

**LEADERS' AND PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS
OF THE MANAGEMENT OF THE LIFE SCIENCE
PROJECT IN NAMIBIA**

submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree

MASTERS IN EDUCATION

Education Leadership & Management

by

NIELS HUGO KIRKEGAARD

August 2001

Acknowledgements

There are several people who have supported and encouraged me during the research and writing of this thesis and to whom I am grateful.

- my family who were supportive and encouraging throughout the process;
- my colleagues in the Life Science Project, with whom I have shared an inspiring and unique experience;
- the participants in this research who took their time to share their experiences with me;
- all the people at Ibis Field Office in Windhoek who often went out of their way to allow me to pursue my tasks;
- Gill and Ursula in Grahamstown who opened their homes for me while I was writing the thesis;
- Finally I acknowledge the support and guidance my tutor Professor Hennie van der Mescht, Rhodes University; gave through the whole process. I appreciate the stimulating discussions which brought me further on the mysterious road of research.

Abstract

After Independence in 1991, Namibia embarked on implementing a new and different educational system. This system was seen as a radical departure from the old apartheid system. The Namibian government approached Ibis, a Danish NGO, to support the change process by establishing and developing a new subject, life science, in Junior Secondary schools in Namibia through the Life Science Project (LSP). In a project of this nature, where a foreign (Danish) educational intervention in a relatively young and new democracy is the issue, cross-cultural aspects are likely to emerge, and these are the focus of this study.

This half-thesis is an attempt to illuminate, not to evaluate, managerial as well as cross-cultural features of the project based on perceptions of selected Danish managers and Namibian advisory teachers from the former LSP expressed in the goal of the research:

- To explore selected leaders' and participants' perception of the management of the Life Science Project.

In line with this goal, I elected to conduct the research in the interpretive paradigm, using unstructured interviews as my chief source of data. The findings illuminate what would appear to be an inconsistency in the management of the project. The project seemed to be able to accommodate regional and even personal differences and to be flexible to internal changes. At the same time it appears that in its relationship to the external or task environment it did not show the same openness and flexibility to accommodate diversity. It is suggested that this could be a result of the apparent failure on the part of the project to clarify its own underlying values. The study also reveals interesting and unexpected perceptions of leadership, which may also be interpreted in terms of cultural values and beliefs. These two features of managerial issues could lead one to reflect upon the importance of recognising values in organisations which work across cultures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
LIST OF ACRONYMS USED IN THIS TEXT	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 CONTEXT	1
1.2 RESEARCH GOAL	3
1.3 THESIS OUTLINE	3
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE	6
2.1 HOFSTEDE	6
2.1.1 Critique and discussion of Hofstede's model	10
2.2 WESTERN MANAGEMENT THEORIES	13
2.2.1 Classical organisational theory	14
2.2.2 Human relations approach	15
2.2.3 The systems approach	16
2.2.4 Reflections inspired by the above described approaches	16
2.2.5 Approaches which are sensitive towards cultural issues	17
2.2.6 Leadership literature	18
2.2.7 Two different value-based views on leadership	19
2.2.8 Reflections on leadership theory	19
2.2.9 Summary	20
2.3 <i>Ubuntu</i> , a suggested synergy of African values and Western management models	20
2.4 Summary	22
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	24
3.1 PARADIGMS	24
3.1.1 Positivism	25
3.1.2 The interpretive paradigm	25
3.1.3 The critical paradigm	26
3.1.4 Deconstructive/poststructural approaches	26
3.2 Selection of paradigm	27
3.3 Key issues related to this research method	29
3.3.1 Objectivity	29
3.3.2 Validity and reliability	29
3.3.3 Ethics	31
3.4 The research path	32
3.4.1 The background and start of the research	32
3.4.2 Sampling	34
3.4.3 Interviews	35
3.4.4 The data	38

3.4.5 Data analysis	39
3.4.6 Discussion of the research method.....	40
CHAPTER FOUR: THE DATA	42
4.1 The focus of the project	43
4.2 The structure of the project	46
4.3 Management of the project	48
4.4 Human capacity building in the project	54
4.5 LSP IN THE NAMIBIAN CONTEXT	60
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF DATA.....	69
5.1 Introduction	69
5.2 Discussion of the goals and structure of the LSP.....	70
5.2.1 The LSP as a loosely coupled system	73
5.3 DISCUSSION of management/leadership roles of the LSP	74
5.4 DISCUSSION of the LSP and its relation to partners and recipients	77
5.4.1 LSP and the Ministry, NIED and the Regional Offices	78
5.4.2 The LSP and the teachers.....	81
5.4.3 The LSP in terms of systems thinking	84
5.5 Reflections.....	86
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION	88
6.1 Findings from the research.....	88
6.1.1 Literature analysis	88
6.1.2 Data interpretation.....	89
6.1.3 Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research	92
REFERENCES.....	94
APPENDIX 1	97
APPENDIX 2	99

