffé / Dunnett									
					A-B	A-C	A-D	A-E	B-C	B-D	B-E	C-D	C-E	D-E
F1	A B C D E	4,4017 4,2171 4,1465 4,0698 4,2529	** 0,0000	** 0,001	**	*	**							
F2	A B C D E	3,3879 3,3651 3,5455 3,7330 3,5423		** 0,000			*			**				
F3	A B C D E	2,8530 2,8136 3,2517 3,5367 3,1317		** 0,000		**	**		**	**	**			**
F4	A B C D E	3,5162 3,2187 3,4974 3,5146 3,4701		** 0,000	**	**			*	**	**			
F5	A B C D E	3,9571 3,6393 3,6795 3,7598 3,8259		** 0,001	**	**								
F6	A B C D E	3,4000 3,0755 3,3385 3,4438 3,5434		** 0,000						*	**			

F1 = Co-operative governance

F2 = Governance of non-educators

F3 = Governance of educators

F4 = Governance of the community

F5 = Governance of policy

F6 = Governance of learners

\*\* Statistically significant at the 1%-level

\* Statistically significant at the 5% level

- A = 101 principals
- B = 368 educators
- C = 78 others (non-educators & co-opted members)
- D = 96 learners
- E = 173 parents

Using tables 4.4 and 4.5, it follows that the HoM is rejected at the 1%-level of significance. A statistically significant difference thus exists between the vector mean scores of the five representing groups 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 representing groups (A-E) in respect of all six factors. The null hypotheses HoA1 – HoA6 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. HoS.AB1 and Hos.AD1 are thus rejected in favour of HaS.AB1 and HaS.AD1. Principals agree more than educators and learners with proposals that favour co-operative governance.

On governance of non-educators (F2) there is a statistically significant difference on the 1%-level between educators and learners. HoS.BD2 is thus rejected in favour of HaS.BD2. Learners agree more than educators with proposals that favour governance of non-professional staff. On this same factor there is a statistically significant difference on the 5%-level between principals and learners. HoS.AD2 is thus rejected in favour of HaS.AD2. Learners agree more than principals do with proposals that favour the governance of non-educators.

On governance of educators (F3), there is a statistically significant difference at the 1% - level between principals and non-educators (including co-opted members),

between educators and non-educators, between educators and learners, between educators and parents as well as between learners and parent. HoS.AC3, HoS.AD3, HoS.BC3, HoS.BD3, HoS.BE3 and HoS.DE3 are thus rejected in favour of HaS.AC3, HaS.AD3, HaS.BC3, HaS.BD3, HaS.BE3 and HaS.DE3. Principals agree more than educators, non-educators, learners and parents with proposals that favour governance of educators.

On governance of the community (F4), there is a statistically significant difference at the 1%-level between principals and educators, between educators and learners as well as between educators and parents. HoS.AB4, HoS.BD4 and HoS.BE4 are thus rejected in favour HaS.AB4, HaS.BD4 and HaS.BE4. Principals agree more than educators, learners and parents with proposals that favour governance of the community. On this same factor there is also a statistically significant difference on the 5%-level between educators and non-educators. HoS.BC4 is thus rejected in favour of HaS.BC4. Non-educators agree to a greater extent than educators do with proposals that favour governance of the community.

On governance as policy (F5) there is a statistically significant difference on the 1%-level between the principals and the educators. HoS.AB5 is thus rejected in favour of HaS.AB5. Principals agree more than educators with proposals that favour governance as policy.

