

## CHAPTER 6

### DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

#### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the empirical survey was to determine by means of a questionnaire the management development needs, experiences and current activities of educational leaders in schools in the Gauteng Province. The summary of the data collected is presented in this chapter.

#### 6.2 DATA ON THE GENERAL INFORMATION

##### 6.2.1 Review of respondents

Questionnaires distributed amounted to 398. Of this number, 341 (85,7%) were returned.

##### 6.2.1.1 Gender

Table 6.1 depicts the respondents gender review.

**Table 6.1 Data on respondents' gender**

Gender	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Male</i>	62	74,7	47	65,3	86	46,7	195	57,5
<i>Female</i>	21	25,3	25	34,7	98	53,3	144	42,5
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	184	100,0	339	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>	1				1		2	

Table 6.1 shows that more male respondents (57,5%) are on school management teams than their female counterparts (42,5%). This confirms the literature assertions about the gender legacy of the past education system. The difference (15%), however, indicates a tapering off of this tendency maybe because of the new systems' direction which among others, focuses on redress of past imbalances (cf. 2.2.2.4).

It is, however, intriguing to note that the ratio between male and female school principals is still heavily tilted towards the males. Only about a quarter (25,3%) of school principals are female compared to about three times that number of males (74,7%). In the case of deputy principals, the ratio is still tilted more towards the males (65,3%) as compared to slightly more than half (34,7%) of the female deputy principals. This indicates the effects of the gender legacy on the higher educational management positions.

It is noteworthy that in the case of heads of departments, there are more female HODs (53,3%) compared to the male HODs (46,7%). Though marginal, this indicates a major shift in the previous *status quo*. The fact that this picture exists in the lower level of the SMTs could be an indication of women taking the challenge of leading in public educational institutions. This picture indicates drastic in-roads into the traditionally male positions of principal and deputy principals. This can also be attributed to the GDE's redress and equity strategic priorities in education.

#### 6.2.1.2 Age of respondents

Table 6.2 outlines data on the ages of respondents.

**Table 6.2 Data on the ages of respondents**

Age	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
20-29	2	2,4	2	2,8	21	11,4	25	7,3
30-39	14	16,7	28	38,9	88	47,6	130	38,1
40-49	50	59,5	36	50,0	65	53,1	151	44,3
50+	18	21,4	6	8,3	11	6,0	35	10,3
<i>Total</i>	84	100,0	72	100,0	185	54,3	341	100,0

Most respondents (82,4%) fall within the combined age groups of 30 – 49 years. A significant number of principals (59,5%) fall within the 40 – 49 years age group. This implies that in terms of age, principals head most schools. This could be experience as educators. This could serve schools in crisis situations where such principals, by virtue of their experience as educators and in schools, could be relied

upon to be calm and keep the situation under control. This, however, could have an influence on their perceptions of job satisfaction because, as growing adults, the way in which they learn will be affected, especially in a changing education system that needs people to learn new approaches to management. This could be compounded by schools having a sizeable number of young, energetic and somewhat adventurous corps of HODs as seen in almost three fifths (59,0%) of them in the 20 – 39 years age category. These HODs could indicate impatience with the cautious and rather “tedious” approach of older principals to change. The older principals’ experience could, however, come in handy to offset this attitude.

It is noted, however, that the percentage of deputy principals (50,0%) in the 40 – 49 year age group is significant. This can only be of value to schools with regard to maturity. It therefore is imperative that management development programmes be seriously enacted, so as to equip all these SMTs with the necessary skills to be able to manage their responsibilities with an outstanding ability.

Only a tenth (10,3%) of respondents are in the 50+ age category. This could be partly attributed to severance packages opted for by most educators in the recent years. This could be a blessing in disguise to the education system in terms of resistance to change since most school managers are in the lower age categories and are possibly responsive to change. It could also be a disadvantage in terms of experienced school managers having left the system early.

### 6.2.1.3 *Positions held by respondents*

Table 6.3 depicts data on positions held by respondents.

**Table 6.3 Data on positions held by respondents**

Position held	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Principals</i>	84	24,6	0	0,0	0	0,0	84	24,6
<i>Deputy Principals</i>	0	0,0	72	21,1	0	0	72	21,1
<i>HODs</i>	0	0,0	0	0,0	185	54,3	185	54,3
<i>Total</i>	84	100,0	72	100,0	185	54,3	341	100,0

Table 6.3 indicates that of the respondents to this item (341), a quarter (24,6%) occupy principalship positions while about a fifth (21,1%) are deputy principals and just over half (54,3%) occupy HOD positions. The significance of this data is that there are more HODs and principals in Gauteng schools as compared to deputy principals. From the researcher's experience in schools, this could be attributed to most promotion posts at deputy principal and HOD level still being vacant due to the stalled redeployment process and the question of the temporary teachers in schools. This less than full management staff establishment will obviously have adverse impacts on the functioning of the management teams in schools.

#### 6.2.1.4 Experience in the current positions

Table 6.4 depicts data on the number of years respondents have occupied in their current positions.

**Table 6.4 Data on respondents' experience in current positions**

Age	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1-10	53	63,1	47	66,2	124	67,4	224	66,1
11-15	17	20,2	18	25,4	41	22,3	76	22,4
16-20	7	8,3	5	7,0	10	5,4	22	6,5
20+	7	8,3	1	1,4	9	5,0	17	5,0
Total	84	100,0	71	100,0	184	100,0	339	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>			1		1		2	

The highest number of respondents (66,1%) has occupied their current positions for between 1 and 10 years. Of these respondents, most are HODs (67,4%), followed by deputy principals (66,2%) and principals (63,1%). These almost equal numbers of principals, deputy principals and HODs imply that in most schools, managers are relatively inexperienced in their management positions. It could, however, mean that they have had more experience as educators (6.2.1.2). This could serve a positive purpose if management training and development could be enacted timeously and vigorously in order to equip them with the necessary skills in education management.

This is expressed in the light of transformation taking place before these school managers have settled in comfort zones and are still amenable to change.

On the other hand, the stabilising influence of experience is indicated by a total of 34% of respondents in the 11 – 20+ experience as school managers, out of whom 36,8% are principals, 33,8% are deputy principals and 32,7% are HODs.

It must, however, be emphasised that the relative inexperience of most respondents should be seen as a matter of urgency by the GDE so that management development receives priority.

#### 6.2.1.5 *Type of school*

Table 6.5 depicts data on the type of school where respondents work.

**Table 6.5 Data on the type of school**

Type of school	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Primary</i>	47	56,0	38	52,8	100	54,4	185	54,4
<i>Secondary</i>	30	35,7	29	40,3	62	33,7	121	35,6
<i>Intermediate</i>	5	6,0	2	2,8	17	9,2	24	7,1
<i>Combined</i>	2	2,4	3	4,2	5	2,7	10	2,9
<i>Total</i>	84	100,0	72	100,0	184	100,0	340	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>					1		1	

Of the respondents to this question, more than half (54,4%) are in primary schools. Of these respondents, the majority (56,0%) are school principals, followed by almost equal numbers of deputy principals and HODs (52,8% and 54,4% respectively). Slightly more than a third of the respondents (35,6%) are in secondary schools, while about a twentieth (7,1%) are in intermediate schools, i.e. primary schools that have grade eight. Respondents in combined schools, i.e. schools combining both the primary and secondary school phases, counted for only 2,9%. This data indicates that most schools in the GDE are correctly composed in terms of phases as against in the past where there were many intermediate and combined schools. This data implies

therefore that school managers are appropriately placed and should thus be able to deal with their managerial responsibilities.

#### 6.2.1.6 Location of schools

Data on the location of schools is presented in Table 6.6.

From Table 6.6 it can be seen that most respondents (77,6%) hold posts in township schools. Of these respondents, more than four fifths (84,6%) are HODs, followed by deputy principals (74,3%) and principals (65,1%). This data indicates that most schools in the townships have more or less a full complement of management team members. Just less than a fifth of the respondents (16,4%) hold posts in suburban schools which are mostly ex-TED schools. Of these respondents 27,7% are principals, about a fifth (18,8%) are deputy principals while a tenth (10,4%) are HODs. Only about a twentieth (6,0%) of the respondents are in the rural schools. Out of these respondents less than a tenth (7,2%) are principals, deputy principals (7,1%) and HODs (5,0%).

**Table 6.6 Data on the location of school**

Location of school	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Township</i>	54	65,1	52	74,3	154	84,6	260	77,6
<i>Suburban</i>	23	27,7	13	18,6	19	10,4	55	16,4
<i>Rural</i>	6	7,2	5	7,1	9	5,0	20	6,0
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>100,0</b>
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		2		3		6	

The spread of the respondents across the various localities indicates an unbalanced distribution. It could be expected that rural schools would have fewer members in the SMTs as compared to their suburban and township counterparts. This will certainly have an impact on the management development and performance in the rural schools. Experience has shown that rural schools usually have a principal and an HOD who normally double up as educators with a workload tantamount to that of

educators on post level one. This is a situation for redress and equity as propounded by the vision of the GDE.

#### 6.2.1.7 Highest academic qualifications

Data relating to academic qualifications is detailed in Table 6.7.

From Table 6.7 it can be seen that most respondents' (43,6%) highest academic qualification is standard 10. Out of these respondents the majority is HODs (52,2%), followed by deputy principals (40,9%) and principals (27,4%). This points out the need for motivational strategies to encourage management teams to study further, thereby attuning them to being responsive to new information and knowledge.

About three tenths (29,1%) of respondents are in possession of a bachelor's degree. Of these respondents, more principals (32,1%) have a bachelor's degree compared to 29,6% and 27,5% of deputy principals and HODs respectively.

**Table 6.7 Data on the highest academic qualifications**

Highest academic qualifications	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Std 10</i>	23	27,4	29	40,9	95	52,2	147	43,6
<i>B. Degree</i>	27	32,1	21	29,6	50	27,5	98	29,1
<i>B. Ed/Hon.</i>	32	38,1	20	28,2	29	15,9	81	24,0
<i>M. Degree</i>	2	2,4	1	1,4	2	1,1	5	1,5
<i>D. Degree</i>	0	0,0	0	0,0	6	3,3	6	1,8
<i>Other</i>	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
<i>Total</i>	84	100,0	71	100,0	182	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>			1		3		4	

A combined 3,3% of respondents have masters degrees and doctoral degrees. Out of these respondents only six (1,8%) have doctoral degrees and these are HODs. This means that principals and deputy principals have to be encouraged to study for higher

degrees than the bachelor's degree. This is in itself empowering as far as it impacts of feelings of professional growth.

### 6.2.1.8 Highest professional qualification

Data on the highest professional qualification is important since it will give an insight into the qualification direction of respondents, *vis a vis* the educational management positions they hold. Data in this regard is depicted in Table 6.8.

Table 6.8 shows that the majority of respondents (38,3%) are in possession of a Primary Teachers Certificate (PTC) or Primary Teachers Diploma (PTD) qualification. These are qualifications for educators in primary schools. A combined half of the respondents (49,5%) possess Junior Secondary Teachers Certificate (JSTC)/Senior Secondary Teachers Certificate (SSTC) and Senior Education Diploma (SED)/Secondary Teachers Diploma (STD) qualifications which put them at secondary schools. Just more than a tenth (12,2%) of the respondents have the Higher Education Diploma (HED) qualification, which is normally a post graduate qualification. Only one respondent has a qualification not stated in the questionnaire. The response did not state the other qualification.

**Table 6.8 Data on the highest professional qualification**

Location of school	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>PTC/PTD</i>	22	26,5	32	44,4	75	41,0	129	38,3
<i>JSTC/SSTC</i>	15	18,0	10	13,9	46	25,1	71	21,0
<i>SED/STD</i>	32	38,6	21	29,2	43	23,5	96	28,5
<i>HED</i>	14	16,9	9	12,5	18	9,8	41	12,2
<i>Other</i>	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	0,6	0	0,0
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	183	100,0	337	100,0

The data about professional qualifications shows that the majority of school managers are in possession of minimum qualifications for their posts. This can only be positive for them since it should have a positive impact on their feelings of self-confidence as change agents. Very often the researcher has observed that school managers who do

not have the apposite qualifications, usually do not feel confident enough to introduce and manage change to subordinates who are professionally better qualified.

#### 6.2.1.9 Number of SMT members in the school

The number of SMT members in a school is bound to influence the entire management process of the school. A full establishment of the SMT will have a better chance of functioning optimally than a less than full establishment. Data in this regard is presented in Table 6.9.

Data from Table 6.9 indicates that most schools (74,9%) have a management staff establishments of between four and six members. About a tenth of schools (8,6%) have a management establishment of between one and three and just less than a tenth (7,1%) have SMT members between eight and ten. This data indicates that schools in the GDE are inequitable endowed with SMTs. This could be felt more in rural schools where SMTs, because of school grading, cannot endow their energies to management responsibilities only but have to share educator workloads as well.

**Table 6.9 Data on the number of SMT members in the school**

Number of SMTs members in the school	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	1	1,2	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	0,3
2	2	2,4	1	1,5	1	0,6	4	1,2
3	8	9,8	4	6,0	11	6,2	23	7,1
4	16	19,5	12	17,9	29	16,4	57	17,5
5	30	36,6	26	38,8	61	34,5	117	36,0
6	16	19,5	10	14,9	40	22,6	35	10,7
7	4	4,9	10	14,9	21	11,9	35	10,7
8	3	3,7	2	3,0	10	5,6	15	4,6
10	2	2,4	2	3,0	4	2,3	8	2,5
<i>Total</i>	82	100,0	67	100,0	177	100,0	326	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	2		5		8		15	

However, the researcher must point out that data indicating more than six or at least seven SMT members could be invalid. This question could have been confused with the number of SGB (School Governing Body) members. The acronyms SMT and SGB could have been looked at to be the same since they are relatively new and are currently in regular use. This also confirms the notion that there is a need for school

management teams to be apprised and get used to the contemporary educational management language and terminology in use. This notion is attested to by the following item in the questionnaire.

#### 6.2.1.10 Further study in education management

This item intended to find out what fields of study respondents were pursuing. This is important since it would indicate the suitability of respondents' own study interests in relation to their education management responsibility. The researcher has observed many SMTs who pursue studies in education management unrelated fields. Data in this regard is depicted in Table 6.10.

Of the overall respondents (341) only about two fifths of the respondents 137 (40,2%) answered this question. Of these respondents, almost equal numbers of principals (42,8%), deputy principals (37,5%) and HODs (40,0%) indicated that they were studying further in educational management. However, an analysis of their specified field of study indicated that some fields of study were unrelated to educational management. For instance, some respondents indicated studies for, *inter alia*, B. Degrees, Empirical Studies, Guidance, B. Tech Education and Communication. This is indicative of the necessity to popularise and induce SMTs to understand and use educational language and terminology appropriately. This point is supportive of the finding in 6.2.1.9 above.

**Table 6.10 Data on further study in education management**

Further study in educational management	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	36	42,8	27	37,5	74	40,0	137	40,2
<i>Null</i>	48		45		113		204	

Educational managers have education management development needs as found in the literature study. The next section looks at findings regarding management development needs in education.

### 6.3 AN ANALYSIS OF MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

Various management development needs were identified in the literature study (cf. 3.4.6) as applicable to most school managers. Among others, needs for the development of interpersonal skills, personal and individual development and the development of the school as an organisation were identified. These management development needs were tabulated to include performance appraisal, management tasks, conflict management, financial management, managing interpersonal relationships, managing change, delegation, team building and motivation, communication skills and managing a multicultural environment. Respondents were requested to prioritise these needs from very low to very high in their own situations. The following data relates to frequency counts of data collected.

#### 6.3.1 *Performance appraisal*

The GDE did not have a formal programme of performance appraisal until recently, when an agreement was reached in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) for developmental appraisal which is envisaged to be operational as from 1999 (Department of Education, 1998a:7). This was expected to have an effect on respondents' prioritisation thereof in their own situations. Expectations were that this management development need would receive a very high prioritisation. Table 6.11 depicts data on performance appraisal.

**Table 6.11 Data on performance appraisal**

Priority	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Low</i>	37	44,6	39	54,2	86	48,0	162	48,5
<i>High</i>	46	55,4	33	45,8	93	52,0	172	51,5
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	179	100,0	334	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>	1				6		7	

There were 334 responses to this question with a 2,1% null response. Although negligent, the null response could be attributed to respondents not knowing exactly what form performance appraisal should take since there has been no programme or policy thereof in GDE schools. It could also be that respondents could not discern

between performance appraisal and the traditional work evaluation as was practised in the previous education departments. It is also noted that of the seven null responses, 6 were from HODs, *vis a vis*, one and zero from principal and deputy principals respectively. HODs have not been performing managerial duties due to the “defiance campaign” in which the South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) refused to co-operate with school inspectors, subject advisors and consequently SMTs in any form of evaluation (Department of Education, 1998a:6).