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED IN THIS TEXT

AT	Advisory Teachers
DANIDA	Danish International Development Assistance
GSM	General staff meeting
LCE	Learner centred education
LO	Learning organisation
LSP	Life Science Project
MBO	Management by Objectives
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NIED	National Institute for Educational Development
OD	Organisation Development
SWAPO	South West Africa People's Organisation
US	United States
WUS	World University Service

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 CONTEXT

This research is inspired by my work experiences as Advisory Teacher for the Life Science Project (LSP) in Namibia. I have worked for the project in two different regions from 1994 until the project's termination by the end of 2000.

The beginning of the LSP can be dated back to the early 1980s. The South West Africa Peoples Organisation (SWAPO), a Namibian liberation movement, approached WUS Denmark, now the Danish NGO Ibis, for financial support to start a Secondary School for Namibian learners in exile. The school, the Namibian Secondary Technical School in Loudima, was established and operational in Congo in 1984/85. The experiences from the school were incorporated into the new educational reform processes after Namibian independence in 1990. In 1991 a proposal for introducing the subject Life Science in Junior Secondary schools and to support the National Institute for Educational Development (NIED) was approved. Thus the LSP was created, designed with a two-year pilot phase followed by a five year implementation phase. LSP closed officially at the end of 1998 but a few remaining Danish staff remained in place during the project's phasing out period 1999 – 2000.

In my job I was in contact with people from different levels in the educational system. It gave me a first hand experience of the differences between the old apartheid educational system, that was the reality in Namibia before independence, and the new teaching ideas and methods, presented in the educational reform after independence. It was a move away from an autocratic, top-down, racial segregated system towards a system built on the ideas of equity, access, quality and democracy.

There was resistance towards or a reluctance to embrace the new ideas. When I visited a school in Namibia I could for example find that 2 out of 18 teachers had a formal education and there were no support materials at all; would that be a set-up

for the new ideas? Or if you experience that people firmly believe that you learn by listening to people who have more education than you? How do you actually introduce new ideas in places like that? Why did the classroom practices change so slowly? I come from a country where these ideas are prevailing in the educational system and it is more or less a “natural” way of thinking and practising for teachers and the resistance and the experiences from the schools made me wonder if the methods really were directly applicable in Namibia because of different cultural values in the two countries. Could it be that the methods were designed to match Western teaching philosophies and Western social needs? Was it a way of exporting Western values?

It also made me curious how the LSP actually coped with its position as a project which was introducing the new methods and ideas. One would expect that the project, working in a particular social and cultural context, would show sensitivity towards this context. Did the project do that? How was it possible to manage a project like the LSP in the cultural context where it was located?

My experiences from the Namibian educational system showed me that there was little knowledge about managerial issues. It could at school level for example create situations where a school was “locked” in a conflict of interests between the management of the school and the teachers or between the Principal and the management. I found that managerial issues often influenced my work with the teachers in a negative way. With this background I decided to expand my knowledge of the area and joined Rhodes University’s Masters course in Educational Leadership and Management. During this course I got interested in how management is practised in different countries and if management theories could be regarded as universal. Inspired by Hofstede’s survey (1980) in which he claims that management theories developed in one country cannot be transferred directly to another country I found it to be interesting to investigate the management of the LSP since it was a cross-cultural project and that it could provide me with a deeper understanding of some of the questions I raised above related to my work experiences in Namibia. I felt that this intention could be obtained by interviewing former Danish managers of

the project and Namibian Advisory Teachers for Life Science about their interpretation of the management of the project.

A number of evaluations of the project have been carried out during its operational period and a final evaluation of the project is at this moment (July 2001) being finalised. Being a participant in the final evaluation process of the project I found that managerial issues had not been an explicit part of evaluations. I hope that this research can add information to the picture the evaluations paint. At the same time I also hope it will contribute to an understanding, and raise awareness of management of cross-cultural organisational initiatives in general and Ibis in particular.