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

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

Name	Category	Mean scores					
		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
Province	Gauteng	4,2114	3,5494	3,0722	3,3363	3,6904	3,2067
	Northern Province	4,1626	3,3953	2,9431	3,3821	3,5729	3,3375
	Other	4,3946	3,2102	3,0526	3,5319	3,9020	3,3548
	North-West Province	4,2831	3,4427	2,9662	3,3702	3,7949	3,4179
	Kwa-Zulu Natal	4,1105	3,4964	2,8725	3,3261	3,8622	3,2961
Qualifications	Secondary	4,1180	3,6535	3,4138	3,5514	3,7964	3,5402
	Tertiary	4,2714	3,3831	2,8303	3,2863	3,7081	3,1691
Income	< R1000	4,0891	3,7238	3,4003	3,5730	3,7407	3,5333
	R1001 – R3000	4,1993	3,4913	3,0119	3,3133	3,7065	3,3919
	R3001 – R4000	4,2589	3,3679	2,8419	3,2108	3,7250	3,1025
	> R5000	4,3391	3,3376	2,8705	3,4588	3,7843	3,2045
School type	Primary	4,2200	3,4329	2,8555	3,3173	3,6868	3,2074
	Secondary	4,2256	3,4918	3,1303	3,4063	3,7705	3,3397
Geography of school	Township	4,2223	3,4855	3,0699	3,3323	3,6942	3,2154
	Suburban	4,3292	3,5710	3,0674	3,6486	3,9207	3,3063
	Rural	4,1921	3,4102	2,9202	3,3274	3,7251	3,3688
Size of school	< 400	4,2121	3,4794	2,9572	3,3401	3,7387	3,3672
	400 - 600	4,2778	3,4205	2,9039	3,2922	3,7662	3,2583
	601 - 800	4,1909	3,4453	3,0575	3,4017	3,7168	3,3408
	> 800	4,2262	3,4902	3,0417	3,3863	3,7330	3,2855

#### 4.4 Brief discussion of the differences in the factor mean scores in Table 4.6

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. Due to the length of the mini-dissertation, only three factors will be discussed.

- \* F1 = Co-operative governance
- \* F3 = Governance of educators
- \* F4 = Governance of the community

##### 4.4.1 Co-operative governance

###### ◇ Province

The mean scores of the five provinces give a picture in practice that all provinces have taken part with slight differences here and there. Other provinces have a slightly higher factor mean score than Kwazulu-Natal. Kwazulu-Natal tends to have a high death rate and therefore one would expect them not to be in favour of co-operative governance.

###### ◇ Qualifications

Respondents with tertiary qualifications have higher mean scores than respondents with secondary qualifications. People with tertiary qualifications have more knowledge and understand the importance of co-operative governance in schools than those with secondary qualifications.

###### ◇ Income

Respondents earning >R5000 have higher mean scores than other income groups. The group with the highest mean scores are educated people who know the importance of incorporating co-operative governance in schools.

#### ◇ **School type**

Secondary respondents differ slightly from primary respondents as far as the mean scores are concerned. Secondary schools are always involved in strikes and therefore educators in secondary schools are in favour of co-operative governance in order to be able to work together to combat the unrest in schools.

#### ◇ **Geography of school**

Respondents living in suburban areas have higher mean scores than township and rural respondents. People in rural areas are not qualified and do not understand and know the importance of having co-operative governance in schools.

#### ◇ **Size of school**

Schools with 400 – 600 learners have higher mean scores than other sizes. The schools with 400 - 600 have an average number of learners and educators and are in favour of school governance.

### **4.4.2 Governance of educators**

#### ◇ **Province**

Respondents from Gauteng have higher mean scores than Kwazulu-Natal and other provinces. Gauteng province is a developed province and therefore they are in favour of governance of educators to develop their schools.

#### ◇ **Qualifications**

Respondents with secondary qualifications have higher mean scores than tertiary respondents. Secondary educators are in favour of governance of educators because they represent them in the school governing body and they can liaison with the school governing body through their governance of educators.

◇ **Income**

Respondents earning <R1000 have higher mean scores than other income groups. People earning <R1000 depend on professionals to further their studies.

◇ **School type**

Secondary school respondents have higher mean scores than primary respondents. Secondary school educators know their rights and always want to know things in their school. They are in favour of governance of educators as their representative in the school governing body.

◇ **Geography of school**

Township respondents have a higher mean score than suburban and rural respondents. Township schools are always engaged in strikes and therefore they favour the governance of educators to be part of the school governing body. Educators can help the school governing body to solve the problems in schools.

◇ **Size of school**

Schools with an enrolment of 601 – 800 have higher factor mean scores than schools with less and more learners.

#### **4.4.3 Governance of the community**

- ◇ Respondents from other province have a slightly higher factor mean score than other provinces. The scores give a picture in practice that governance of the community do take part in all provinces.