It can be seen, however, that just over half (51,5%) of the respondents highly prioritised performance appraisal as a management development need. This supports literature assertions that performance appraisal is indeed perceived as a management development need by educational managers (3.4.6). In Gauteng schools, and consequently South Africa, this could be as a result of the decline in the culture of learning and teaching in schools as a result of among others, there being no form of evaluation of educators’ performance.

The almost equally low prioritisation of performance appraisal as a management development need (48,5%) is cause for concern. As against implying that respondents do not need development in performance appraisal, this suggests a lack of understanding and maybe knowledge of what performance appraisal is and what purpose it serves. As alluded earlier, this could be because there has been no policy or programme of performance appraisal in GDE schools.

Of the total number of principals, less than half (44,6%) perceived performance appraisal as being of low priority, while over half (55,4%) perceive it as being of high priority. Although marginally more than half, this indicates that school principals see management development in performance appraisal as being of high priority. This should be understandable in the light of the declining culture of learning and teaching resulting from the “defiance campaign” alluded to earlier. This implies that principals see the role of performance appraisal among others, as a way of ensuring that teaching and learning takes place effectively. The low prioritisation of performance appraisal as a management development need could be attributed to lack of knowledge and role thereof as well as to apathy and a possible reluctance to explore appraisal due to the resistance of the past to any form of evaluation.

### **6.3.2 *Planning, organising, guiding and controlling***

Planning, organising, guiding and controlling were identified as management tasks in the literature study (3.4.7) and were seen as management development needs (3.4.6). Table 6.12 presents data on planning, organising, guiding and controlling as

management development needs. Of the total respondents (337), there were 1,7% null responses.

**Table 6.12 Data on planning, organising, guiding and controlling**

Priority	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Low</i>	31	36,9	33	45,8	68	37,6	132	39,2
<i>High</i>	53	63,1	39	54,2	113	62,4	205	60,8
<i>Total</i>	84	100,0	72	100,0	181	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>					4		4	

Three fifths (63,1%) of principal respondents prioritised management tasks as management development needs as being high, while only just over three tenths (36,9%) prioritised these tasks as being low management development needs. This seems to support literature findings about the educational managers' need for development in these tasks. The three tenths (36,9%) who prioritised these tasks as being low, could be educational leaders who have furthered studies or are furthering studies in education management so that they could be familiar with the terminology of management tasks. However, taking the decline in the culture of teaching and learning suggests that this knowledge is not serving the utmost purpose of effective school management (cf. Reeves, 1994).

Deputy principals (54,2%) perceived the need for management development in the management tasks as being high. This may be because deputy principals could generally not be involved actively in school management and as such feel a need for management development in these tasks. The researcher has observed this tendency in schools where deputy principals only end up managing on a "delegated" basis.

It is noteworthy that over three fifths (62,4%) of HODs regarded the need for management development in management tasks as being of high priority. The researcher observes from experience that the majority of HODs (32%) are in the age group between 20 and 39 years (cf. Table 6.2) and most (48,7%) are in the 1 - 15 years experience in these positions (cf. Table 6.4). This could mean these educational managers are motivated to learn and develop as much as is possible in education management. This is attested to by the fact that most of them (54,0%) of them are engaged in further studies in education management (cf. Table 6.10).

It is, however, disconcerting to observe that a sizeable percentage (37,6%) regarded management tasks as being of low priority. This suggests a need for orientation and induction in education management for newly promoted HODs since this data suggests that most HODs are promoted into their positions on the basis of their proficiency in responding to interview questions. Interview processes observed by the researcher, very often are conducted by people who are often not well versed in educational management (cf. Gauteng Provincial Government, 1997:17).

### 6.3.3 *Financial management*

Table 6.13 presents data on financial management as a management development need. Of all the respondents, the majority (60,9%) considered the need for management development in financial management as being of high priority. Generally this could be attributed to the previous financial management systems which lacked accountability and consequently, led to financial mismanagement in many instances. The researcher has had experiences where disputes and conflicts around financial mismanagement had to be resolved among various stakeholders. Another reason for this high prioritisation could be because of the new dictates of the South African Schools Act around financial matters and control in public schools (cf. Gauteng Provincial Government, 1997:16-17).

**Table 6.13 Data on financial management**

Priority	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Low</i>	26	31,0	38	52,8	67	37,4	131	39,1
<i>High</i>	58	69,0	34	47,2	112	62,6	204	60,9
<i>Total</i>	84	100,0	72	100,0	179	100,0	335	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>					6		6	

The respondents (39,1%) who prioritised the need for management development in financial management as being low, could be mainly from the ex-TED schools and other school managers who might have had sound financial management skills and could have had people with financial accounting skills in their non-teaching personnel, the governing bodies and in their financial committees. This could also allude to the open and participative leadership styles in those schools.

Principals and HODs (69,0% and 62,6% respectively) regarded management development in financial management as being of high priority as against the low prioritisation by 47,2% of the deputy principals. The former could be alluded to the pressure and demand for financial accountability from all stakeholders and the fact that the SASA requires that there be strict financial management and accountability. With the principals it is a foregone conclusion that they are accounting officers in their schools, while with HODs it could be because in the past they were not involved in financial matters in the schools. It is, however, discrepant that deputy principals, who in essence are leaders next to the principals, should indicate the need for management development in financial management as being of low priority. This seems to suggest that research on this would be necessary to determine the reasons thereof.

#### 6.3.4 Conflict management

Conflict management was identified as a management development need of educational managers (cf. 3.4.6). Data collected on this need is depicted in Table 6.14.

**Table 6.14 Data on conflict management**

Priority	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Low</i>	28	33,3	38	52,8	76	42,0	142	42,1
<i>High</i>	56	66,7	34	47,2	105	58,0	195	57,9
<i>Total</i>	84	100,0	72	100,0	181	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>					4		4	

The majority (57,9%) of respondents regarded conflict management as a management development need as being of high priority. The two fifths (42,1%) of the respondents who regarded it as being of low priority could be attributed to a percentage of respondents who may feel confident in resolving conflict rather than managing it.

It strikes one, however, to realise that it is the majority of principals (66,7%) who considered management development in conflict management as a high priority need.

This seems to point to the reality that it is usually principals who are faced with having to manage conflict between and among various stakeholders in schools. This is further seen in the less than half (47,2%) of the deputy principals and almost three fifths (42,0%) of the HODs who regarded this need as being of high priority. It can be seen that in most instances it is the school principal who faces conflict situations. This could also allude to the management style that seeks to assume that the principal should be the one who faces such situations. This situation is a major challenge to empower deputy principals and HODs with conflict management skills and perhaps an understanding of their roles as co-managers in schools. This would then make them feel co-responsible for ensuring that there is effective school management through their participation in all areas of educational management.

### 6.3.5 *Managing interpersonal relationships*

Managing interpersonal relationships is perhaps one of the most important management development needs identified in literature (3.4.6). Table 6.15 presents data on managing interpersonal relationships.

**Table 6.15 Data on managing interpersonal relationships**

Priority	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Low</i>	32	38,6	34	47,2	79	43,6	145	43,2
<i>High</i>	51	61,4	38	52,8	102	56,4	191	56,8
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	181	100,0	336	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>	1				4		5	

More than half (56,8%) of the respondents regarded the need for management development in managing interpersonal relationships as being of high priority as against 43,2% who regarded it as being of low priority. Managing interpersonal relationships could be seen by the latter respondents as normal day-to-day relationships that border around familiarity and friendship. It could be possible that the management of interpersonal relationships is not seen as a management catalyst to ensuring job satisfaction via, feelings of collegiality and an improved working life, hence the low prioritisation.

On the other hand, respondents who highly prioritised the need for management development in the management of interpersonal relationships could be seeing this as a way of removing tensions and discomforts caused by among others, the transition to a democratic school management and governance where stakeholders are afforded more involvement and participation as well as perhaps integration which has brought about a new dimension of multiculturalism and diversity in schools.

It can be seen from Table 6.13 that the majority of principals, deputy principals and HODs (61,4%, 52,8% and 56,4% respectively) saw the management of interpersonal relationships as a management development need. This is in line with literature assertions in this regard (cf. 3.4.6). It is also noteworthy that the majority of principals (61,4%) saw this need as being of high priority. Just like in the case of conflict management (6.3.4), it could be because principals are perceived to be responsible for ensuring the normalisation of relationships in schools and therefore it is seen as their task to manage interpersonal relationships. This is once more cause for empowerment of other SMT members to be made to see themselves as co-managers who have a role to play in all aspects of educational management. This is all the reason for emphasising and enacting a democratic management style. This cannot be left to principals alone to do on their own but rather a more concerted effort is needed from the Education Management Development (EMD) Institute to induce all school managers to this leadership style (cf. 2.5.2 & 2.5.3).

### 6.3.6 *Managing change*

This management development need is perhaps pivotal to the whole education transformation process (cf. Chapter 2 & 2.4.6). Data on the management of change as a management development need is depicted in Table 6.16.

**Table 6.16 Data on managing change**

Priority	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Low</i>	18	21,7	31	43,7	64	35,8	113	33,9
<i>High</i>	65	73,3	40	56,3	115	64,2	220	66,1
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	71	100,0	179	100,0	333	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>	1		1		6		8	

The majority of respondents (66,1%) saw the need for management development in managing change as being of high priority compared to almost a third of respondents (33,9%) who saw it as being of low priority. This seems to suggest that the majority of respondents actually saw themselves as change agents and recognised the immensity of the challenge posed by ushering in and managing change. Only eight (2,4%) null response frequencies were noted in this item.

The majority of respondent principals (73,3%) regarded management development in managing change as being of high priority. This attests to the widely held notion that principals are responsible for managing among others, change in schools. It seems that principals also uphold that view, hence the expression of a need for management development in this regard.

Most deputy principals (56,3%) regarded this need for management development as being of high priority. This could be attributed to the new changes that have beset the education system. However, it causes consternation that a sizeable percentage (43,7%) of deputy principals regarded the need for management development in managing change as being of low priority. This again seems to point to deputy principals not regarding themselves as leaders in the mould of the principals and therefore taking a low profile in taking a lead in management issues like the management of change.

It is also catching that the majority of HODs (64,2%) saw managing change as a management development need. This could be attributed to the fact that the majority of HODs are between ages of 20 and 39 years and between the one to ten years' experience in their positions. They could be overwhelmed by the changes in the education system and consequently in schools and thus feel a need for management development in the management of change. One could cite the need for managing the cascading introduction of OBE while managing the present curriculum in other grades where OBE is not yet introduced.

The general impression is, however, that respondents attest to literature findings (3.4.6) that managing change is a management development need.

### **6.3.7 *Delegation***

Delegation as a management task is one of the highly misconstrued concepts. The researcher's observation in schools has been that delegation has been used rather scantily and has been used to "pass the buck" or as an end in itself. Faulty delegation without follow-up or assistance to achieve the delegated objectives has been observed. It is against this background that delegation has been included as a

management development need and has thus been found in literature to be indeed such a need. Table 6.17 presents data on delegation as a management development need.

There were only 4 null response frequencies to this item. The majority of respondents (65,0%) regarded delegation as a management development need as being of high priority. This seems to support the afore-stated view that delegation is generally not properly carried out. Respondents in this case seem to suggest recognition of this view and feel thus a need for management development in delegation.

**Table 6.17 Data on delegation**

Priority	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Low</i>	27	32,1	29	40,3	62	34,3	118	35,0
<i>High</i>	57	67,9	43	59,7	119	65,7	219	65,0
<i>Total</i>	84	100,0	72	100,0	181	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>					4		4	

There is, however, a not-so-negligible percentage (35%) that viewed delegation as a management development need as being of low priority. It is strongly felt that this emanates from responses of deputy principals and HODs (on average 74,6%) who themselves usually perform mostly delegated duties and do little, if any management functions that involve delegating. This poses a management development challenge to the EMD Institute in attempting to induce school managers to perform all their management functions with confidence.

### 6.3.8 *Team building and motivation*

In research investigating factors influencing the job satisfaction of educators, it was found that team building and motivation were essential factors influencing the job satisfaction of educators (cf. Xaba, 1996). Literature has identified these concepts as management development needs (3.4.6). Data collected on team building and motivation is presented in Table 6.18.

From Table 6.18 it can be seen that most respondents (68,4%) regarded team building and motivation as management development needs of high priority while only approximately a third (31,6%) regarded them as being of low priority. The former attest to literature assertions that team building and motivation are indeed management development needs and contribute to job satisfaction (cf. Xaba, 1996).

**Table 6.18 Data on team building and motivation**

Priority	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Low</i>	23	27,7	30	41,7	53	29,4	106	31,6
<i>High</i>	60	72,3	42	58,3	127	70,6	229	68,4
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	180	100,0	335	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>	1				5		6	

An overwhelming majority of principals (72,3%) and HODs (70,6%) regarded team building and motivation as management development needs of high priority. This could be attributed to the often-expressed demoralised teaching corps and chaotic and individualistic work performance of educators (cf. Reeves, 1994) and the concomitant helplessness of SMTs to build and manage teamwork as well as motivate educators effectively. This has been observed in many instances in schools by the researcher.

Almost three fifths of deputy principals (58,3%) regarded these needs for management development as being of low priority. This seems to support the notion that deputy principals, in most instances, see themselves somewhere between principals and HODs in terms of management. This can be seen by the sizeable percentage (41,7%) that regarded these needs as being of low priority. This seems to be situated in the fact that most schools have two deputy principals whose roles and job descriptions are largely ill-defined and, the fact that the principal is "responsible" for the whole school, while HODs are charged with managing their "own" departments, whereas deputy principals do not have any specific department as their responsibilities. This needs to be addressed by the EMD Institute and the Education Department in terms of clearly defining roles of SMTs and giving clear-cut job descriptions.

### 6.3.9 Communication skills

Communication forms the basis of any management situation. It is more so important in organisations of service like education where the day-to-day interactions between and among people are carried through good and effective communication. Literature rightly identified communication skills as a need for management development of educational managers (cf. 3.4.6). Table 6.19 presents data on communications skills as a management development need of educational managers.

**Table 6.19 Data on communication skills**

Priority	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Low</i>	29	34,9	26	36,1	68	37,8	123	36,7
<i>High</i>	54	65,1	46	63,9	112	62,2	212	63,3
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	180	100,0	335	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>	1				5		6	

Data on communication skills as a management development need indicates that most (63,3%) respondents regarded this need for management development as being of high priority. This finding is important as found in literature because it shows that SMTs in schools recognise the importance of good communication skills and thus express a need for management development in them. This is perhaps related to the contemporary multicultural and diverse composition of most ex-TED schools.

This need is regarded almost equally as being of high priority by the three categories of respondents, viz. principals, deputy principals and HODs (65,1%, 63,9% and 62,2% respectively). This response supports literature findings about communication as being a management development need. This implies a need for the EMD Institute and the Education Department to design a management development programme, which would address the communication skills empowerment of SMTs who are already in their respective positions.

Almost equal percentages of principals, deputy principals and HODs (34,9%, 36,1% and 37,8% respectively) regarded communication skills as a management development need as being of low priority. This finding could be attributed to the

management styles practised in schools where participation and involvement of others is very minimal.

### 6.3.10 *Managing a multicultural environment*

This management development need is made essential by the contemporary transformation of the education system. In South Africa managing a multicultural educational environment is made even more imperative by the integration experienced by many schools where learners from different cultural backgrounds suddenly find themselves in one educational environment. The educator composition is, however, still dominantly unicultural. Consequently the researcher has observed multiple conflict situations and problems emanating from the inability to deal with problems apparently stemming from multiculturalism and diversity. Managing a multicultural environment is rightfully identified by literature as a management development need.

Table 6.20 depicts data pertaining to managing a multicultural environment.

**Table 6.20 Data on managing a multicultural environment**

Priority	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Low</i>	41	49,4	34	47,2	102	57,0	177	53,0
<i>High</i>	42	50,6	38	52,8	77	43,0	157	47,0
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	179	100,0	334	100,0
<i>N.R.F</i>	1				6		7	

From Table 6.20 it can be seen that most respondents (53,0%) regarded managing a multicultural environment being a management development need as being of low priority. This could emanate mainly from ex-DET schools, which are mainly unicultural in terms of race. SMTs from these schools could be misconstruing a multicultural environment to mean “black and white” differences whereas this involves a wide range of issues like religion, ethnicity, language and so on. It could also be due to ignorance as to what multiculturalism is. The percentage (47%) that regarded managing a multicultural environment as being of a high management development priority could mostly be from ex-TED schools which have opened doors

to all race groups. This response implies the recognition of the need for management development in managing a multicultural and diverse environment as being important.