1.2 RESEARCH GOAL

The goal of this research is:

- To explore a selected group of managers' and advisory teachers' perceptions of the management of the former Life Science Project in Namibia.

The research is intended to illuminate themes and trends of management related issues and not to evaluate them.

1.3 THESIS OUTLINE

This short outline and explanation of the content and features in the following chapters will provide the reader with information which makes it easier to follow the path of this research.

Chapter two provides a review of literature. The LSP was a Danish funded program set in Namibia with staff from both countries. The literature should provide a background for understanding and highlight aspects of management in multicultural or cross-border organisations. There are three sections in the chapter and the issues which are highlighted and discussed are firstly the possibility of exporting

management theories developed in one country with one set of cultural values to another with different cultural values. Secondly different Western directions of management and leadership theory are explored for their possible ability to accommodate cultural differences. Thirdly an African way of management based on African values is discussed. Some of the issues from this chapter will later give input to the discussion of data and it will also form part of the last chapter, the conclusion, as a supplement to the themes and trends of managerial aspects of the LSP which emerged on the basis of the interviews.

Chapter three is a methodology chapter, where the research orientation and the research path is described and discussed. First part discusses the importance of distinguishing between the ontology and epistemology of a paradigm and the methods used in research. On this background I argue for locating this research in the interpretive paradigm. This research stand recognises that the researcher brings his/her values into the research. Therefore I discuss the key issues objectivity, validity, reliability and ethics in relation to interpretive/qualitative research. I argue that rigour in research is closely linked to the researcher being aware of the subjectivity of the study and therefore is the research path described thoroughly to show the researchers role in the research process. Finally chapter three reflects on strength and weaknesses of the research.

Chapter four presents the data collected from focussed and unstructured interviews with four former Danish managers of the LSP and three Namibian advisory teachers for the subject life science. The views of the interviewees are organised in themes in accordance with the issues touched upon in the interviews. The chapter is written in a narrative way with frequent quotations from the interviews which allows the views of the participants to come forward and the researcher to be in a more emic position.

Chapter five is a discussion of the data. Different themes related to management features were highlighted in the chapter four. These themes seem to illustrate an inconsistency in the management of the project. This inconsistency is described by illuminating two opposing trends, one which describes the internal processes in the project and the other the projects relationship to the external/"task" environment like

Regional Offices, teachers etc. The two trends are presented separately and features from them highlighted by drawing on literature from chapter two as well as different documents from the LSP. The last part of the chapter is a reflection on the data discussion and what questions it raised.

The last chapter draws together the themes and trends which emerged from the research path. It illuminates main features and asks questions about cross-cultural organisations' awareness of and ability to deal with cultural issues. As this thesis only paints a part of a bigger picture the chapter also suggests areas for further research.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE

This research is to a great extent inspired by the survey done by Hofstede (1980) about cultural dimensions in relation to management. His main conclusion is that management theories developed in one country can not be applied directly in another country because of their different cultural values.

Inspired by this and by the goal of my investigation I will firstly in this chapter go more in depth with and discuss the work of Hofstede. From there I will look critically at Western based theories and research concerning management seen in relation to them being able to accommodate cultural differences. Thirdly I will review literature which looks at management from one African perspective, especially the ideas which are pertinent in the *Ubuntu* movement.

2.1 HOFSTEDE

Hofstede conducted research based on data collected between 1967 and 1973 where he was interested in finding out if it was possible successfully to implement management theories with roots in one culture, in this case the US, in another cultural setting. He states that:

For about 60 years, the United States has become the World's largest producer and exporter of management theories covering such areas as motivation, leadership and organization (Hofstede 1980:49).

He goes further back in history and argues that the centres of theories of management were based in the Old World.

The theories have emerged in a cultural environment and that has influenced/shaped the theories:

Only to a limited extent can we, in our thinking, step out of the boundaries imposed by our cultural conditioning (Hofstede 1980:50).

This leads to look at the way he defines culture:

as the collective mental programming of the people in an environment (Hofstede 1980:43).

He continues by saying that culture is not related to individuals but to groups and these groups could be e.g. minorities, majorities, tribes or nations. His special interest lies in how the national environment (e.g. language and culture) shapes what he calls the national character. The national character is conditioned in the country and since it “is collective in nature it is difficult to change; if it changes at all, it does so slowly” (Hofstede 1980:43).