◇ **Qualifications**

Respondents with secondary qualifications have a slightly higher factor mean scores than respondents with tertiary qualifications.

◇ **Income**

Respondents earning <R1000 have slightly higher factor mean score than other income groups. The differences give a picture that they all favour governance of the community in schools.

◇ **School type**

Secondary respondents have a slightly higher mean score than primary respondents. Secondary educators understand the importance of governance of community.

◇ **Geography of school**



Suburban respondents have higher factor mean scores than those in the township and rural areas. People living in suburban areas are educated and they want to know more about the education of their children; so they favour governance of the community to represent them in the schools.

◇ **Size of school**

Schools with 601 – 800 learners have slightly higher factor mean scores than other size schools. Schools with 601 – 800 learners favour governance of community to represent them in schools.

## 4.5 Summary

In this chapter an analysis and interpretation of some of the empirical data was undertaken. The construct validity of the research instrument was investigated by means of six successive factor analyses which reduced the 101 items to just six factors namely:

- \* Co-operative governance consisting of 33 items with a reliability coefficient of 0,899;
- \* Governance of non-educators consisting of 11 items with reliability coefficient of 0,703;
- \* Governance of educators consisting of 19 items with reliability coefficient of 0,836;
- \* Governance of community consisting of 15 items with reliability coefficient of 0,766;
- \* Governance as policy consisting of 18 items with reliability coefficient of 0,835;
- \* Governance of learners consisting of 5 items with reliability coefficient of 0,65.

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 differ slightly in their mean scores.

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

From the research conducted it can be concluded that the function, recommending to the Head of Department on the appointment of educators, revolves around the construct of the six factors being:

- \* Co-operative governance
- \* Governance of non-educators
- \* Governance of educators
- \* Governance of the community
- \* Governance as policy
- \* Governance of learners

The six factors were shown to have construct validity and high reliability and could thus serve as a basis for measuring and developing the functions of the school governing body.

In Chapter 5 a summary of the research will be given. Important findings will be discussed and recommendations will be made.



## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE CONCLUSION

#### 5.1 Introduction

In chapter five a summary of the research is given. Important literature findings and empirical research findings are discussed. Recommendations, topics for further research and conclusions will be made on the function: "Make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators".

The governing body is the legal body responsible for the development of the overall school policy, the vision and mission of the school, financial management, fundraising as well as making recommendations on the appointment of educators at the school (Davidoff and Lazarus, 1997: 164). According to them an effective governing body will ensure that the school is fulfilling its particular purpose and provides an important mechanism for accountability and transparency throughout the process. Jansen (1995: 186) maintains that schools should be learning organisations, which motivate its governing bodies to be active.

Governing bodies need to be empowered and trained in order to work together with educators, learners and community as a team. Self-managing work teams are the building blocks and innovative sources for success (Murgatroyd and Morgan, 1994: 141).

#### 5.2 Summary

In chapter one light was shed on what this research essay entails.

Mention of the eleven functions of the governing body on which the research project hinged was made. Eleven students each researched one function. The writer of this

research essay researched the recommendation to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators.

Chapter one focused on the problem statement, the motivation, the purpose of the study, research methodology and clarification of concepts. The aims of this research project, the aim of the research group project and the specific aim of the research essay was elucidated. The methods of research used in investigating the research group project and the specific problem were indicated and these were:

- ◇ a literature review; and
- ◇ the quantitative research method using a questionnaire.

Chapter two mainly focused on a literature study with the sole purpose of establishing what other theorists in other countries say about the function of governing bodies: "make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators".

The questionnaire developed was discussed in chapter three to obtain individual opinions from members of governing bodies regarding this function as stipulated in the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996. Members of governing bodies were sampled in South African Provinces (see table 3.2 to 3.14).

Returned questionnaires were sent to the Statistical Consulting Service of the Rand Afrikaans University where the data was transcribed and processed.

In chapter four the functions were analysed and interpreted, using multivariate statistical analysis. Six factors were identified and used to investigate the construct validity of the research instrument. This resulted in the 101 items being reduced to six factors (see table 4.1 to 4.3).