It is remarkable that it is mostly principals and deputy principals (50,6% and 52,8% respectively) who regarded this need as being of high priority. This alludes to the task of managing a multicultural environment being mostly their responsibility. These percentages including that of HODs (43,0%) indicate, however, that the realisation of confidently managing a multicultural environment is not yet recognised by all SMTs. This could lead to problems experienced in the USA with the advent of integration (cf. Steyn, 1993:38-54). This is perhaps one single area of management development where the Education Department and the EMD Institute have to play a pivotal role.

The needs for management development necessitate an examination of actual management experiences of SMTs in schools in the GDE.

#### **6.4 AN ANALYSIS OF MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCES**

This section intended to find out what, if any, management development experiences and opportunities did respondents have in their positions. This would include whether they themselves had undergone any management development or had conducted any development for themselves and their subordinates. Questions in this section include their perceptions about management development, e.g. whether parents should be involved in the planning and implementation of management development programmes. They were requested to respond on a scale of yes, no or not sure.

##### **6.4.1 *Accredited management training***

This item intended to elicit information about whether respondents had had any accredited management training. Table 6.21 depicts data in this regard.

The majority of respondents (64,4%) indicated that they do not have any accredited management training. There were four null responses to the question. Only about one third (32,3%) indicated having accredited management training, while a minority (3,3%) was not sure if they have had any accredited management training. This information supports literature assertions that in South Africa, and therefore the GDE, there has been no programme of educational management training. This sheds some light as to the state of affairs in most schools where school managers are not confident in managing all aspects of their managerial duties. This also indicates the authenticity

of the afore-going section in which school managers indicated the management development needs as being applicable in their own situations.

**Table 6.21 Data on accredited management training**

Item C01	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	29	34,9	19	26,8	61	33,3	109	32,3
<i>No</i>	53	63,9	50	70,4	114	62,3	217	64,4
<i>Not sure</i>	1	1,2	2	2,8	8	4,4	11	3,3
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	71	100,0	183	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		1		2		4	

An interesting observation is that most respondents, who indicated having accredited management training, indicated university degrees, diploma offered by colleges and NGOs like the MSTP as management training courses for which they were accredited. It can be concluded that knowledge, skills and experiences gained from these courses would be of minimal help since among others, they would be acquired for simply being accredited. The effectiveness thereof would depend on students being able to integrate and apply the theory acquired in a real school situation. There would also be a problem of applicability since as university degrees and diplomas, they would have equipped students mainly with generic concepts and skills as against a hands-on and school management specific training.

This state of affairs attests to the urgent need for a systematic approach to management development to be offered by the Department of Education through a centre for management development for which school managers would be accredited. This would go a long way towards building their confidence through accreditation while equipping them with the apposite skills for educational management.

It is encouraging, however, to note that, of the respondents who have some accredited management training, school principals are in the majority (34,9%) as against deputy

principals (26,8%) and HODs (33,3%). A question relating to the roles of deputy principals in schools as previously observed, is once more raised: Could it be that they do not have clearly defined roles, being neither in the role of principal or maybe being overshadowed by the principal or having no specific departments over which they are directly responsible?

#### 6.4.2 Attendance of in-service training in management

This question intended to find out if respondents had attended any INSET on management in the last two years. Table 6.22 presents data on this item.

**Table 6.22 Data on attendance of INSET on management in the last two years**

Item C02	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	27	32,5	15	20,8	54	29,7	96	28,5
<i>No</i>	55	66,3	51	70,8	121	66,5	227	67,3
<i>Not sure</i>	1	1,2	6	8,3	7	3,9	14	4,2
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	182	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				3		4	

The majority of respondents (67,3%) indicated that they had not attended any form of INSET in the last two years. The majority (70,8%), are deputy principals with almost an equal number of principals and HODs (66,3% and 66,5% respectively). This indicates a situation in GDE schools where very little management development and training takes place to empower school managers. This is attested to by the 28,5% of school managers who have had some form of INSET in the past two years. These INSET programmes could be conducted on district basis, so that, in some districts there might not have been any INSET. This is all the more reason for the need for a management development centre that will provide a needs-based systematic programme of management development.

The fact that data indicates that few respondents attended any INSET in the past two years induces a question as to whether school managers see a need for management development at school level. This is explored in the next section.

#### 6.4.3 *The need for management development at school level*

This item intended to elicit information from respondents as to whether they see a need for management development at school level. This implies management development programmes at school as a complement to any management development approach that could emanate from the Department of Education. Data on this item is depicted in Table 6.23.

**Table 6.23 Data on the need for management development at school level**

Item C03	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	82	97,6	71	98,6	175	94,6	328	96,2
<i>No</i>	2	2,4	1	1,4	8	4,3	11	3,2
<i>Not sure</i>	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	1,1	2	3,2
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	71	100,0	183	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		1		2		4	

An overwhelming majority of respondents (96,2%) saw a need for management development at school level. This was expressed by the majority of principals (97,6%), deputy principals (98,6%) and HODs (94,6%). This could allude to respondents seeking practical skill equipment at a situation in which they are involved, i.e. at school. Almost all deputy principals but one, indicated a need for management development at school level. This seems to suggest that the earlier observations about them could be true and that they also are acutely aware of the need for them to be equipped as educational managers in all aspects of school management. This is a major challenge for the education system and schools especially in the light of time resources needed to develop and train deputy principals.

Perhaps a programme that would include them in training and management development together with the principals would alleviate this problem in the long term.

#### 6.4.4 Management development courses conducted for staff in 1998

This item attempted to elicit information from respondents about whether they themselves had conducted any development courses for their staffs during year 1998. This was intended to find out if school managers do conduct any staff development activities in their positions. Table 6.24 portrays data in this regard.

**Table 6.24 Data on management courses conducted for staff in 1998**

Item C04	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	53	63,9	33	45,8	69	37,7	155	45,9
<i>No</i>	30	36,1	36	50,0	105	57,4	171	50,6
<i>Not sure</i>	0	0,0	3	4,2	9	4,9	12	3,6
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	183	100,0	338	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				2		3	

From Table 6.24, it can be seen that the majority (50,6%) of respondents answered in the negative to this question. This is almost two-thirds of the respondents and as such it indicates that most school manager respondents have not or do not conduct any staff development activities. This can be attributed to the fact that these schools managers have themselves not undergone any training or development, at least in the past two years (cf. 6.4.2 above). This alludes to stagnation in staff development in the department, especially at school level. Just less than half (45,9%) of the respondents answered positively to the question. This percentage is significant in terms of staff development activities in schools under the present climate. This, however, could be school managers who indicated staff development activities related to information sharing about the introduction of OBE and dissemination of

information about new policy and legislative initiatives. One alludes to the possibility that staff development activities conducted in schools could be basically not so related to subordinate empowerment with regard to work performance. This, the researcher bases on actual experience of not observing much evidence of staff development which would be evident in the improved teaching and learning culture, which in turn would translate to improved learner performance.

It is interesting to note that it is the majority of principals (63,9%) compared to deputy principals and HODs (45,8% and 37,7% respectively) who responded negatively to this question. It can be concluded also that the 3,6% that indicated being unsure whether they conducted any staff development activities could be those respondents who could not decide if their development activities, if any, were information dissemination sessions or development activities in the line of teaching and learning. It is, however, interesting to note that school principals are sure of the development courses they conducted, i.e. either conducted (63,9%) or not (36,1%). This suggests that principals generally know what staff development entails.

#### 6.4.4 *Willingness to attend a management development course with a member of staff*

This item was intended to let respondents relate to their willingness to be transparent and accept learning with their subordinates in the light of whole school development. A positive response would indicate a willingness to accept that learning of any form is for all and contributory to whole school development and an open, democratic style of leadership. Table 6.25 portrays data in this regard.

Table 6.25 shows that the overwhelming majority of respondents (95,3%) would attend a management development course with a member of staff who is not in the SMT. Only a few (3,5%) indicated a negative response. The respondents all show that they understand the implications of co-operative management where staff members are also part thereof. Attending management development courses with (a) staff member(s) would also assist the SMT with regard to cascading information and skills. Experience in schools has shown that very often, educators are resistant to management innovations that are perceived to be top-down. Experience has also shown that including members of staff in management development courses conducted for SMTs has helped in the implementation of development programmes, advocacy of new management innovations and has contributed to transparency. This has also helped many school managers, especially principals, to change their management styles from being largely autocratic and individualistic to being broadly consultative and participative as well as being democratic.

**Table 6.25 Data on the willingness to attend a management course with another member of staff**

Item C05	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	81	97,6	71	98,6	171	92,9	323	95,3
<i>No</i>	2	2,4	1	1,4	9	4,9	12	3,5
<i>Not sure</i>	0	0,0	0	0,0	4	2,2	4	1,2
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	184	100,0	339	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				1		3	

Since the majority of respondents felt that they would attend management development with other staff members, it would also be worthwhile to find out how they would feel about observing other school managers in action.

#### 6.4.6 *Willingness to observe other school managers at their schools for a day or longer*

This question intended to find out if respondents would be helped by observing other school managers in their schools for a day or longer. This experience, it was concluded, would find out if there is any management development collegiality among school managers even if they are not in the same school. Data in this regard is presented in Table 6.26.

Most respondents (76,6%) indicated that it would help to observe other school managers in their schools for a day or even longer. This indicates that respondents do feel that they can learn from other school managers. This also reveals a yearning for being like other “successful” school managers. It also foregrounds the need for collegiality even among educational leaders.

An interesting observation is that more HODs (83,6%) and deputy principals (73,6%) than principals (63,9%) felt that it would help to observe other school managers in

their schools. School principals (27,1%) could have observed that there is really no difference in their own management styles and those of other principals even though better experienced than themselves. This could be based on rationalisation of the successes of other schools. For instance, the researcher has heard some school principals express the notion that “successful” schools have become thus because of, *inter alia*, availability of resources, admission policies that insist on “gifted” learners and affluent parents communities. Even though these espoused reasons do contribute to successes of some schools, these principals could be missing out on efficiency as a cornerstone of any success, i.e. using available resources optimally and encouraging by involvement and participatory decision-making, the parent community as well as proper and effective marketing of their schools.

**Table 6.26 Data on the willingness to observe other school managers in their schools**

Item C06	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	53	63,9	53	73,6	153	83,6	259	76,6
<i>No</i>	23	27,7	8	11,1	17	9,3	48	14,2
<i>Not sure</i>	7	8,4	11	15,3	13	7,1	31	9,1
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	183	100,0	338	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				2		3	

Being prepared to get help by shadowing and observing other school managers leads the investigation to finding out if respondents themselves would be willing to offer help to others by being tutors or mentors for them.

#### 6.4.7 Willingness to act as a tutor for other school managers

This item purported to find out if the respondents would be willing to act as mentors for other school managers in their schools. Table 6.27 portrays data in this regard.

Data from Table 6.27 indicates that most respondents (79,2%) indicated that they would be willing to act as tutors or mentors for other school managers. Almost equal percentages of the principals, deputy principals and HODs (79,8%, 80,6% and 78,5% respectively) indicated willingness to act as mentors for other school managers. Unfortunately the question does not indicate whether this willingness to be mentors relates to the present management situation, or a situation after which school managers themselves would have undergone training and development in education management. It is hoped that the latter situation would be ideal in the light of most respondents previously indicating a need for management development themselves (cf. 6.4.3). This response, however, indicates the willingness of respondents to be collegial and while getting help from shadowing others, are willing to learn from others.

**Table 6.26 Data on the willingness to act as a tutor for other school managers**

Item C07	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	67	79,8	58	80,6	142	78,5	267	79,2
<i>No</i>	8	9,5	4	5,6	18	9,9	30	8,9
<i>Not sure</i>	9	10,7	10	13,9	21	11,6	40	11,8
<i>Total</i>	84	100,0	72	100,0	181	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>					4		4	

However, it seems discrepant that the percentage of principals (63,9%) who indicated unwillingness to observe other school managers, are less than that of principals (79,8%) who are willing to be mentors for others. This could indicate a high level of confidence in their own management styles. It could also mean they see themselves as having something worth learning by others as against what they themselves could learn from others.

Only 40 (11,9%) of the respondents indicated being unsure whether they would be willing to act as mentors for other school managers. This could indicate a low level

of confidence in themselves. Motivational and morale-boosting strategies are necessary for these respondents to feel competent enough to be willing to exemplify their management activities to others. This is especially for deputy principals who make the most (13,9%) of the respondents who indicated being unsure in this item.

Another interesting angle to find is whether courses conducted by subordinates would be seen as beneficial by SMT respondents.

#### 6.4.8 *Attending a management development course conducted by a staff member*

This item relates to a staff member who is not in the school management team who may have the necessary skills and expertise to conduct and facilitate a management development course. This is in the light of many educators who are not necessarily school managers, but who may be skilled in training and facilitation and could also have undergone some form of management training or are studying for a management skills course, diploma or degree. Table 6.28 depicts data in this regard.

**Table 6.28 Data on attending a management development course conducted by a staff member**

Item C08	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	80	96,4	71	98,6	159	86,0	310	91,2
<i>No</i>	1	1,2	1	1,4	12	6,5	14	4,1
<i>Not sure</i>	2	2,4	0	0,0	14	7,5	16	4,7
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	185	100,0	340	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1						1	

Table 6.28 indicates an overwhelming majority (91,2%) of respondents who would be willing to attend a management course conducted by a staff member who is not in the school management team. This seems to support the earlier finding about attending a course with a staff member not in the school management team (cf. 6.4.4). This is

notably evident in principals (96,4%) and deputy principals (98,6%) who responded overwhelmingly positive to the question. This whole situation indicates a paradigm shift from separatism of the past where a “them and us” relationship existed between school managers and educators. SMTs recognise educators as their subordinates as partners. This strongly indicates a shift from reliance on expert or “knowledge” power to a situation where there is willingness to learn from each other and or share information, skills and expertise.

Seeing that most respondents see a need for management development at school level and recognise a need the for management training and development, a poser then rises: Would respondents be willing to pay for a management development course if it were to be offered?

#### 6.4.9 Willingness to pay for a management development course

This item aimed to find out if respondents would be willing to pay for their own management development. This is in the light of a realisation that the performance of school managers could be greatly enhanced if they were to receive management training and development. Table 6.29 portrays data in this regard.

**Table 6.29 Data on the willingness to pay for a management development course**

Item C09	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	50	59,5	53	74,6	118	64,1	221	65,2
<i>No</i>	17	20,2	8	11,3	39	21,2	64	18,9
<i>Not sure</i>	17	20,2	10	14,1	27	14,7	54	15,9
<i>Total</i>	84	100,0	71	100,0	184	100,0	339	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>			1		1		2	

The majority of respondents (65,2%) indicated a willingness to pay for a management development course. This indicates that respondent school managers realise their

own need for development. This supports the findings on the prioritisation of management development needs which were generally highly prioritised (cf. 6.3). Interestingly, most deputy principals (74,7%) about whom observations of mediocrity were noted, indicated a willingness to pay for management development. This can only show that they really want to be highly functional and skilled in educational management. It is noted that the question did not give scope for decisions based on the cost of the course or the duration thereof as well as when this course would run. In that regard it is understandable that just more than a third (34,8%) of the respondents indicated an unwillingness to pay for a development course or were unsure if they would pay for one. It must however, be observed that a willingness to pay for a management development course would indicate the level of commitment of the respondents who are willing to do so.

Perhaps in the light of the new education mission of stakeholder participation, a crucial question would be whether parents should be involved in the school management development programme.

#### 6.4.10 *Parent involvement in the school management development programme*

This question was motivated by the new mission of the GDE, i.e. stakeholder participation in all areas of schooling. Parents play a major role in whole school development. Since management development is an aspect of staff development and is essentially integral to whole school development, it is worth investigating if parents should be involved in management development programmes from the planning stage to the implementation stage. Of course, the professional nature of management development is noted while focus is also not lost on the supportive role of parents in this regard, e.g. financial support. Data on whether parents should be involved in management development is presented in Table 6.30.

Table 6.30 indicates that most respondents (70,6%) felt that parents should be involved in the school management development programmes from the planning to the implementation stage. This shows recognition that accountability is essential to the paying parents since school finances are most probably to be used in these programmes. It also indicates the willingness to involve parents as stakeholders in all activities of the school.