From the data, covering more than 116.000 questionnaires collected from one large US based multinational corporation, IBM, with branches in 40 different countries, mostly representing wealthy countries in the West and more prosperous countries in the Third World he “tried to determine especially the main criteria by which their national cultures differed” (Hofstede 1980:43). The data were based on beliefs and values of the employees expressed in a continuum between opposites e.g. “identity is based in the social system” vs. “identity is based in the individual” and “you work in order to live” vs. “you live in order to work” (See Appendix 2).

The four criteria found, also called dimensions, he used for describing national cultures were:

Power distance, which:

Indicates the extent to which a society accepts the facts that power in institutions and organisations is distributed unequally.

Uncertainty avoidance:

Indicates the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations by providing greater career

stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviours, and believing in absolute truths and the attainment of expertise.

Individualism – collectivism:

Individualism implies a loosely knit social frame work ... while collectivism is characterized by a tight social framework in which people distinguish in-groups and out-groups.

and Masculinity:

the extent to which the dominant values in society are masculine – that is, assertiveness, the acquisition of money and things and not caring for others, the quality of life, or people (Hofstede 1980:45-46).

He gave an index value to each country on each dimension. From this it was possible to rank the countries and also to represent the positions of the countries in 2x2 diagrams showing two dimensions at a time e.g. power distance and uncertainty avoidance.

From his point of view it is of special importance to see where the US rates since the management ideas to a great extent come from there. On power distance it is a little below average, for uncertainty avoidance it is well below average, on masculinity it is well above average, and on individualism it appears to be the most individualistic of all countries.

With this knowledge/tool he assessed how different American theories actually were being implemented in other countries. An example is how the management technique MBO (management by objectives), which was very popular in the US, was received in countries with other cultural dimensions than the US. In Germany the MBO had to be adjusted because Germany has a strong uncertainty avoidance. In France the MBO did not work at all because of the large power distance there. His conclusion was that he would:

question the universal validity of management theories developed in one country (Hofstede 1980:62).

Hofstede's work was the first imperial survey about cultural features relevant to management and organisations, and its influence is still prominent.

For example Swartz (1994) says that:

Hofstede has provided one of the few empirically and conceptually based sets of cultural dimensions on which contemporary cultures or nations can be arrayed (Swartz cited in Kim *et al.* 1994:86).

Golembiewski (1991:201) says that Hofstede's model is the most prominent nowadays among cultural models relevant to management and organisations.

In the literature there seems to be few reported empirical field research conducted on the basis of Hofstede's findings. The majority of the articles are theoretical. It could be because comparisons like he did need to be carried out in different countries and therefore require manpower and definitely a substantial funding to be carried out.

One of the few cross-border investigations done is by Shackleton and Ali (1990) who tested Hofstede's dimensions power distance and uncertainty avoidance against groups of managers from Sudan and England. The English group consisted of two subgroups, one with Pakistani and one with English cultural background. The conclusion was that the two tested dimensions provided support for Hofstede's model.

The theorists seem to have accepted his ideas of the dimensions and use them as one of the means to explain phenomena and/or recommend approaches/interventions within the fields of management and OD (Adler 1983, Jaeger 1986, Golembiewski 1991).

2.1.1 Critique and discussion of Hofstede's model.

I will look more critically at Hofstede's work and discuss its usefulness today.

A main critique of the model is that by working with "culture" based on nations, it is not seen to take into account that there can be different cultures within a single nation and also that within a multicultural society an organisation will hold groups of people with different cultural background and that this might invalidate the method.

Hofstede (1980:62) mentions it as problems which have to be considered, but then he does not go beyond the statement. I agree to a large extent with the critique especially when the method is used in a country where the survey is based on a small number of participants. By saying this I will consider the method specifically useful for the United States and Western Europe because at the time of the data collection the computer technology, which IBM works with, was mainly well established in those two areas and therefore the sampling from there would be sufficient big to establish a reasonable validity. The further you move away from these regions the more problematic the size of the sampling would be.

Another critique is about the sampling. Since the firm used for the survey operates in high-technology it is likely that their recruitment of employees is not a true reflection of the surrounding society's population composition. For example, is South Africa rated very closely to the former English speaking British colonies even though the majority of that country has an African cultural background? I find a result like that very problematic.