Hotelling T2 test was used to investigate the difference between the vector mean score of male and female respondents in respect of the six factors considered together. In respect of three or more independent groups' multivariate difference are

investigated by means of Manova multivariate analysis in respect of the six factors considered together.

During the literature review and data analysis in respect of the functions of the governing bodies, important findings were made. These findings are now briefly examined.

### **5.3 Important findings**

Important findings made are classified into two categories, namely:

- ◇ Literature review findings
- ◇ Empirical research findings

#### **5.3.1 Important literature findings**

In respect of the literature review the following findings from four countries namely England, Papua New Guinea, Tanzania and South Africa were significant:

- 1) In England governing boards have been delegated powers of hiring and firing staff if the staff's service do not satisfy the community. Governing boards do not make recommendations to the Head of Department to approve the appointment, they themselves appoint and fire educators.
- 2) In Papua New Guinea the board does not appoint educators. The board appoints a committee to be responsible for the appointment of educators. If the board cannot appoint a committee, then the function of appointing educators would not take place. Neither the board nor the appointing committees make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators.

- 3) In Tanzania, school committees are still functioning. School committees do not appoint educators. This function is executed by hierarchy of officers, both at a district and divisional level. The officers do not make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators.
- 4) In South Africa, governing bodies make recommendations to the Head of Department regarding the appointment of educators. Governing bodies do not appoint educators, the Head of Department is the one who must come up with the final approval on the appointment of educators.

Governing bodies do not write recommendation letters (see 1.6.1). They only furnish the following information through the chairperson of the school governing body on the form called "Application for an educator's post": Education Department Northern Province 1 (EDNP1).

The following information should be included:

- ◇ surname and initials of an educator;
- ◇ the previous incumbent of the post;
- ◇ the reason of his / her leaving for instance retirement, new post;
- ◇ they state whether the educator is permanently or temporarily employed; and
- ◇ the signature of the chairperson of the school governing body.

### 5.3.2 Empirical research findings

The empirical research has revealed that functions of the governing bodies consist of six factors (see 4.6). The six factors have construct validity and high reliability and could thus serve as a basis for measuring and developing this function of governing bodies.

- 5) When considering the factor mean score, it is evident that people living in Gauteng are in favour of co-operative governance, governance of non-educators, governance of educators and governance of learners than those at Kwa Zulu-Natal and other provinces (see table 4.6).
- 6) The factor mean score in (table 4.6) clearly indicates that people with secondary qualifications are in favour of governance of non-educators, governance of educators, governance of community, governance as policy and governance of learners than those with tertiary qualifications.
- 7) People earning less than R1 000 according to the factor mean score in (table 4.6) are in favour of governance of non-educators, governance of educators, governance of community, governance as policy and governance of learners than other income groups earning more than R1 000.
- 8) Secondary school educators and learners are in favour of co-operative governance, governance of non-educators, governance of educators, governance of community, governance as policy and governance of learners than primary educators (see table 4.6).
- 9) People living in suburban areas are in favour of co-operative governance, governance of non-educators, governance of community, governance as policy than those living in the township and rural areas.
- 10) Schools with an enrolment of less than 400 learners are in favour of governance of learners while schools with 400 to 600 learners are in favour of co-operative governance and governance as policy. Schools with 601 to 800 learners are in favour of governance of educators and governance of community while those with enrolment of more than 800 are in favour of governance of non-educators (see table 4.6).



## **5.4 Recommendations**

- 5.4.1** According to South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 the Head of Department is supposed to establish a programme to provide introductory training for newly elected governing bodies. The Head of Department should provide continuing training to governing bodies to promote effective performance of their functions and to enable them to assume additional functions (RSA, 1996: 14).
- 5.4.2** The National Department of Education and Culture should provide the provinces with sufficient funds to train governing bodies. Workshops should be conducted where governing bodies will be developed and empowered. This could be done by making available management consultants in various areas of management to assist governing bodies and principals could do this.
- 5.4.3** The educators, principals and governing bodies should attend the workshops together in order to develop their relationship and help them to know how they should work together and accept one another. This could help to close a gap between educators and governing bodies.
- 5.4.4** For principals of schools to be effective in their management of schools, they must receive special training in designing, organising and presenting research and development courses for both educators and governing bodies of their schools. This will develop the school into learning organisations as governing bodies will execute their function of recommending the appointment of educators to the Head of Department with ease.
- 5.4.5** Good attendance of governing bodies to meetings will enhance them to perform their function effectively and therefore development programmes should be designed in such a way that they encourage educators and principals to create an environment which will discourage absenteeism by members of governing bodies to meetings.