It is noteworthy that it is mostly deputy principals and HODs (76,4% and 75,7% respectively) who indicated this willingness for parents to be involved in management development programmes. This could be because these are mainly young and relatively inexperienced respondents in their positions and probably subscribe to the advocated stakeholder participation.

On the hand, just over half (54,2%) of the respondent principals indicated that parents should not be involved in management development programmes. This could be caused by perceptions they have about parental involvement in professional activities. The researcher has observed many situations in schools where tensions and conflicts have existed between principals and parents over professional matters. This calls for the encouragement of involving parents in schooling matters in a positive and constructive way. A major education drive is necessary for this to be realised. Of course this response could be because the nature of the involvement of parents needs definition, i.e. whether they should be involved in actual planning and implementation which would imply their having to monitor and evaluate the development processes, or whether they should only play a supportive role in terms of financial and other support.

**Table 6.30 Data on parent involvement in management development programmes**

Item C10	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	45	54,2	55	76,4	140	75,7	240	70,6
<i>No</i>	24	28,9	9	12,5	32	17,3	65	19,1
<i>Not sure</i>	14	16,9	8	11,1	13	7,0	35	10,3
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	185	100,0	340	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				3		4	

The next section looks at the actual management development activities in schools in the GDE.

## 6.5 AN ANALYSIS OF EXISTING MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN SCHOOLS

This section intended to investigate existing management development activities currently taking place in schools in the Gauteng Department of Education. Among others, it was intended to find out if there were policy statements regarding management development, needs for development are identified, implementation of development programmes is meticulously carried out, action plans are used, key strategic issues are identified from the mission statements so that management development activities are related to the vision of the schools, indicators of good practice are used, and if management development activities get the support of staff and parents. Respondents were requested to use the same rating scale as in the previous section to indicate their current circumstances. Data collected in this regard is presented in the next section.

### 6.5.1 *A policy statement regarding management development and training of the SMT*

This item intended to find out if the school has a policy statement regarding management development and training of the SMT. This would indicate if there was a systematic and conscious management development programme, as well as if such a programme is included in the staff development policy and programme. Data regarding this is presented in Table 6.31.

There were nine (2,6%) null responses to this question. There were more deputy principals (4) who did not respond to this question while there were two and three for principals and HODs respectively. The null responses could be attributed to misunderstanding what the policy for SMT management training and development actually refers to. This is rooted in the observation that most respondents could possibly be unexposed to the management language and terminology which was evident in for instance some respondents indicating study areas such as B.A. and Empirical Education as fields of further study in educational management.

Almost half (49,1%) of the respondents indicated that their schools had a policy for management training and development of the school management team. It would be worth finding out how these policies incorporate management development within the staff development programmes, since respondents had indicated generally not having conducted any staff development courses for their staffs this year. The possibility could be that there are policies on paper. The implementation thereof could be another story.

**Table 6.31 Data on the policy for management training and development**

Item D01	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	45	54,9	38	55,9	80	44,0	163	49,1
<i>No</i>	34	41,5	23	33,8	81	44,5	138	41,6
<i>Not sure</i>	3	3,7	7	10,3	21	11,5	31	9,3
<i>Total</i>	82	100,0	68	100,0	182	100,0	332	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	2		4		3		9	

There is an indication, however, that most schools do not have a policy for the management training and development of their SMTs. This is attested to by about two fifths (41,6%) of the respondents, while 9,3% indicated being unsure of whether there were policies or not. This indicates that most schools still are run in an “one-person-show” kind of way.

It is peculiar that more than half of respondent principals (54,9%) and deputy principals (55,9%) indicated the availability of a policy for management development and training compared to only 44,0% of the HODs. The researcher takes note of the fact that respondent principals and deputy principals could have indicated what they thought was an expected response, since the questionnaires were administered by Education Specialists in their schools and some respondents knew they were completing the questionnaire for an Education Specialist in their schools. On the other hand, HODs might responded “honestly” with the hope that the persons administering the questionnaires would gain an insight of what goes on in their schools, especially if these are HODs who feel uninvolved in the school management and are willing to be fully involved.

In order to focus on whole school development, any management development and training programme must be needs based. The next section looks at responses to need identification for whole-school development.

### 6.5.2 Whole-school development and individual development needs identification

This item intended to investigate if schools identified needs for individual and whole-school development. This would indicate whether development programmes take cognisance of individuals and the whole school. If this were the case, then it would indicate an adherence to the vision and mission of the school. Table 6.32 depicts data in this regard.

**Table 6.32 Data on whole-school and individual needs identification**

Item D02	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	66	79,5	46	65,7	98	54,1	210	62,9
<i>No</i>	14	16,8	18	25,7	67	37,0	99	29,6
<i>Not sure</i>	3	3,6	6	8,6	16	8,8	25	7,5
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	70	100,0	181	100,0	334	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		2		4		7	

The majority of respondents (62,9%) indicated that their schools did identify individual and whole-school development needs. This alludes to schools knowing what their needs are and probably keeping their visions and missions alive throughout their management development exercises. About a third (29,6%) of the respondents indicated their schools as not identifying whole-school and individual development needs. This implies that these schools could be going about their development processes in an unplanned and uncoordinated manner which in itself would lead to purposeless and incoherent management and development exercises.

Most principals (79,5%) indicated a positive response to this question. This poses a question as to whether this implies that only these principals know the needs of the schools and actually do a needs identification. If this be the case, it would indicate an autocratic management style where there is little or minimal consultation and participation of other staff members. The researcher has indeed observed this

tendency where the school principal does this for the sake of ensuring that work is done, which normally leads to mediocre plans and performance.

The next item looks at the costing and budgeting for management development programmes.

### 6.5.3 Costing and budgeting for management development programmes

In order for management development to be effective and successful, it is important that costing be done for these programmes and be duly included in the school annual budget. Table 6.33 depicts data on costing and budgeting for management development programmes.

**Table 6.33 Data on costing and budgeting for management development programmes**

Item D03	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	32	38,6	28	38,9	57	31,3	117	34,7
<i>No</i>	49	59,0	30	41,7	104	57,3	183	54,3
<i>Not sure</i>	2	2,4	14	19,4	21	11,5	37	11,0
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	182	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				3		4	

It can be seen from Table 6.33 that most respondents (54,3%) indicated that management development in their schools are not costing and budgeted for. Only about a third (34,7%) indicated that costing and budgeting for management development programmes is done. It can be concluded that this would mean even if there are management development programmes in most schools, they are not very well carried out. This is because it would virtually be impossible to do so without the necessary financial resources and these cannot be available for such programmes if they are not included in the school budgets. This also says a lot about whether

parents through the school governing bodies are involved in the management development programmes of schools since budgeting has to be done in conjunction with the school governing body. A tenth (11%) of the respondents indicated being unsure if costing and budgeting was done for management development programmes.

This could mean that these respondents may not be involved in any management development activities or are unaware of any budgeting for any purpose in their schools. The researcher has observed that in most ex-DET schools budgeting is usually not done in a systematic way and that many educators are unaware of the school budgets and what the contents thereof are.

It is revealing that most principals (59,0%) compared to deputy principals (41,7%) and HODs (57,1%) indicated that there is no costing and budgeting for management development programmes. This raises a question as to whether any management development takes place in these schools. It could also be an acknowledgement of a need for management development in costing and more importantly, budgeting in their schools.

Management development can be school-based or external where the SMT conduct INSET for their subordinates or attends INSET conducted externally by NGOs or the GDE. This is exposed in the next item.

#### *6.5.4 Attendance of school-based and external INSET by the SMTs*

This item aimed to investigate if school management teams attended school-based and external in-service training. Table 6.34 presents data in this regard.

It can be seen that the majority of respondents (67,6%) indicated that they attend school-based and external in-service training. About a third (4,2%) responded negatively with only 4,2% indicating being unsure. Respondents who indicate being unsure could be relating to school-based INSET and the fact that these are rarely conducted.

Since most respondents (67,3%) (cf. 6.4.2; Table 6.22) indicated that they have not attended any INSET in the past two years, the positive response by an almost equal 67,6% of the respondents indicates a discrepancy in the responses. The possibility could be relating to a willingness to attend school-based and external INSET rather than actually doing so. This is based on initial responses referred to which indicate that no INSET was attended in the last two years.

It is noted that the majority that indicated attending INSET are the principals (76,8%) followed by the deputy principals (71,8%) and the HODs (61,7%).

**Table 6.34 Data on attendance of school-based and external in-service training**

Item D04	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	63	76,8	51	71,8	111	61,7	225	67,6
<i>No</i>	19	23,2	18	25,4	57	31,7	94	28,2
<i>Not sure</i>	0	0,0	2	2,8	12	6,7	14	4,2
<i>Total</i>	82	100,0	71	100,0	180	100,0	333	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	2		1		5		8	

The next item investigated whether there were procedures that ensure the implementation of management plans and procedures.

#### 6.5.5 Procedures to ensure the implementation of plans and experiences

It is important for a management development programme to have procedures that ensure that development plans and experiences gained through management development, are implemented. Very often workshops and training courses are held with an expectation that the learning experiences would be implemented. Sadly the often does not happen or if it does, it usually is done for the sake of keeping to due dates and not real implementation in a way that would ensure success or feedback that would mean a need for reinforcement or corrective action. These procedures could include reporting, monitoring and feedback. These could build in corrective action mechanisms. Data pertaining to whether such procedures exist or not, is depicted in Table 6.35.

Most respondents (53,6%) indicated that they do have procedures for ensuring the implementation of management development experiences and plans. This comes mainly from the principals (63,9%) and the deputy principals (68,8%), with only

43,1% of the HODs concurring with them. The validity of this response is somewhat questionable since a significant number of HODs agree with the other SMT categories. It will be worth investigating if this difference is significant or not. On the other hand, about a tenth (10,2%) of the respondents, indicated being unsure if there were procedures for implementation of development plans and experiences. This can be attributed to their playing a minor role in the implementation of management plans and also not getting the opportunities to enact their own learning experiences. A significant percentage (13,8%) of these respondents comprises HODs as compared to principals (6,0%) and deputy principals (5,7%). This situation draws one to conclude that a lot of work in inducing flat and shared management styles is imperative, especially in the light of the mission statement of the GDE that enshrines participation in school management and governance.

**Table 6.35 Data on the implementation of development plans and experiences**

Item D05	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	53	63,9	48	68,8	78	43,1	179	53,6
<i>No</i>	25	30,1	18	25,7	78	43,1	121	36,2
<i>Not sure</i>	5	6,0	4	5,7	25	13,8	34	10,2
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	70	100,0	181	100,0	334	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		2		4		7	

It is important that management development plans be carefully monitored and evaluated. This will serve as a way of getting feedback on the implementation process and thus be able to take corrective action if necessary. Data in this regard is explored in the next section.

6.5.6 *The monitoring and evaluation of the implementation plans of management development*

This item intended to investigate find out if plan for implementation of management development plans is carefully monitored and evaluated. Table 6.36 details data collected in this regard.

**Table 6.36 Data on the monitoring and evaluation of management development plans**

Item D06	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	51	61,5	38	52,8	88	48,1	177	52,4
<i>No</i>	27	32,5	21	29,2	75	41,0	123	36,4
<i>Not sure</i>	5	6,0	13	18,1	20	10,9	38	11,2
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	183	100,0	338	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				2		3	

From Table 6.36 it can be seen that just over half of the respondents (52,4%) indicated a positive response to the question. This means that in their schools the implementation of plans is carefully monitored and evaluated. This should give them scope to ensure the implementation of management development plans. Once again a concern is raised that, if this was really happening, there would be a different teaching and learning scenario in schools. The possibility exists that this response could only relate to an understanding that plans have to be carefully monitored and evaluated and not really taking place in practice.

A significant number of respondents (36,4%), however, indicated that the implementation of plans was not carefully monitored and evaluated. A further tenth (11,2%) indicated being unsure as to whether plans were monitored and evaluated. Combining the latter two groups indicates that for a sizeable number of respondents (47,5%), the implementation of plans could be left to chance without any mechanism

for monitoring and evaluation. This is cause for management development training and development of entire SMTs in schools especially regarding planning and implementation of plans. The proposed model of management development intends to provide a commitment process that would be easily accessible and usable.

It is worth noting that it is mostly principals (61,5%) who responded positively to the question as compared to about two fifths (41,0%) of HODs who responded negatively. This could also relate to management styles where principals feel it incumbent on them to see to it that plans are carried out. Doing this on their own could give an impression to other management team members that no monitoring and evaluation really takes place.

Management development activities have to focus on all areas of school management. The implication is that school managers must be developed to manage all areas. This means principals, deputy principals and HODs must be enabled to manage for instance conflict, as against the finding and implications in the section on management development needs (cf. 6.3.4 & 6.3.8). The next section tables data in this regard.

#### *6.5.7 The focus of management development activities on all areas of school management*

Data presented in Table 6.37 illustrates whether management development activities focus on all areas of school management. This would include all areas identified from literature (cf. 3.2.8.1 & 3.2.8.2).

It can be seen from Table 6.37 that most respondents (57,3%) answered positively to the question. This means that in most schools management development activities do focus on all areas of school management. It is also significant that the majority of principals and deputy principals echoed this response (72,3% and 61,1% respectively) as compared to 48,9% of the HODs. On the other hand, a sizeable 33,0% of the HODs did not agree with the principals (25,3) and deputy principals (27,8%). This could be attributed to the HODs not feeling empowered to manage all areas of school management due to perhaps leadership styles that see them dealing with what they could see as minor roles. However, there is an emerging pattern in these responses where HODs seem not to respond similarly to principals and deputy principals. It would be worthwhile to test the significance of these differences.

The management development programme must be designed to advance the tenets of whole-school development through an emphasis and continuous reference to the schools mission and aims. This will ensure that the programmes activities are

**Table 6.37 Data on the focus of management development activities**

Item D07	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	60	72,3	44	61,1	89	48,9	193	57,3
<i>No</i>	21	25,3	20	27,8	60	33,0	101	30,0
<i>Not sure</i>	2	2,4	8	11,1	33	18,1	43	12,8
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	182	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				3		4	

focused continuously on school improvement and direction. The next item relates to management development conducted in the context of the school's mission and aims.

#### 6.5.8 Management development programme in the context of the school's mission and aims

This item investigated whether the management development programmes are conducted in the context of the school's mission and aims. Table 6.38 presents data in this regard.

Almost three fifths (59,1%) of the respondents answered positively to this question. This would mean that most schools carry out their management development activities in the context of their missions and aims. Only about one third (32,9%) of the respondents answered in the negative. It is an open question whether this positive response is not motivated by an "expected" response, since in the researcher's experience, most school missions and aims are formulated by the principal and deputy, perhaps with a few staff members. This poses a question on whether mission statements are shared by all stakeholders. This is evident in the fact that mostly principals and deputy principals responded positively (68,7% and 61,1% respectively) compared to just over half (53,8%) of the HODs. This attests to the emerging pattern alluded to elsewhere in this text (6.5.1) and poses a question as to whether in this case as one goes down the school hierarchy, the views about the schools' management

development activities being in the context of the mission and aims of the school differ. These differences will have to be tested for any significance.

**Table 6.38 Data on management development programmes in the context of the school's mission and aims**

Item D08	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	57	68,7	44	61,1	98	53,9	199	59,1
<i>No</i>	22	26,5	23	31,9	66	36,3	111	32,9
<i>Not sure</i>	4	4,8	5	6,9	18	9,9	27	8,0
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	182	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				3		4	

The success of any school development activities hinges upon the involvement of staff members in the planning and implementation processes. Since management development activities will have an impact on other staff members, it is imperative that they be consulted and involved in the planning and implementation thereof.

#### 6.5.9 Staff involvement in management development planning and implementation

This item intended to investigate if management development planning and implementation involves staff members. Table 5.39 details data in this regard.

Most respondents (52,4%) indicated that staff members were involved in the planning and implementation of management development. It is mostly the principals (55,4%) and the deputy principals (53,5%) who indicated that staff members are indeed involved in management development. This would imply a participative style of management in most schools. The effectiveness of this would be measured by among others, the success of the culture of teaching and learning in schools. The converse, however, applies in reality. On the other hand, it is alarming that just over half (50,6%) of the HODs agreed to this response. It can generally be concluded that the

concept of participatory management, where staff members are involved in planning and implementation of even management development, is recognised by all the respondents. This supports the respondents' willingness to attend management courses conducted by staff members who are not in the management teams as well as to attend management development courses with them (cf. 6.4.1.5 & 6.4.1.8).