Some 14 years after the publication of the paper referred to above, Hofstede (1994a) acknowledged this weakness, suggesting that Black South Africans may resemble other Black Africans more closely than they do white South Africans. So, for example, Black South Africa may be a "tender" rather than "tough" culture, perhaps more "feminine" as captured in the concept of *ubuntu* (Hofstede 1994a:77). He concluded that "Western instruments cannot reveal all relevant dimensions of African cultures" (Hofstede 1994a:28). By saying this he touched on the problem of

getting the “right” information if the tool for collecting it is developed in another culture. I believe that it is of utmost importance that one thoroughly considers the context in which a method is used and the purpose of it. This might alter the sense of stiffness/impersonality which questionnaires often have. It seems to me that this has not been counted for sufficiently when the method was used in some countries. Maybe he fell into the trap of regarding his method as universal while he actually tries to advocate that methods in one country cannot be directly transferred to other countries.

Yet another thing is that a firm, a group of people working closely together, might create a special value system which differs from the rest of the country. Hofstede tries to defend the validity of his method with the argument that it is the same sampling which is done in all the countries and that it in the end would be equal for all. It sounds to me that he knows that it is a weak point in the survey.

The work is based on data collected in the late 60s and early 70s. One could argue that since then the world has moved forward and the cultures and their values have changed over time. The globalisation process might also have added extra velocity to the process. The survey was an attempt to uncover values and beliefs in societies and I believe that the deeper you go into Schein’s (1990) three levels of culture, from “observable artefacts”, to “values”, and last “basic underlying assumptions” (Schein 1990:11), the less change is likely to occur. Change will of course take place since society is ‘plastic’, but it will be very slow. I do not think that the changes which have taken place at the deeper levels since then will invalidate the findings in a substantial way.

An interesting occurrence related to this is that Hofstede added a new dimension, “Confucian dynamism”, to the four original dimensions (Hofstede 1994b:x). This I see as an attempt to accommodate the values of the Far East. The countries from that region were at that time very influential in the world economy. This suggests that the original model was not geared equally to deal with all cultures and it gives me the impression that the values/beliefs in Hofstede’s work are an expression of the environment it was developed in, which was American-European.

I also see Hofstede's model as a child of the prevalent trends of theory of that period. Especially the concept of "socio-technical systems" (French and Bell, 1995:92) which in short describes an organisation as containing two components, a social system which are related to the human aspects and a technical system which is more related to the tasks. A change in one of the subsystems will have an impact on the other system. Hofstede's model is to me an early attempt to sensitise systems/organisations about the role their environments play, by identifying aspects of the social system which in the end would help improving the effectiveness of their activities.

By identifying/describing he is taking the etic position, watching from the bridge, as it were, and is not really trying to understand or looking at values from/through the insider's position/view, the emic position.

This is criticised by some researchers with a psychological background as superficial and pretending to have deeper knowledge of the dimensions studied (Schein 1990:110). Schwartz (1994) has gone further with his criticism in that direction and has developed a new set of dimensions, seven in all, which cover more aspects than Hofstede's. It especially caters for his interest in the individualism-collectivism dichotomy. He has also tested them in different countries and is still working on them. It could be a good supplement to Hofstede's model if you are interested in going deeper into the different dimensions.

I find it important to look at what the purpose of using Hofstede's model is. I do not see it as an attempt to give a thorough explanation of the cultural issue, but rather as a framework which will allow one to work with cultural issues in an organisation. The model can therefore be useful for investigating organisations which contain cross-cultural aspects, either within the organisation itself, or across countries. This is the basis on which I have adopted Hofstede's dimensions to inform my questionnaire for my research.

Since the focus of this study is to examine potentially conflicting interpretations of management and leadership practices, it may be appropriate at this stage briefly to consider the extent to which Western management theories developed over the last century are able to accommodate cultural diversity.

2.2 WESTERN MANAGEMENT THEORIES

In this section of the chapter I will give an overview of the development of management theory. I do not intend to give a detailed description which already has been done thoroughly by many others, but concentrate on the major trends which can inform my study. To pursue this I will look at whether the theories focus chiefly on the **task** (which basically is rational), the **persons** in the organisation (their satisfaction and motivation) or the **situation** (which has to do with the internal and external environment). Hoy and Miskel (1996:381) explain what could be included when the situation is described; the education, age, knowledge and experience, and positional power of the subordinates. Other elements are the climate, culture, openness, participativeness, group atmosphere, values, and norms of the organisation. The more a theory focuses on the person and especially the situation the more likely it is to be open for cultural differences, since these elements incorporate the human and social characteristics of organisations.