## 5.5 Topics for further research

Studies on the functions of governance have been done in many overseas countries. However, South Africa is lagging behind as governing bodies have been established only in 1997. Therefore a great deal of research in this regard will have to be done.

Further studies could be undertaken to investigate inter alia, the following:

- ◇ Integration and cultural tolerance of members of governing bodies in multicultural schools.
- ◇ Elimination of biased interview results by interview panels before governing bodies can make recommendations to the Head of Department.
- ◇ Educational development as a tool for recommending suitable educators.
- ◇ The criteria used by the Head of Department when appointing educators.

Research on the above proposed topics could add another dimension and shed more light on governing bodies so that effectiveness in their functions could be improved.

## 5.6 Conclusion

Governing bodies need workshops so that they can execute their functions effectively. Governing bodies should be thoroughly workshopped and capacitated so that they can hold meetings in the absence of the principal and can be able to write the minutes.

Workshops should be conducted in their own languages so that they can understand and feel free to participate. Working together with the principal and educators can motivate them to belong and own schools.

The challenge facing South Africa today is building a nation. Nxumalo (1997: 17) maintains that the birth of the nation demands fundamentally transformation of our society through adult education. Governing bodies should be encouraged to attend adult education classes in order for them to be able to perform

their functions effectively. New members should attend workshops before they can assume their duties as members of governing bodies.

This research has been able to accomplish its main objective, which is the perception of governing bodies concerning their functions. How other countries perceive the function of recommending to the Head of Department on the appointment of educators was discussed in literature review.

Furthermore empirical research has been undertaken and results have been interpreted and made public to benefit all governing bodies.



## 6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS 1995: A policy framework for education and training. Mbabane: MacMillian.

BADENHORST, D C, CALITZ, L P, VAN SCHALKWYK, O J, VAN WYK, J G & KRUGER, A G 1991: School management: the tasks and role of the teacher. Pretoria: Kagiso.

BRASE, C H, & BRASE, C P 1997: Understanding basic statistics. Boston: Mifflin.

DAVIDOFF, S & LAZARUS, S 1997: The learning school: an organisation development approach. Johannesburg: Juta.

DEAN, J 1995: Managing the primary school. Second edition. London: Routledge.

DEKKER, E & VAN SCHALKWYK, O J 1995: Second edition. Modern education systems. Durban: Butterworths.

FULLAN, M & HARGREAVES, A 1992: Teachers development and educational change. London: Falmer.

GRIMM, L G 1993: Statistical applications for behavioural sciences. New York: John Wiley.

HORNBY, A S 1995: Oxford advanced learners' dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University.

JANSEN, J D (Ed) 1995: Comparative education: effective schools, International Journal of Education, Volume 31, No. 2, June 1995, 186.

- KIRKPATRICK, B 1992: The Cassell concise English dictionary: First edition. London: Cassell.
- LEMMER, E M & SQUELCH, J M 1994: Eight keys to effective school management in South Africa. Durban: Southern.
- MACBETH, A 1989: Involving parents: effective parent-teacher relations. Oxford: Heinemann.
- MAHA, A C 1997: Governance of Education in Papua New Guinea: the role of boards of governors, International Review of Education. 43, (2, 3) 1997: 179 - 192.
- MCMILLIAN, J H & SCHUMACHER, S 1993: Research in education. Third edition. New York: Harper Collins.
- MOUTON, J & MARAIS, H C 1994: Basic concepts in the methodology of the social sciences. Fourth edition. Pretoria: Human Science Research Council.
- MULDER, J C 1986: Statistical techniques in education. Pretoria: Haum.
- MUNN, P (Ed) 1993: Parents and schools: customers, managers or partners? London: Routledge.
- MURGATROYD, S & MORGAN, C 1994: Total quality management and the school. Buckingham: Open University.
- NORTHERN PROVINCE 1996: Education reconstruction declaration. Pietersburg: Department of Education.
- NXUMALO, G 1997: ABET Journal: South African Address at the Conference, A South African journal of Adult Basic Education and Training. 1 (2) 1997: 17 - 19.