**Table 6.39 Data on staff involvement in management development planning and implementation**

Item D09	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	46	55,4	38	53,5	92	50,6	176	52,4
<i>No</i>	34	41,0	32	45,1	83	45,6	149	44,4
<i>Not sure</i>	3	3,6	1	1,4	7	3,9	11	3,3
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	71	100,0	182	100,0	336	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		1		3		5	

Cognisance must be taken of the significant number of respondents (44,4%) who indicated that staff members are not involved in management development planning and implementation as well as the 3,3% who indicated being unsure if this was the case in their schools. This means that in those schools, staff members are not involved in the planning and implementation of such plans. This could mean that in those schools staff members do not share ownership of management processes and consequently could be resistant to most innovations. This is cause for concern since experience has shown this trend in most schools. In most instances, participation is seen as carrying out instructions from the principal. There is no room for initiative and involvement from planning to implementation of processes. Another reason for the non-involvement of staff members in especially management development planning could be the lack of skills of how staff members could be appropriately involved. This implies a need for management development of SMTs in skills for ensuring constructive and effective participation.

The evaluation of management development activities is essential to ensure that the plans are on track and any deviation is corrected timeously. The next section deals with the evaluation of management development activities.

#### 6.5.10 *The regular evaluation of management development activities*

Table 6.40 illustrates responses regarding the regular evaluation of management plans and activities.

**Table 6.40 Data on the regular evaluation of management development plans**

Item D10	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	55	66,3	27	39,1	84	46,7	166	50,0
<i>No</i>	24	28,9	33	47,8	82	45,6	139	41,9
<i>Not sure</i>	4	4,8	9	13,0	14	7,8	27	8,1
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	69	100,0	180	100,0	332	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		3		5		9	

Half of the respondents (50,0%) indicated that the management development activities are regularly evaluated to identify needs for reinforcement and or corrective action. The majority of these respondents are principals (66,3%), followed by HODs (46,7%) while only 39,1% of the deputy principals concurred with the statement. It is eye-catching that only half the principals indicated a positive response while a few deputy principals concurred. This could mean that it is mostly the principals who evaluate these activities. Maybe HODs are assigned delegated tasks of “checking” on these activities. On the other hand, this could be an area where deputy principals are not completely involved. This highlights a need for the empowerment of all school managers to engage fully in management activities. It is noted also that almost a tenth (8,1%) of the overall respondents, out which 13,0% are deputy principals, indicated being unsure of whether activities were evaluated regularly. The need for

management development in skills of evaluation is implied herein and cannot be overemphasised.

The focus of whole-school development and consequently management development should be on continuous improvement. There is a need to build in quality assurance systems to ensure this. The next item looks at whether management development activities do focus on continuous improvement or not.

#### 6.5.11 *The focus of management development activities on continuous improvement*

This item intended to investigate if the management development activities in schools focus on continuous improvement. Table 6.41 depicts data in this regard.

**Table 6.41 Data on whether management development is focused on continuous improvement**

Item D11	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	59	71,1	39	55,7	108	59,7	206	61,7
<i>No</i>	18	21,7	17	24,3	61	33,7	96	28,7
<i>Not sure</i>	6	7,2	14	20,0	12	6,6	32	9,6
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	70	100,0	181	100,0	334	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		2		4		7	

It can be seen from Table 6.41 that the majority of respondents (61,7%) agreed that management development activities focus on continuous improvement. This means that in most schools SMTs focus on continuous improvement. The success rate of activities focused on continuous improvement will be dependent on the kinds of activities those are as well as the plans that are enacted to effect improvement. It is however important to realise that SMTs in schools, recognise the need for continuous improvement.

The fact that almost a third (28,7%) of the respondents responded negatively to the question, with a about tenth (9,6%) being unsure, highlights a need for whole-school development training and advocacy. The most important concept to emphasise is the vision of the school that must be kept alive throughout all improvement process.

Management development activities must be grounded on the school's mission. This means that the mission statement must be unpacked to highlight strategic priorities or issues upon which the focus of development activities will be.

#### 6.5.12 Key strategic issues upon which management development activities must focus

This item intended to find out if management development activities in schools are in line with the mission statements and thus identify key strategic issues whereupon they have to focus. Table 6.42 reflects data collected in this regard.

**Table 6.42 Data on key strategic issues upon which management development must focus**

Item D12	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Yes</i>	52	63,4	34	47,2	82	45,6	168	50,3
<i>No</i>	20	24,4	31	43,1	74	41,1	125	37,4
<i>Not sure</i>	10	12,2	7	9,7	24	13,3	41	12,3
<i>Total</i>	82	100,0	72	100,0	180	100,0	334	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	2				5		7	

Table 6.42 shows that half of the respondents (50,3%) agreed that their schools have identified key strategic issues upon which management development activities must focus. A little less than two fifths (37,3%) indicated not identifying key strategic issues upon which management development activities must focus, while just above a tenth (12,3%) indicated being unsure.

The relative positive response is in line with earlier findings that the management development programmes are conducted in the context of the school's mission and aims (cf. 6.4.7). This implies that schools recognise the importance of focusing on particular areas of improvement by concentrating on key strategic issues out the mission statements. The effectiveness of these activities of course remains to be seen as schools delve on the change processes brought about by transformation in education.

On the other hand, the percentage of respondents (37,4%) that answered negatively suggests that not all schools and consequently, SMTs make use of their mission statements as starting points for school development. This once more highlights the necessity for school managers' to be trained and developed in all areas of school management.

It is encouraging that the majority of principals (63,4%), answered positively to this item. This is important since they have a role to play in the management development of their subordinates at school level.

It is important for the management development programme to enjoy the support and commitment of staff and parents. This is because whatever improvement plans management development will bring about, these will affect staff as well as parents. Obviously this implies involving staff and parents at relevant areas of management development. The next section outlines data collected in this regard.

#### *6.5.13 Support and commitment of staff and parents to the management development programme*

This item intended to find out if the management development programmes in schools enjoyed the support and commitment of staff and parents. Table 6.43 outlines data collected in this regard.

Just over half of the respondents (51,2%) noted that their management development programmes enjoyed the support of both parents and staff members. Most principals (62,2%) followed by deputy principals (55,6%) responded positively to this item. Less than half of the HODs (45,5%) responded positively. This could imply that not all HODs are involved in management development programmes and as a result do not see if there is support for the programmes especially maybe by parents.

On the other hand, slightly more than a third (36,9%) of the respondents indicated that staff and parents did not support their management development programmes,

**Table 6.43 Data on support and commitment of staff to the management development programmes**

Item D13	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	51	62,2	40	55,6	81	44,5	172	51,2
<i>No</i>	24	29,3	28	38,9	72	39,6	124	36,9
<i>Not sure</i>	7	8,5	4	5,6	29	15,9	29	15,9
<i>Total</i>	82	100,0	72	100,0	182	100,0	336	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	2				3		5	

while about a tenth (11,9%) indicated being unsure. This means that in their schools there is a need for management styles that will encourage participation and ownership of management development processes.

The management team has to have systems or procedures for identifying management development needs. This is crucial in order to plan for improvement within the context of continuous improvement. The next item outlines data in this regard.

#### 6.5.14 *Management development needs identification systems and procedures*

This item intended to investigate whether SMTs have systems or procedures for management development needs identification. Data in this regard is outlined in Table 6.44.

The majority of respondents (54,9%), indicated that they have systems or procedures for identifying management development needs. The majority of principals (57,8%), deputy principals (57,8%) and HODs (48,6%) answered this question positively. This means that these respondents have ways of identifying their development needs. This supports most of the findings regarding the prioritisation of management development needs (cf. 6.3). This situation can be supported by programme of management development that focuses on the identified needs.

It is, however, noted that a significant 11,3% indicates not having systems or procedures for identifying management development needs. It therefore implies that most SMTs need a management development approach that will facilitate needs identification at school. The model to be designed proposes to provide a readily usable tool for this.

**Table 6.44 Data on management development needs identification systems and procedures**

Item D14	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	55	66,3	41	57,8	89	48,6	185	54,9
<i>No</i>	18	21,7	24	33,8	72	39,3	114	33,8
<i>Not sure</i>	10	12,1	6	8,5	22	12,0	38	11,3
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	71	100,0	183	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		1		2		4	

Action plans are a cornerstone for directing management development processes. They assist in keeping implementation focused on issues to be addressed and make it easy to monitor and evaluate progress.

#### 6.5.15 Action plans for management development programme implementation

This item intended to investigate if action plans were being used for the implementation of management development programmes. Data in this regard is presented in Table 6.45.

The majority of respondents (57,9%) responded positively to this question. Most principals (71,1%), deputy principals (63,9%) and HODs (49,6%) responded positively. This means that these respondents see the value of action plans and do use them in implementing management development programmes. In the light of reports about the collapse in the culture of learning and teaching, this relative positive

response could relate to the actual planning stages as against real effective implementation. The 35,0% of respondents that indicated a negative response could be alluding to the implementation of plans that have not be detailed in action plans. The need for a management development approach that addresses whole-school development as well as an approach that seeks to entrench mission statements through the use of strategic priorities derived from the mission statements, seems all the more imperative.

**Table 6.45 Data on action plans for management development programme implementation**

Item D15	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	59	71,1	46	63,9	90	49,6	195	57,9
<i>No</i>	18	21,7	23	31,9	77	42,1	118	35,0
<i>Not sure</i>	6	7,2	3	4,2	15	8,2	24	7,1
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	182	100,0	337	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				3		4	

Action plans for management development implementation have to detail success criteria or expected outcomes. In this case the indicators of good practice could also be used as final and ultimate outcomes or success criteria. The next item deals with this issue.

#### 6.5.16 Management development plans' expected outcomes and success criteria

This item elicits information from respondents about whether their management development plans indicate outcomes and success criteria. Table 6.46 details data in this regard.

The majority of respondents (56,9%) indicated that their management development plans detail expected outcomes and success criteria. Most principals (69,5%), deputy principals (63,9%) and HODs (48,4%) indicated this concurrence. This means that in most schools the implementation of management development plans is done with the

end product in mind, i.e. success criteria and expected outcomes. It is, however, noted that a combined percentage of respondents (43,1%) indicated a negative response and being unsure. An approach that ensures that expected outcomes and success criteria are clearly formulated and detailed is necessary. This also indicates a need for management development in setting out expected outcomes and success criteria. As stated earlier in this text, the model proposed in this study seeks to provide a readily usable tool to this regard.

**Table 6.46 Data on expected outcomes and success criteria of management development plans**

Item D16	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	57	69,5	46	63,9	88	48,4	191	56,9
<i>No</i>	19	23,2	18	25,0	68	37,4	105	31,3
<i>Not sure</i>	6	7,3	8	11,1	26	14,3	40	11,9
<i>Total</i>	82	100,0	72	100,0	182	100,0	336	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	2				3		5	

The management development programme must be able to identify development needs through the use of indicators of good practice. This will assist SMTs to rate themselves against these in their needs analysis or self audit stage. The next section details data in this regard.

#### 6.5.17 *Indicators of good practice for rating management development needs*

This item wanted to determine if respondents used indicators of good practice or performance indicators to rate their current status in order to determine their management development needs. This is mainly because not everyone would be comfortable with needs identification without a guiding instrument of some sort. Table 6.47 portrays data to this effect.

**Table 6.47 Data on indicators of good practice for rating management development needs**

Item D17	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Yes</i>	50	60,2	30	42,9	78	43,1	158	47,3
<i>No</i>	22	26,5	26	37,1	72	39,8	120	35,9
<i>Not sure</i>	11	13,3	14	20,0	31	17,1	56	16,8
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	70	100,0	181	100,0	334	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		2		4		7	

Data from Table 6.47 shows a positive answer from just less than half (47,3%) of the respondents. In contrast, a significant number of respondents (35,9%) indicated a negative response to this question. This is coupled with a sizeable number of respondents (16,8%) who were unsure. These responses could have a number of reasons. It could mean respondents do not really have a thorough understanding of what indicators of good practice or performance mean and fit into the self-audit of the management development process. After all, the concept of quality assurance, which uses quality performance indicators, is relatively new to education in South Africa. It could also mean there are not guiding indicators for schools to self-audit themselves. It could also mean there is generally no systematic planning for management development in schools. It could also mean that the identification of strategic issues, from which performance indicators are derived, is not meticulously carried out. The implication of all this data is that there is a need to initially provide a usable tool to SMTs and take them carefully through it. Only thereafter can one be sure that the concepts of quality assurance are fully internalised for use in various management development scenarios in schools.

There is a need for the school-based management development programme to flexible in order to accommodate any changes or interventions from outside the school. This ensures that there is minimal disruption in the management development programme and consequently the school as a whole. The next section details data in this regard.

### 6.5.18 Flexibility of the management development programmes

This item aimed to determine if the school management development is flexible enough to accommodate changes or external interventions. These could be new policy measures or new approaches to management development and management in schools. Table 6.48 captures data in this regard.

**Table 6.48 Data on the flexibility of the management development programmes**

Item D18	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	69	84,2	50	69,4	117	64,3	236	70,2
<i>No</i>	10	12,2	16	22,2	51	28,0	77	22,9
<i>Not sure</i>	3	3,7	6	8,3	14	7,7	23	6,9
<i>Total</i>	82	100,0	72	100,0	182	100,0	336	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	2				3		5	

Most respondents (70,2%) regarded their school management development programmes to be flexible enough to accommodate external changes or interventions. This implies that in these schools there are mechanisms in place to ensure that changes or new policy measures fit easily into the management development programmes, which would mean that very little disruption or confusion is created by additions to existing programmes. It is also significant that most principals (84,2%), who are essentially prime change agents, answered positively. Most deputy principals and HODs (69,4% and 64,3% respectively) also concurred with this statement. This might also be as a result of having to accept anything coming from for instance the GDE. It does, however, indicate a positive attitude from the respondents in as far as change management is concerned. This, however, contrasts with the finding that respondents generally regarded the need for management development in change management as being of high priority (cf. 6.3.6).

Management development entails a large spectrum of expertise. The SMTs alone cannot be knowledgeable enough to enact management development in all aspects of management. There will be a need for engaging external expertise in some areas of management development and improvement. This is more so in a situation of transformation and change.

#### 6.5.19 *The use of external expertise by the management development programme*

This item aimed to investigate out if the management development programmes of schools made provision for employing external expertise like NGOs. This would assist SMTs to deal with those management issues where no expertise in the school exists. Table 6.49 outlines responses to this effect.

**Table 6.49 Data on the use of external expertise in management development**

Item D19	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	64	77,1	47	65,3	114	63,0	225	67,0
<i>No</i>	18	21,7	20	27,8	57	31,5	95	28,3
<i>Not sure</i>	1	1,2	5	6,9	10	5,5	16	4,8
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	72	100,0	181	100,0	336	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1				4		5	

The majority of respondents (67,0%) responded positively to this item. Most principals (77,1%), deputy principals (65,3%) and HODs (63,0%) indicated that their programmes of management development made use of external expertise. This implies that most schools see the need for and makes use of other knowledgeable persons in their management development. This response is in line with the flexibility of the management development programme (cf. 6.5.18), i.e. it accommodates external interventions.

It is, however, noted that almost a third of the respondents (28,2%) indicated a negative response to this item. This could be respondents who feel compelled to attend training and development courses run by or commissioned by the GDE. Consequently, these respondents would not feel they are using external expertise but rather attend courses organised and conducted by external expertise.

The staff has to report on the content and value of management development activities. This is because these activities affect them one way or the other and also because it is an accessible way of getting feedback on management development aimed at whole-school management. This is detailed in the next section.

#### 6.5.20 Reporting of the staff on the content and value of management development activities

This question focused on staff members' ability to report on the content and value of management development activities. This would highlight the level of staff involvement in management development planning as well as the implementation thereof. Data in this regard is outlined in Figure 6.50.

**Table 6.50 Data on reporting of the staff on the content and value of management development activities**

Item D20	Principals		Deputy Principals		HODs		Total	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>Yes</i>	36	43,4	26	36,6	72	39,8	134	40,0
<i>No</i>	40	48,2	36	50,7	94	51,9	170	50,8
<i>Not sure</i>	7	8,4	9	12,7	15	8,3	31	9,3
<i>Total</i>	83	100,0	71	100,0	181	100,0	335	100,0
<i>N.R.F.</i>	1		1		4		6	

Most respondents (50,8%) indicated that staff members do not report on the content and value of management development activities. Questions to be asked here are:

Are the staff members sufficiently involved or given a chance to comment or report of management development activities or are they just reluctant to? If these findings are valid, could the findings on the management development support by staff and parents as found earlier (6.5.12) be valid? This finding means that staff members are largely not involved in management development activities, or if they are, they are only involved by way of notification only so that they do not get to report of the activities themselves.

Only two fifths (40,0%) of the respondents affirmed this question. This could be those schools where participatory management is practised and staff members are involved in the management processes.

It would be worthwhile to compare by rank order the prioritisation of management development needs (cf. Appendix A: Section B) by the respondents. This would reveal the variance in the extent to which principals, compared to deputy principals and HODs, see these management development needs as priorities for management training and development in their own circumstances. The next section explores these comparisons.

## **6.6 A COMPARISON OF NEEDS PRIORITISATION BY RANK ORDER**

The frequency analysis of responses pertaining to some management development needs prioritisation, indicates differences in responses among principals, deputy principals and HODs. It will be revealing to find out how the respondents compare in the prioritisation of their management development needs. Table 6.51 illustrates the rank order of the management development needs prioritisation by the three respondent categories.

Table 6.51 indicates a number of differences regarding the prioritisation of management development needs among the respondents. Managing change (B06) was ranked first by principals, while deputy principals and HODs ranked it seventh and fourth respectively. The reason for this could be the one alluded to earlier (cf. 6.3) where principals seem to be the ones “tasked” with ushering in and managing change. The seventh ranking by the deputy principals seems to agree with the notion that they do not see themselves as being fully charged with managing all areas of the school, but rather manage delegated duties. In other words, they do not see themselves as managers of the schools in their own right. While HODs ranked this item fourth, a similar conclusion that they see other management duties as belonging to their immediate superiors could be drawn. This could imply that very often innovation usually flows from the principal downwards in a “top-down” fashion.

**Table 6.51 A rank order comparison of management development needs**

Item	Item description	Principals		Deputy principals		HODs	
		Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
B01	Performance appraisal	3,69	9	3,25	10	3,46	9
B02	Planning, organising, guiding, controlling	3,79	8	3,57	4	3,87	2
B03	Financial management	3,83	5	3,32	9	3,77	5
B04	Conflict management	3,96	3	3,54	5	3,70	7
B05	Managing interpersonal relationships	3,87	7	3,51	6	3,66	8
B06	Managing change	4,13	1	3,50	7	3,80	4
B07	Delegation	3,90	4	3,64	2	3,82	3
B08	Team building and motivation	4,09	2	3,72	1	3,97	1
B09	Communication skills	3,88	6	3,47	8	3,17	6
B10	Managing a multicultural environment	3,53	10	3,47	8	3,17	10

Both deputy principals and HODs ranked team building and motivation (B08) first. These managers indicated a need for management development in these aspects. Several reasons could be pertinent to this. Among others it could be because they find themselves in situations where there are always conflicts resulting from lack of teamwork and teacher motivation. It could also be because educators do not regard them as managers with authority like the principal is normally regarded. It could be because they are not experienced enough to command authority from the educators. It could also be because they realise the importance of teamwork and a motivated staff hence an indication of the need for management development in this regard. It is, however, clear that they recognise the importance of team building and motivation of staff, especially in a changing educational environment with its concomitant demotivating effects in terms of shifting paradigms and moving from comfort zones. Principals, however, regarded this item as being of second priority. It can be concluded that this item is ranked of equal priority and that principals see being able

to manage change as well as building teams and motivating staff as being of high priority.

Being able to manage conflict is ranked third, fifth and seventh by principals, deputy principals and HODs respectively. This indicates that in the case of principals, the previous two management development needs plus managing conflict are of high priority. These management aspects, by their very nature, are complementary to a functional school, such that being able to deal with them well is seen as being of high priority. In the case of deputy principals and HODs, this item is prioritised thus, maybe because conflict situations are normally referred to the principal. However, the difference in ranking is indicative of the high priority they enjoy among deputy principals and HODs.

An interesting and somewhat disturbing observation relates to the ranking of performance appraisal (B01) and managing a multicultural environment (B10). It appears that both these management development needs were ranked the lowest. The former is ranked ninth by principals and HODs and tenth by deputy principals, while the latter is ranked tenth by principals and HODs and eighth by deputy principals respectively. The implication hereof is that these needs do not enjoy immediate management development priority. This is much against the current situation where appraisal should be seen as important since a new programme has been agreed to in the ELRC (cf. 6.3.1) and thus it could have been expected that respondents would express the need to be trained and developed in it. This could be due to misunderstanding how appraisal fits into schools' present evaluative exercises in the light of the rejection of past evaluation exercises.

On the other hand, it could have been expected that managing a multicultural environment would be ranked highly since due to education transformation and the consequent integration, respondents would be expected to seek skills of managing such environments. This could be due to the majority of respondents being in ex-DET schools and thus seeing no need for multicultural management skills, basically because the learner population is still the same. It is noted that multiculturalism factors like ethnic, religious, cultural and traditional diversities have not been taken cognisance of by most respondents.

Management development needs like financial management and delegation are of relatively high priority ranking. Deputy principals ranked management development in financial management ninth in priority. This could be because often they are not involved in financial management to the extent that principals are. On the other hand, HODs ranked this need fifth which could be attributed to their wanting to be part of all decision making, especially since they could have been instrumental in the

struggle against non-participation in the past. This is based on their being mostly young and relatively inexperienced in their positions.

It is, however, clear that despite the different rankings of the management development needs, these needs were seen as being of management development priority by most respondents, which confirms literature assertions (3.4.6) that they indeed are management development needs in education. This is more so in the light of the emerging education management paradigm (cf. 2.3). The different rankings could also be attributed to different perceptions about what constitutes a high or low priority from person to person. Some respondents could be looking at the high priorities as having a potential of spilling over to the other management development needs.

These differences, however, need to be tested for statistical and practical significance. This will help to see if they are chance differences or are really significant due to a certain probability.

## **6.7 AN ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCES IN THE PRIORITISATION OF MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF RESPONDENTS**

It was necessary to analyse respondents' prioritisation of management development needs in order to determine if differences were significant or not. For this purpose, the t-test was used, and subsequently, the d-value was computed to determine the effect sizes of the significant differences. This was done for differences in responses between principals and deputy principals, principals and HODs and deputy principals and HODs.

### **6.7.1 The t-test**

The t-test is used to determine whether two means differ significantly from each other or whether two sets of scores differ significantly at a selected probability level (Herbert, 1990:87; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990:185; Vockel & Asher, 1995:321). The t-test was used in this study in order to determine if there are any significant differences from the respondents in their management development needs prioritisation, management development experiences and management development activities regarding their positions, i.e. principals, deputy principals and HODs. The t-test was also used for its reliability to produce accurate probability statements.

### 6.7.2 The p-value

The probability value (p-value) indicates whether there are statistically significant differences between two means of a sample (Gall *et al.*, 1996:183; Vockel & Asher, 1995:320). A statistically significant difference means that the difference between means of samples are not due to chance or coincidence, but point towards a real difference between the population means (Gall *et al.*, 1996:185; Vockel & Asher, 1995:319).

In this study,

- the 0,05 (5%) significance level was selected to determine if there are any significant differences in needs prioritisation; and
- p-values greater than 0,05 indicated no significant differences, while p-values less than 0,05 indicated significant differences in management development needs prioritisation, management development experiences and management development activities' differences (cf. Gall *et al.*, 1996:184).

All these statistical differences were determined between principals and deputy principals, principals and HODs and between deputy principals and HODs.

### 6.7.3 The d-value (effect size)

The effect size assesses the magnitude of a difference between two means, i.e. it takes into account the size of the difference between means regardless of whether it is statistically significant (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990:197). In this regard Vockel and Asher (1995:357) assert that the effect size determines if the difference is enough to recommend changes in the educational practice. Gall *et al.* (1996:196) cautions, however, that though the effect size is helpful in judging the practical significance of a research result, it is by no means an absolute index of practical significance. It is therefore an aid to interpretation, albeit an important one.

Therefore, in this study the effect size is computed in order to determine whether the observed differences derived from the t-test can be interpreted to be of practical significance or use. This is done for differences in responses between principals and deputy principals, principals and HODs and deputy principals and HODs. It was obtained by using the following formula (Cohen, 1988:553; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990:197; Vockel & Asher, 1995:357):

$$d = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{SD_{Max}}$$

where,

- $\bar{X}_1$  = the mean of principals/deputy principals/HODs  
 $\bar{X}_2$  = the mean of principals/deputy principals/HODs  
 $SD_{\max}$  = the maximum standard deviation (of either of the respondents)  
 $d$  = effect size

The interpretation of the effect size was done on the basis of the following guidelines proffered by Cohen (1988:26) and Vockel and Asher (1995:357):

- $d = 0,2$  (small effect)  
 $d = 0,5$  (medium effect)  
 $d = 0,8$  (large effect)

According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1990:197) effect sizes of 0,5 or more should be treated as important. However, Cohen (1988:26) postulates that such effect sizes could depend on the reader's frame of reference, i.e. he may consider them either too small or too large, which projects the arbitrariness of quantitative operational definitions to qualitative adjectives. It was therefore decided in this study to interpret effect sizes above 0,8 to be important. This was because it was realised that all respondents were emerging from a system of management that needs to change. Therefore, they would all require management development and training in the new education management and governance paradigm (cf. 2.3.4). On the strength of that frame of reference, only significant differences of a large enough effect size,  $d = 0,8$ , would be considered to be of practical significance (cf. Cohen, 1988:26).

Since the effect size indicates the practical significance of findings displaying significant statistical differences, only those findings displaying significant differences in terms of their p-values are considered for practical significance. Therefore, d-values were only indicated in cases where  $p < 0,05$ .

#### **6.7.4 Difference in responses between principals and deputy principals regarding the prioritisation of management development needs**

Table 6.52 presents the probability values regarding management development needs between principals and deputy principals (cf. Appendix A: Section B).

It can be seen from Table 6.52 that there were no significant differences between principals and deputy principals' prioritisation of delegation, team building and

motivation, communication skills and managing a multicultural environment as management development needs. This implies that data regarding the prioritisation of these management development needs can be accepted as being applicable to both principals and deputy principals (cf. 6.5.1).

Table 6.52 shows, however, that there were significant differences between principals and deputy principals regarding their prioritisation of items B01 – B06. Frequency counts (6.3.1) between principals and deputy principals regarding performance appraisal (B01) indicated that more principals than deputy principals prioritise this item highly (cf. Table 6.1). The difference is relatively marginal (9,6%). This could be because deputy principals' roles are not well defined in schools and as a result they see performance appraisal as the principal's responsibility. However, the difference indicates recognition of the need for management development in performance appraisal. This is especially so in the light of the fact that developmental appraisal is a new concept in the GDE for which school management teams still have to be trained and developed.

There were also significant differences between principals and deputy principals regarding their prioritisation of the management tasks – planning, organising, guiding and controlling as management development needs. Table 6.12 indicated that more principals compared to deputy principals regarded these tasks as being of high priority. This difference, though relatively small (8,9%), could allude to the role deputy principals play in schools. As alluded to elsewhere in this text (6.3.7), deputy principals seem to perform delegated management duties as against principals who are seen as accountable for managing schools. This could explain why principals prioritise management development in these tasks highly.

On the other hand, it could be possible that principals by virtue of their experience and responsibility in their positions, have been exposed to training or development in these tasks or by way of trial and error feel relatively confident in managing these tasks. It is noted, however, that both categories of respondents regarded this item as being of high priority. It is also notable that the differences between the respondents were also of small practical significance ( $d = 0,372$ ).

The prioritisation of financial management as a management development need also indicated significant differences between principals and deputy principals. These differences, though significant, were of small practical importance ( $d=0,429$ ). Frequency counts (cf. Table 6.13) indicated more principals than deputy principals who prioritised this need highly. The frequency count difference was a sizeable number (21,8%). This supports the validity of findings about deputy principals' minimal involvement in financial management in schools as well as the rank order

findings thereof (cf. 6.5.1). It is observed that on the one hand less than half of the deputy principals (cf. Table 6.13) seemed to feel a need for management development in financial management and, on the other hand, their ranking of the need for management development in financial management was ninth. This could be explained in terms of their latent, if any, involvement in financial management.

There were significant differences between principals and deputy principals regarding the prioritisation of conflict management as a management development need. Frequency counts attest to this finding (6.3.4). Frequency counts indicated almost 22% more principals compared to deputy principals prioritising this need highly. It could be that principals feel the need for more equipment in conflict management or deputy principals' roles in conflict management are minimal since most conflict is the principals "responsibility" in schools, by virtue of his authority. The effectiveness of conflict management could be another story. These differences were, however, of small practical effect ( $d=0,372$ ).

There were significant differences regarding the prioritisation of managing interpersonal relationships as a management development need between principals and deputy principals. The difference in frequency counts (Table 6.15) between the two groups is however marginal (8,2%) with principals being more than deputy principals. This could attest to the findings in 6.3.6 where deputy principals' management roles were put to question. It could be that the principal is seen as the person in the school who must ensure that interpersonal relationships are healthy as is applicable to conflict management. Differences noted here displayed a small effect size ( $d=0,318$ ).

Managing change as a management development need, indicated significant differences in prioritisation by principals and deputy principals. Frequency counts (Table 6.16) indicated 17% more principals than deputy principals prioritising the need for management development highly. This could be an indication of how the current changes are viewed by most respondent deputy principals, i.e. they could be seeing this task as the principal's responsibility since they often are reduced to managing delegated tasks. These differences were, however, negligible in terms of their effect size ( $d=0,568$ ).

There were also differences in responses indicating prioritisation of management development needs between principals and HODs. The next section looks at whether these differences are significant or not. The same t-test procedure is used to do so.

**Table 6.52 p-values regarding management development needs between principals and deputy principals**

Item	Item description	Principals		Deputy principals		t	p	d
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
B01	Performance appraisal	3,686	1,167	3,250	1,171	2,318	0,021*	0,372
B02	Planning, organising, guiding and controlling	3,785	1,141	3,569	1,136	1,182	0,238*	
B03	Financial management	3,833	1,138	3,319	1,196	2,744	0,006*	0,429
B04	Conflict management	3,964	0,974	3,541	1,137	2,498	0,013*	0,372
B05	Managing interpersonal relationships	3,867	0,997	3,513	1,113	2,085	0,038*	0,318
B06	Managing change	4,132	0,866	3,549	1,025	2,826	0,000*	0,568
B07	Delegation	3,904	1,048	3,638	1,117	1,531	0,127*	
B08	Team building and motivation	4,048	0,895	3,722	1,153	1,943	0,054*	
B09	Communication skills	3,879	1,028	3,597	1,070	1,672	0,096*	
B10	Managing a multicultural environment	3,530	1,309	3,472	1,266	0,278	0,780*	

\* p < 0,05

▪ No significant difference

d = 0,2 small effect

d = 0,5 medium effect

d = 0,8 large effect

### **6.7.5 Differences in prioritisation of management development needs between principals and HODs**

Table 6.53 presents data on the prioritisation of management development needs by principals and HODs.

Table 6.53 shows that there were no significant differences in the prioritisation of management development needs between principals and HODs regarding performance appraisal, management tasks, financial management, managing interpersonal relationships, delegation, team building and motivation and communication skills. Data gathered in this regard can therefore be accepted as applying to both principals and HODs in the study sample.

There were, however, significant differences pertaining to the prioritisation of conflict management, managing change and managing a multicultural environment. It is noted however, that the observed differences, though significant, displayed small practical significances (Table 6.53).

Frequency counts (Table 6.14) revealed a difference of almost 10% between principals and HODs on high prioritisation of conflict management while the ranking thereof is third and seventh respectively for principals and HODs. The implication of this significant difference, though relatively small, could allude to the different perceptions both respondent categories have regarding management development in conflict management. As suggested elsewhere (5.3.4 & 5.5) this could be because SMT members see their management duties differently. As a result, HODs could be seeing conflict management as a task to be done by the principal. On the other hand, principals could have resigned to the fact that that is their role. The same reasoning could be applied to the management of change and that of a multicultural environment.

These significant differences suggest a need for a clear role definition for each school manager. In fact, deputy principals and HODs need to be made to accept their roles as managers and leaders in their own right. That will make them conscious of their roles in the management of all areas of the school. The third management approach (cf. 4.4.4.3), which advances governance and management, is appropriate in inducing and conscientising them of these roles.