- PRETORIUS, F & LEMMER, E (Eds) 1998: South African education and training: transition in a democratic era. Johannesburg: Hodder & Stoughton.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA 1996: South African Schools Act 84 of 1996: Cape Town: Government Printers.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA 1998: Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998. Cape Town: Government Printers.
- SADTU 1998: The educator's voice: The paper for teachers by teachers. 2 (3) July 1998: 7.
- SINCLAIR, J M 1979: Collins English Dictionary. Birmingham: Harper Collins.
- THE WORLD BOOK ENCYCLOPEDIA 1996: E. Volume 6. London: World Book International.
- THE WORLD BOOK ENCYCLOPEDIA 1996: O – V Volume 20. London: World Book International
- VOCKELL, E L & ASHER, J W 1995: Educational research. Second edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- VOS, A J & BRITS, V M 1990: Comparative Education and National Education system. Durban: Butterworths.
- WRIGHT, D B 1997: Understanding Statistics. London: Sage.

## QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNING BODIES

--	--	--	--

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:

- o Do not write your name on the questionnaire - it remains anonymous.
- o There are no correct or incorrect answers in section B. We merely require your honest opinion.
- o Your first spontaneous reaction is the most valid.
- o Please answer all questions.
- o 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?

Male	1
Female	2

1. Your gender?

Male	1
Female	2

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

Principal	1
Educators	2
Non-educators	3
Learners	4
Parents	5
Co-opted member	6

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

3	5
---	---

--	--



4. In which province is your school situated?

Gauteng	1
Northern province	2
Mpumalanga	3
North-West province	4
KwaZulu-Natal	5
Freestate	6
Northern Cape	7
Western Cape	8
Eastern Cape	9

5. Your highest educational qualification?

Choose only one option.

Lower than Grade 9 (Std. 7)	1
Grade 10 or grade 11 (Std.8 or 9)	2
Grade 12 (Std. 10)	3
Post school certificate	4
Post school diploma	5
Bachelor's degree or higher diploma	6
Master's degree	7
Doctorate	8

6. Which is your religious commitment?

Choose one option only.

None	1
Christian	2
Islam	3
Hindu	4
Jewish	5
Other (Specify)	6

7. Which language do you regard as your mother tongue? Choose one option only.

Afrikaans	1
English	2
Ndebele	3
North Sotho	4
South Sotho	5
Swati	6
Tsonga	7
Tswana	8
Venda	9
Xhosa	10
Zulu	11
Others	12

8. What work do you do?

Learner	1
Unemployed	2
Government sector	3
Private sector	4
Informal sector	5
Other	6

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

R0-R500 per month	1
R501-R1 000 per month	2
R1 001-R2 000 per month	3
R2 001-R3 000 per month	4
R3 001- R5 000 per month	5
More than R5 000 per month	6

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

Primary	1
Secondary	2

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

Township	1
Suburban	2
Rural	3

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?

1-200	1
201-400	2
401-600	3
601-800	4
801-1 000	5
More than 1 000	6

## 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

TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

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.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE TO A PROPOSAL THAT:

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

70. The governing body must draw up a code of conduct for

learners.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

80. Will ensure that the governing body takes responsibility for the order and discipline in the school.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

94. The governing body must pay voluntary workers from the community a small amount.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

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
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

96. The governing body must discipline learners who carry dangerous weapons to school.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

97. The governing body should draw up a code of conduct for learners

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

98. The governing body must draw up the job description of educators at the school.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

99. The governing body must draw up criteria for measuring the performance of educators at the school.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

100. The governing body must appraise the performance of educators at the school.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE

101. The governing body must provide a programme for the training and development of educators at the school.

DISAGREE

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

AGREE