**Table 6.53 p-values regarding management development needs between principals and HODs**

Item	Item description	Principals		HODs		t	p	d
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
B01	Performance appraisal	3,686	1,167	3,458	1,354	1,326	0,186*	
B02	Planning, organising, guiding and controlling	3,785	1,141	3,872	1,016	-0,624	0,532*	
B03	Financial management	3,833	1,138	3,765	1,142	0,450	0,652*	
B04	Conflict management	3,964	0,974	3,657	1,189	2,218	0,027*	0,258
B05	Managing interpersonal relationships	3,867	0,997	3,701	1,115	1,158	0,247*	
B06	Managing change	4,132	0,866	3,804	1,117	2,592	0,018*	0,293
B07	Delegation	3,904	1,048	3,817	1,024	0,639	0,523*	
B08	Team building and motivation	4,048	0,895	3,972	1,075	0,560	0,575*	
B09	Communication skills	3,879	1,028	3,733	1,028	1,071	0,285*	
B10	Managing a multicultural environment	3,530	1,309	3,173	1,364	1,994	0,047*	0,261

\*  $p < 0,05$

▪ No significant difference

d = 0,2 Small effect

d = 0,5 Medium effect

d = 0,8 Large effect

### 6.7.6 The prioritisation of management development needs between deputy principals and HODs

Table 6.54 illustrates the probability values regarding the prioritisation of management development needs between deputy principals and HODs (cf. Appendix A: Section B).

Table 6.54 shows that there were no significant differences in the prioritisation of performance appraisal, conflict management, managing interpersonal relationships, managing change, delegation, team building and motivation, communication skills and managing a multicultural environment as management development needs. This implies that data regarding these management development needs can be accepted as applying to both deputy principals and HODs.

There were, however, significant differences regarding the prioritisation of management tasks and financial management as management development needs between deputy principals and HODs. Frequency counts on the management tasks as management development needs revealed a high prioritisation by more HODs than deputy principals (Table 6.12). This could be due to suggested reasons (cf. 6.3.2) or, to HODs actually having to do these tasks in their departments while on the other hand, deputy principals do not have departments for which they are in charge. The researcher's experience in schools is invoked here to emphasise that in most instances deputy principals seem to be straddling management duties on a delegated basis rather than being managers in their own right. These differences, however, displayed a small effect size (Table 6.54). They are thus of small practical significance.

Frequency counts on financial management as a management development need indicated a high prioritisation by more HODs than deputy principals (cf. Table 6.13). The ranking of the prioritisation of financial management also indicated a higher ranking by HODs (fifth) than deputy principals (ninth). The reasons propounded earlier (6.3.4) could equally apply in this case. This is an indication of the situation regarding deputy principals' roles as managers in schools. It must be noted that, being in a situation suggested in this research for a long time, could ultimately induce a feeling of apathy among deputy principals and finally make them enjoy their non-involvement status as a comfort zone. Ultimately they might see management duties as belonging to either the principal or HODs. The differences in responses between deputy principals and HODs were, however, of a small practical significance ( $d=0,374$ ).

**Table 6.54 p-values regarding management development needs between deputy principals and HODs**

Item	Item description	Deputy principals		HODs		t	p	D
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
B01	Performance appraisal	3,250	1,171	3,458	1,354	-1,142	0,254*	
B02	Planning, organising, guiding and controlling	3,569	1,136	3,872	1,016	-2,070	0,039*	0,298
B03	Financial management	3,319	1,196	3,765	1,142	-2,759	0,006*	0,374
B04	Conflict management	3,541	1,137	3,657	1,189	-0,707	0,480*	
B05	Managing interpersonal relationships	3,513	1,113	3,701	1,115	-1,209	0,227*	
B06	Managing change	3,549	1,025	3,804	1,117	-1,666	0,097*	
B07	Delegation	3,638	1,117	3,817	1,024	-1,220	0,223*	
B08	Team building and motivation	3,722	1,153	3,972	1,075	-1,633	0,103*	
B09	Communication skills	3,597	1,070	3,733	1,028	-0,938	0,349*	
B10	Managing a multicultural environment	3,472	1,266	3,173	1,364	1,601	0,110*	

\* p < 0,05

▪ No significant difference

d = 0,2 Small effect

d = 0,5 Medium effect

d = 0,8 Large effect

Responses regarding management development experiences of respondents also indicated differences (cf. 6.4.1). The next section will investigate if these differences are significant or not.

## **6.8 AN ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCES IN THE MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCES**

A t-test was used to find out if there were any significant differences in responses regarding management development experiences. This was done to investigate whether significant differences exist between principals and deputy principals, principals and HODs and deputy principals and HODs, as well as whether these differences are of practical importance.

### **6.8.1 The differences between principals and deputy principals regarding management development experiences**

It is important to determine whether the different responses regarding data collected on management development experiences of the respondents are significant or not. This will perhaps give a clearer picture of the pattern of differing responses between the principals, deputy principals and HODs. Table 5.55 presents probability values regarding management development experiences between principals and deputy principals.

It seems that there were no significant differences regarding management development experiences between principals and deputy principals in terms of management development experiences except for items C02, C04 and C10.

More deputy principals than principals indicated having attended an in-service training on management in the last two years (cf. 6.4.1.2). The significant differences in responses between deputy principals and principals, though marginal and of small practical significance ( $d=357$ ), could be attributed to perceptions of training in management. As alluded to in 6.4.1.2, the in-service training referred to could be district-based and could mainly be relating to the introduction of OBE as against educational management. This is premised on the fact that responses regarding accreditation of management training (C01) indicated a lack of understanding of education management (cf. 6.4.1). The significant differences indicated by data collected suggests, however, a need for research in perceptions of different categories of school management teams regarding school and education management.

The significant differences in responses between principals and deputy principals regarding having conducted any development course for staff in 1998, though of

small practical effect ( $d=0.386$ ), show a clear discrepancy between principals and deputy principals. Frequency counts indicated more principals compared to deputy principals, who indicate having conducted staff development in 1998 (cf. Table 6.23). There could a number of reasons for this discrepancy. First, it could be that principals really conducted staff development and thus know exactly what it entails which could be the converse with deputy principals. Second, it could be that principals are giving what they think is an expected response, especially since the questionnaire was administered by education specialists in their districts and since most principals would have known from the covering letter that the researcher is also an education specialist in one of the GDE districts. This is indicative of some disadvantages of using a questionnaire as a research instrument. The researcher is inclined to go with the lower positive response regarding this item. This is based on the actual experience in schools where there is no real evidence of staff development, except a few indications of instructional development by way of instruction, i.e. educators are told what to do and not necessarily developed to master skills in doing teaching tasks.

There were also significant, though practically small differences between principals and deputy principals regarding the involvement of parents in management development (Table 6.55). More than a tenth (22,2%) of the deputy principals compared to principals indicated an agreement to parental involvement. This could be an indication of perceptions of educators in general regarding parental involvement in what they feel is their professional reserve. On the other hand, principals' responses could be indicative of the reasons alluded to earlier (6.4.1.10). There are indeed problems in schools regarding the extent to which parents should be involved in "professional" and governance issues. This could also indicate the problems inherent in clearly delineating the differences in management and governance where parental involvement is concerned.

### **6.8.2 An analysis of differences between principals and HODs regarding management development experiences**

Table 6.56 portrays p-values for management development experiences between principals and HODs.

Table 6.56 indicates significant differences between principals' and HODs' experiences of management development regarding items C04, C05, C06, C08, and C10 (cf. Appendix A: Section C). These differences were, however, found to be of small practical significance (Table 6.56).

**Table 6.55 p-values regarding management development experiences between principals and deputy principals**

Item	Item description	Principals		HODs		t	p	d
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
C01	Accredited management training	1,662	0,500	1,760	0,491	-1,219	0,224*	
C02	Any in-service training on management in the last two years	1,686	0,492	1,875	0,529	-2,293	0,023*	0,357
C03	A need for management development at school level	1,023	0,153	1,013	0,117	0,456	0,648*	
C04	Development courses conducted for staff in 1998	1,361	0,483	1,583	0,575	-2,609	0,010*	0,386
C05	Willingness to attend management course with another staff member	1,024	0,154	1,013	0,117	0,466	0,641*	
C06	Willingness to observe other school managers at their schools	1,445	0,648	1,416	0,745	0,260	0,795*	
C07	Willingness to act as a tutor for other school managers	1,309	0,658	1,333	0,712	-0,216	0,828*	
C08	Willingness to attend management course conducted by staff member	1,060	0,325	1,013	0,117	1,208	0,229*	
C09	Willingness to pay for a management development course	1,607	0,806	1,394	0,726	1,711	0,089*	
C10	Parent involvement in school's management development programme	1,626	0,760	1,347	0,674	2,402	0,017*	0,413

\* < 0,05

▪ No significant differences

d = 0,2 Small effect

d = 0,5 Medium effect

d = 0,8 Large effect

Responses regarding having conducted any management development courses for staff in 1998 (Item C04) indicated significant differences between principals and HODs. This incidentally was the case between principals and deputy principals. Possible reasons propounded in the case of principals and deputy principals could equally apply in this case. It could, however, also relate to the pattern observed between principals and HODs elsewhere in this text (6.5.1), i.e. HODs increasingly indicated the opposite of what principals' response indicate. This is evident in the number of HODs who responded positively as compared to principals who did not (cf. Table 6.23).

Data collected also indicates significant differences between principals and HODs regarding attending a management development course with another staff member who is not in the SMT (C05). Frequency counts indicated more principals than HODs who responded positively to the question (Table 6.25). This could be because of numerous reasons. For one, it could be that principals realise the value of involving staff members and thus feel they can attend courses with them. It could also be that principals see this as a way of getting teachers' support for the somewhat unpopular decisions they have to take in the school. This would hopefully reduce the level of resistance associated with some decisions that have to taken at times. It could also be because principals see this as a way of having changes and unpopular decisions being ushered in by educators' peers rather than themselves for fear of it being perceived as top down or authoritarian. It could also be that principals recognise the value of empowering educators in management skills so as to delegate managerial responsibilities. This would hopefully ensure participation of educators through encouraging ownership of management processes and decisions.

On the other hand, HODs could be seeing this as a travesty on their authority since they are nearer the educators by virtue of the hierarchy. This could be especially so since HODs in schools still have to function and be regarded as managers with authority.

There also were quite significant differences regarding being helped by observing other school managers in their schools for a day or longer. Frequency counts indicated that more HODs responded positively to this question than principals (Table 6.26). This response difference could be attributed to principals in most instances fearing exposure if they acknowledge that other school managers could be doing better than themselves. This is indicative of a general low level of collegiality among most school principals. The researcher's experience includes reasons propounded by principals for the poor performance of their schools. Among others, reasons advanced normally relate to what makes other schools better rather than real weaknesses in their own schools.

**Table 6.56 p-values regarding management development experiences between principals and HODs.**

Item	Item description	Principals		HODs		t	p	d
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
C01	Accredited management training	1,662	0,500	1,710	0,542	-0,680	0,484 <sup>■</sup>	
C02	Any in-service training on management in the last two years	1,686	0,492	1,741	0,519	-0,812	0,417 <sup>■</sup>	
CO3	A need for management development at school level	1,023	0,153	1,064	0,287	-1,230	0,219 <sup>■</sup>	
C04	Development courses conducted for staff in 1998	1,361	0,483	1,672	0,566	-4,333	0,000*	0,549
C05	Willingness to attend management course with another staff member	1,024	0,154	1,092	0,357	-2,178	0,030*	0,190
C06	Willingness to observe other school managers at their schools	1,445	0,648	1,234	0,568	2,678	0,007*	0,371
C07	Willingness to act as a tutor for other school managers	1,309	0,658	1,331	0,675	-0,248	0,804 <sup>■</sup>	
C08	Willingness to attend management course conducted by staff member	1,060	0,325	1,216	0,567	-2,837	0,004*	0,275
C09	Willingness to pay for a management development course	1,607	0,806	1,505	0,739	1,015	0,311 <sup>■</sup>	
C10	Parent involvement in school's management development programme	1,626	0,760	1,313	0,598	3,317	0,000*	0,523

\*  $p < 0,05$

■ No significant difference

d = 0,2 Small effect

d = 0,5 Medium effect

d = 0,8 Large effect

Reasons like “better schools perform thus because they admit learners on a discriminatory basis”, are not uncommon.

HODs on the other hand, could be seeing this as a way of learning from other school managers by shadowing them. It could also be a way of seeing how other principals could be managing their schools in terms of especially their roles as HODs. This is often evident in questions HODs ask in workshops and meetings that the researcher has conducted. Very often these are questions more attuned to venting out frustrations they experience with their principals’ management styles.

There were significant differences with regard to attending a management course conducted by a staff member who is not in the SMT (C08). More principals than HODs responded positively to this question (cf. Table 6.27). This difference in response could be attributed to the same reasons advanced in the case of item C05 above. This raises an important question of collegiality where SMTs are concerned. A major development drive is needed to conscientise SMT members especially those in the lower levels of management about the value of involving all staff members and indeed all stakeholders in management tasks. The relevance and extent of their involvement would of course have to taken cognisance of.

There were also significant differences between principals and HODs regarding parent involvement in management development programmes. More HODs responded positively to the question. Reasons suggested in the case of principals and deputy principals could be equally applicable in this case (cf. 6.7.1).

It would be worth investigating the responses of deputy principals compared to HODs as SMT members in the lower levels of the school management hierarchy.

### **6.8.3 An analysis of differences between deputy principals and HODs regarding management development experiences**

Table 6.57 depicts data on differences between deputy principals and HODs regarding management development experiences.

Table 6.57 shows that there were only three items on which respondent deputy principals and HODs differed significantly, though practically negligible, regarding their management development experiences.

First, there were significant differences regarding the need for management development at school level although very marginal (0,005). Although this difference was significantly small, there were differences between deputy principals and HODs.

**Table 6.57 p-values regarding management development experiences between deputy principals and HODs.**

Item	Item description	Deputy principals		HODs		t	p	d
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
C01	Accredited management training	1,760	0,491	1,710	0,542	0,678	0,493▪	
C02	Any in-service training on management in the last two years	1,875	0,529	1,741	0,519	1,832	0,068▪	
CO3	A need for management development at school level	1,013	0,117	1,064	0,287	-2,014	0,045*	0,177
C04	Development courses conducted for staff in 1998	1,583	0,575	1,672	0,566	-1,122	0,262▪	
C05	Willingness to attend management course with another staff member	1,013	0,117	1,092	0,357	-2,633	0,009*	0,221
C06	Willingness to observe other school managers at their schools	1,416	0,745	1,234	0,568	1,864	0,065▪	
C07	Willingness to act as a tutor for other school managers	1,333	0,712	1,331	0,675	0,019	0,984▪	
C08	Willingness to attend management course conducted by staff member	1,013	0,117	1,216	0,567	-4,597	0,000*	0,358
C09	Willingness to pay for a management development course	1,394	0,726	1,505	0,739	-1,080	0,280▪	
C10	Parent involvement in school's management development programme	1,347	0,674	1,313	0,598	0,391	0,696▪	

\* p < 0,05

▪ No significant difference

d = 0,2 Small effect

d = 0,5 Medium effect

d = 0,8 Large effect

Frequency counts indicated more deputy principals than HODs who indicated that there was a need for management development at school level (Table 6.23). The slight response edge by deputy principals could be attributed to their “not-too-clearly-defined” roles as suggested elsewhere in the text.

Second, there were significant differences observed regarding attending a management development course with another staff member who is not in the school management team (C05). Frequency counts indicated that more deputy principals than HODs responded positively to this question (cf. 6.4.5). The same pattern observed in 6.7.1 with regard to principals and deputy principals is reminiscent of this item. The same suggested reason for this difference in response is espoused in this case as well (cf. 6.7.1).

Third, there were significant differences regarding attending a management development course conducted by a member of staff who is not in the management team (C08). Frequency counts (cf. Table 6.27) indicated more deputy principals than HODs who responded positively to this question. This pattern was observed in the case of principals and deputy principals. The same reasons are thus suggested even in this case. It could even be more pertinent to HODs who are at the very lowest level of the management hierarchy in schools (6.7.1).

Management development implies specific activities aimed at management skills and expertise development. The new education vision calls on all management development programmes to focus on whole-school development through among others the involvement of all stakeholders at school. Frequency counts regarding management development activities in schools indicated some differences in responses between respondents. A t-test was also conducted to see if these were significant differences or not. The next section investigates these differences between principals and deputy principals, principal and HODs and deputy principals and HODs.

## **6.9 AN ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCES IN MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES**

This section intends to find out if there are any significant differences in respondents' answers regarding their own management development activities at school level. Section 6.5 outlined a frequency analysis of the responses regarding management development activities. The t-test was used in this section to determine if observed differences were significant or not.

### **6.9.1 An analysis of differences regarding management development activities between principals and deputy principals**

Table 6.58 depicts probability values regarding management development activities between principals and deputy principals.

Table 6.58 shows five items where there were significant differences in responses regarding management development activities between principals and deputy principals. These differences, however, displayed small and medium practical effect sizes (Table 6.58). There were significant differences regarding the focus of management development activities on all areas of school management (D07). More principals compared to deputy principals responded positively to the question (cf. 6.5.7). This could be lending weight to the expressed notion that deputy principals do not have clearly defined roles and as a result, perform mainly delegated duties.

Therefore, whatever development activities they experience, do not seem to focus on all areas of school management. The prioritisation of management development needs indicated that deputy principals seem mostly uninvolved in such matters as financial management, conflict management, managing change and managing a multicultural environment. This could also allude to there being few in-service training programmes at school level so that those that they engage are initiated by outside interventions like the GDE, e.g. OBE training. It must be noted that the OBE training dealt with the introduction and implementation of the OBE approach itself and not with the management thereof.

On the other hand, principals could be seeing management activities as focusing on all areas of school management since essentially they are the ones responsible for managing the entire school. This is also partly implied in their positive responses in most items.

Significant differences were also noted between principals and deputy principals in regard to regular evaluation of management development activities to identify needs for reinforcement and or corrective action (D10). Frequency counts indicated more principals responding positively to this question than deputy principals (cf. 6.5.10).

This could also be related to principals feeling responsible for all management processes in schools and thus indicating that management development activities are regularly evaluated. On the contrary, deputy principals could be seeing themselves in the middle of management tasks and not really involved in evaluating activities, after all, principals perform that function. Deputy principals could also be hinting at the real situation in schools, i.e. there could be little if any management development

**Table 6.58 p-values regarding management development activities between principals and deputy principals**

Item	Item description	Principals		Deputy principals		t	p	d
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
D01	The school has a policy statement regarding development and training of SMT.	1,487	0,571	1,544	0,678	-0,551	0,582*	
D02	Whole school development and individual development and training needs are identified.	1,240	0,508	1,428	0,649	-1,961	0,051*	
D03	Management development programmes are costed and included in budget.	1,638	0,531	1,805	0,743	-1,623	0,115*	
D04	The SMT attends school-based and external in-service training.	1,231	0,424	1,309	0,523	-1,019	0,309*	
D05	There are procedures ensuring the implementation of management development plans and experiences.	1,421	0,607	1,371	0,593	0,515	0,607*	
D06	The implementation of plans is carefully monitored and evaluated.	1,445	0,609	1,652	0,772	-1,832	0,691*	
D07	Management development activities focus on all areas of school management.	1,301	0,511	1,500	0,692	-2,050	0,046*	0,287
D08	The management development programme is conducted in the context of the school's mission and aims.	1,361	0,575	1,458	0,626	-1,003	0,317*	
D09	Staff members are involved in management development planning and implementation.	1,481	0,570	1,478	0,530	0,034	0,972*	
D10	Management development activities are evaluated regularly to identify needs for reinforcement and corrective action.	1,385	0,580	1,739	0,678	-3,461	0,000*	0,522
D11	Management development activities focus on continuous improvement.	1,361	0,616	1,642	0,799	-2,456	0,017*	0,351
D12	The school has identified key strategic issues upon which management development must focus.	1,487	0,707	1,625	0,659	-1,239	0,217*	
D13	The management development programme gets the support and commitment of parents and staff.	1,463	0,651	1,500	0,605	-0,359	0,719*	



activities hence there is nothing to evaluate. It could also be that they are not equipped with evaluation skills.

There were significant differences between principals and deputy principals regarding the focus of management development activities on continuous improvement (D11). The question here could be the meaning attached to continuous improvement. Since this is a relatively new focus in education management (cf. 4.4.4.3), it could be that whole-school development is not yet off the ground in most instances. Again more principals responded positively to this question compared to deputy principals (cf. 6.5.11). The same suggested reasons about the role of deputy principals play in schools could be applicable in this case while principals are incumbently responsible for the completion of school management activities.

Responses regarding indicators of good practice being used to rate management development needs (D17), indicated significant differences between principals and deputy principals. This could be understood in terms of whole-school development and development planning being relatively new concepts in education management in South Africa. As a result there may be a lack of understanding of what indicators of good practice or performance indicators are. There could also be a difficulty in "unpacking" schools' mission statements to finally come up with indicators of good practice to be used as rating tools in the self analysis processes. Frequency counts in this regard indicated more positive responses from principals compared to deputy principals (cf. Table 6.47). There is thus a need to provide a model of management development that will avail a readily usable set of performance indicators that can easily fit or be adjusted to schools' own circumstances and needs.

There were also significant differences regarding the flexibility of the schools' management development programmes so as to accommodate changes by external interventions like new policies from the GDE. Schools have to have their own management development policies. It so happens, however, that the GDE by way of new policies causes change to standing school policies. School management development programmes and policies have to be flexible enough to accommodate these changes. An example of this could relate to the envisaged management development centres or National Education Management Institute (Department of Education, 1996a). In the event of these being established, the schools' management development policies and programme must be able to accommodate making use of these to avoid among others, duplication of programmes.

This item's frequency counts indicated more positive responses from principals than from deputy principals. Once more it can be reiterated that since principals mostly feel responsible for all areas of school management, they would obviously indicate

knowing if “their” programmes are flexible enough or not. On the other hand, deputy principals’ minimal and often delegated roles would make them feel like programmes are inflexible, especially since they could be having very little to do with the evaluation and monitoring thereof.

The next section investigates if there are any significant differences regarding management development activities between principals and HODs.

### **6.9.2 An analysis of differences regarding management development activities between principals and HODs**

The same t-test procedure was followed to investigate if there are any significant differences in responses between principal and HODs regarding management development activities. Table 6.59 presents probability values in this regard.

Table 6.59 reveals a whole range of significant differences between principals and HODs regarding management activities at school level. Table 6.59 also shows that, though there were significant differences, these were generally of small practical significance. There were no significant differences as far as only three management development activities are concerned, viz., the involvement of staff in management development planning and implementation, the focus of management development activities on continuous improvement and the report by staff on the content and management development activities.

The fact that there were significant differences on almost all management development activities between principals and HODs reveals another dimension of the school management systems. First, it could imply the non-involvement of HODs in management processes in schools by virtue of their positioning in the management hierarchy. It could be that they are charged with managing their own departments without effectively doing so. They could be spending most of their time doing teaching duties and very little management if any. The researcher has actually observed in schools that HODs do little by way of management.

These differences could also be revealing the true picture regarding management development, i.e. there could be no development activities at school level. Few HODs indicated that there were management development policy statements in their schools (cf. 6.5.1). If there is no policy statement regarding management development and training, it indicates a doubt as to whether there is a programme of management development or if it is there, it is often a spontaneous reaction to crisis situations. This is corroborated by the fact that most HODs indicated a negative

**Table 6.59 p-values regarding management development activities between principals and HODs**

Item	Item description	Principals		HODS		t	p	d
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
D01	The school has a policy statement regarding development and training of SMT.	1,487	0,571	1,675	0,672	-2,336	0,020*	0,279
D02	Whole school development and individual development and training needs are identified.	1,240	0,508	1,546	0,653	-4,137	0,000*	0,468
D03	Management development programmes are costed and included in budget.	1,638	0,531	1,802	0,625	-2,195	0,029*	0,262
D04	The SMT attends school-based and external in-service training.	1,231	0,424	1,450	0,618	-3,319	0,001*	0,354
D05	There are procedures ensuring the implementation of management development plans and experiences.	1,421	0,607	1,707	0,697	-3,212	0,001*	0,410
D06	The implementation of plans is carefully monitored and evaluated.	1,445	0,609	1,628	0,674	-2,107	0,036*	0,271
D07	Management development activities focus on all areas of school management.	1,301	0,511	1,692	0,760	-4,913	0,000*	0,514
D08	The management development programme is conducted in the context of the school's mission and aims.	1,361	0,575	1,560	0,688	-2,344	0,019*	0,279
D09	Staff members are involved in management development planning and implementation.	1,481	0,570	1,532	0,572	-0,673	0,501*	
D10	Management development activities are evaluated regularly to identify needs for reinforcement and corrective action.	1,385	0,580	1,611	0,628	-2,768	0,006*	0,359
D11	Management development activities focus on continuous improvement.	1,361	0,616	1,469	0,619	-1,319	0,188*	
D12	The school has identified key strategic issues upon which management development must focus.	1,487	0,707	1,677	0,698	-2,033	0,043*	0,272

Table 6.59 (continued)

D13	The management development programme gets the support and commitment of parents and staff.	1,463	0,651	1,714	0,725	-2,682	0,007*	0,346
D14	The management team has systems or procedures for management development needs identification.	1,457	0,703	1,633	0,633	-1,917	0,563 <sup>■</sup>	
D15	Action plans are used for management development programme implementation.	1,361	0,616	1,587	0,639	-2,702	0,007*	0,353
D16	The management development plans indicate expected outcomes and success criteria.	1,378	0,621	1,659	0,716	-3,072	0,002*	0,392
D17	Indicators of good practice are used to rate management development needs.	1,530	0,721	1,740	0,733	-2,173	0,030*	0,286
D18	The management development programme is flexible to accommodate changes caused by external interventions, e.g. new policies from GDE.	1,195	0,482	1,434	0,633	-3,362	0,002*	0,377
D19	The management development programmes makes use of external expertise, e.g., agencies, GDE specialists.	1,240	0,457	1,425	0,597	-2,750	0,006*	0,309
D20	Staff reports on the content and value of management development activities.	1,650	0,633	1,685	0,619	-0,417	0,677 <sup>■</sup>	

\*  $p < 0,05$

■ No significant difference

d = 0,2 Small effect  
d = 0,5 Medium effect  
d = 0,8 Large effect

response regarding the identification of whole-school and individual development and training needs (cf. 6.5.2).

Most HODs also indicated a negative response regarding the attendance of school-based and external in-service training (cf. Table 6.33). Those HODs who responded positively could be relating to external in-service training that may in itself relate to OBE training which was conducted vigorously in the past two years so that there could be little or no in-service training at school level.

Most HODs' responses were also negative regarding the careful implementation of plans and experiences (D06), the focus of management development activities on continuous improvement (D11) and all areas of school management (D07), the management development programmes' conducting in the context of the school's mission and aims (D08), the identification of key strategic issues upon which management development activities must focus (D12), the use of action plans for programme implementation (D15) and the use of indicators of good practice to rate management development needs as well as the regular evaluation of management development programmes (D10). Most HOD responses were also negative regarding the support and commitment for management development activities by staff and parents (D13), the flexibility of the management development programmes to accommodate external interventions (D18) as well as making use of external expertise (D19).

The significant differences between principals and HODs reinforce the notion expressed elsewhere (6.5.1) that there was a pattern of differences between principals and HODs. In the light of knowing that the questionnaire was administered by the GDE's education specialists could have made HODs look at the questionnaire as a way of expressing their frustrations about management styles in their schools by responding "honestly" while it could have induced principals to respond in "expected" ways. This is a major disadvantage of the questionnaire as a research instrument. However, this also suggests a need for research into perceptions of principals and HODs regarding school management.

It must be noted, however, that principals' responses could be genuine in as far as they are concerned since in most instances they are responsible for managing the entire school. This could also be due to a flaw in their management styles that could see them doing all the school management on their own.

The probability values' analysis of differences between principals and HODs opened a new dimension in the present management systems in schools in Gauteng. It is thus worth investigating if there are significant differences between deputy principals and

HODs regarding management development activities since these are members of SMTs in the lower school management hierarchy. This is explored in the next section.

### **6.9.3 An analysis of differences regarding management development activities between deputy principals and HODs**

The t-test was employed to determine if there were any significant differences regarding management development activities between deputy principals and HODs. Table 6.60 portrays probability values in this regard.

Table 6.60 shows p-values indicating significant differences between deputy principals and HODs with regard to management development activities such as procedures that ensure the implementation of management development plans and experiences (D05). Incidentally there were significant differences in this regard between principals and HODs. This could be supportive of the earlier finding that HODs seem to reveal the actual situation in schools. While more deputy principals responded positively to this question (cf. 6.5.5), it would seem whatever management development programmes exist in school, could be haphazard and could as hinted earlier, be reactions to crisis situations. As indicated in 6.5.5, these significant differences tend to make the responses of principals and deputy principals regarding this question questionable and indeed, the significant differences in responses therefore attest to this.

There were significant differences in relation to support and commitment of staff and parents to management development programmes (D13). This suggests that management development programmes, if they exist in schools, are not necessarily supported by staff and parents. This could be an explanation of the level of ownership of school development processes as would be induced by involvement and participation of educators and parents. Perhaps this explains the often-expressed reluctance of parents to support the schools' activities financially. Frequency counts for this item indicated more deputy principals who responded positively than HODs. This could also call for an investigation as whether the hierarchical positions held by respondents do influence their responses especially when the researcher is an education specialist and is known as such by the respondents.

There were also significant differences regarding whether action plans are used for management development programme implementation (D15). Frequency counts in this regard indicated more deputy principals responding positively in this regard compared to HODs (Table 6.45). This once again raises the suggestion

**Table 6.60 p-values regarding differences in management development activities between deputy principals and HODs**

Item	Item description	Deputy principals		HODs		t	p	d
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
D01	The school has a policy statement regarding development and training of SMT.	1,544	0,678	1,675	0,672	-1,374	0,173*	
D02	Whole school development and individual development and training needs are identified.	1,428	0,649	1,546	0,653	-1,289	0,198*	
D03	Management development programmes are costed and included in budget.	1,805	0,743	1,802	0,625	0,033	0,973*	
D04	The SMT attends school-based and external in-service training.	1,309	0,523	1,450	0,618	-1,684	0,093*	
D05	There are procedures ensuring the implementation of management development plans and experiences.	1,371	0,593	1,707	0,697	-1,559	0,000*	0,482
D06	The implementation of plans is carefully monitored and evaluated.	1,652	0,772	1,628	0,674	0,249	0,803*	
D07	Management development activities focus on all areas of school management.	1,500	0,692	1,692	0,760	-1,861	0,063*	
D08	The management development programme is conducted in the context of the school's mission and aims.	1,458	0,626	1,560	0,668	-1,116	0,265*	
D09	Staff members are involved in management development planning and implementation.	1,478	0,530	1,532	0,572	-0,689	0,491*	
D10	Management development activities are evaluated regularly to identify needs for reinforcement and corrective action.	1,739	0,678	1,611	0,628	1,406	0,160*	
D11	Management development activities focus on continuous improvement.	1,642	0,799	1,469	0,619	1,633	0,105*	
D12	The school has identified key strategic issues upon which management development must focus.	1,625	0,659	1,677	0,698	-0,550	0,582*	



raised in the previous paragraph regarding the influence positions held might have on responses. It is, however, clear that, HODs express sentiments that suggest that there are really no formal management development at school level in the GDE.

The exposition on the significant differences between respondents regarding management development activities has revealed that at school level, there are really no programmes of management development. It has also shown that where there is a semblance of such activities, these are often haphazard and not ordered in a co-ordinated way. This may explain why the responses differ on similar issues. There is also a possibility that whatever management development activities exist, these could be initiated by the GDE and conducted on a workshop basis. This implies that such activities are themselves not sustained and formalised. This could explain why some schools in some districts appear to be managed relatively better than other schools in other districts. There also seems that there is a pattern of differences in responses between principals, deputy principals and HODs as well as between deputy principals and HODs. This then reinforces the motivation behind this research, namely, that there is a need for the designation of a model that will be readily usable by all school stakeholders, particularly the school management teams. It is noted, however, that these differences are of small practical significance (Table 6.60).

## 6.10 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter presented the analysis and interpretation of research results. First, the biographical data of the respondents was presented. It came out, among others, that most respondents in the management positions are suitably qualified for such posts. It also became clear that most respondents were in suitable ages that offered a balance between the old and the new especially if transformation is taken into consideration. It also became clear that though respondents were suitably qualified, they needed further qualifications or studies in educational management so as to possess relevant knowledge for the management positions they occupy.

The major findings of the empirical study confirmed literature findings about management development needs and the prioritisation thereof by most school managers. Responses also indicated that the identified management development needs were indeed perceived as being of high development priority for school managers.

Findings on the management development experiences and activities indicated that school managers have not experienced many management development activities themselves and have not done a lot of staff development for their subordinates. The analysis of management development activities indicated that few, if any,

management development programmes are conducted in a coherent, co-ordinated and well thought of manner. There was also a revelation of a strongly possible non-involvement of all stakeholders in management development programmes.

The next chapter presents a model of management development for use at school level, which intends to make it easy for schools management teams to use. The model makes use of the GDE Quality Assurance Framework was developed by the GDE Task Team on Quality Assurance, of which the researcher is a member.