Firstly I will establish the context in which I see that the theories have developed. It is mostly my personal understanding thereof since it is not in the scope of this paper to go deeper into analysing the background of the professionals within this particular area. In general the theories have emerged in capitalist Western countries and their goals are to improve efficiency and/or create profit of companies or organisations. They are, except for very few cases, written by white, middle class men (Hofstede 1980:50) with background in a seemingly homogenous cultural context.

I will also recognise that there is a difference between management and leadership, but as Schmuck (1986) says:

administrators should combine both leadership and management skills into their repertoires...Leadership brings energy, enthusiasm, and commitment ... Management brings the efficiency, the concern with the detail and co-ordination (Schmuck in Van der Mescht 1996:7).

I will adopt Schmuck's stand of leadership within management in this section and by doing that I will draw on literature from both management theory and leadership theory and let them inform the study.

2.2.1 Classical organisational theory

This approach is also named scientific management and is often connected to Frederick W. Taylor in the US and Henri Fayol in France. The start was originally developed by Taylor (1911) on the basis of daily day experiences from factories and companies. He believed: "that individuals could be programmed to be efficient machines" (Hoy & Miskel 1996:9). The individual would have to adapt to the machine. It was the physical production which was the focus. There was 'the best way' to produce things: it had to be rational.

Fayol's work from the same period was also based on these scientific principles but was more concentrated around: "...management and the application of sound management principles and techniques rather than the minute details of production" (George in Michael 2000:5). Fayol represented the administrative management theory. The manager's role was planning, organising, commending, co-ordinating and controlling. Hoy & Miskel (1996:10) say that Fayol worked from managing director and down and Taylor's human engineers from the individual worker and up.

Some of the implications of this approach were on the increased efficiency, productivity and earning, which would serve the goal of effectiveness. On the other hand it neglected social dynamics and that people are different, not a machine part. The management system was rather rigid and would have problems in coping with outside events.

It was overwhelmingly task oriented. Not people oriented, and not dealing with the relations to the environment it operated in. I find that it would be difficult to accommodate cultural differences within this approach.

2.2.2 Human relations approach

As a reaction to the rational approach, Mary Parker Follett stressed the human side of administration and she: “believed that the fundamental problem in all organisations was developing and maintaining dynamic and harmonious relationships” (Hoy & Miskel 1996:12).

Later the Hawthorne studies supported this by showing the importance of the informal organisation, which is an unofficial social structure within an organisation with its own norms, values, sentiments, and communication patterns.

I find that the approach supports the idea of efficiency and that an organisation should create profit. The manager would have almost the same role as the manager in the scientific approach. But the main idea is that it is the individual’s identification with a group and the dynamics in the group that is seen as the driving force in an organisation.

The focus of this approach was both related to the task and the person, but with the main emphasis on the person. It was mainly interested in what was going on within the organisation and not in its external environment. This approach would have a better chance of accommodating cultural aspects than the scientific approach because of the emphasis on the human factor. On the other hand I find that this interest in the persons is basically for the interest of the effectiveness, achieving goals, and efficiency, “make technically correct, rational decisions based on the facts” (Hoy & Miskel 1996:49) of the organisation and therefore it is less likely that cultural aspects would be considered

2.2.3 The systems approach

This approach has got a more eclectic background with ideas drawn from psychology, sociology, economy and political science. Chester Barnard used it to describe behaviour in organisations, specifically the interaction between the informal and the formal organisations. Later Parsons stressed the importance of the environment for the system – open systems thinking (Hoy & Miskel 1996:16).

The open systems thinking is a rather comprehensive and more holistic approach. It deals with the individual, the system and its dynamic elements and the interrelations with the surroundings. It has elements from the task, the person as well as the situation. An important new part is the culture of the organisation. Hoy and Miskel (1996:129) defines culture as: “Shared orientations that hold the unit together and give it a distinct identity”.

Culture is in this way used as supporting the feeling of belonging to the in-group, different from all other groups. It has to do with norms, values and assumptions often developed in the informal system. Culture is not seen as the culture of the environment the organisation is embedded in, but more as a means to support the organisation: “effective organizations have strong and distinctive corporate cultures” (Hoy & Miskel 1996:128). This approach emphasises opportunities for process management and downplays the role of more scientific or rational management approaches.

This approach will be able to contain cultural differences, but when the overall goal is the effectiveness of the organisation, it could be that these differences will be downplayed on the expense of task issues.

2.2.4 Reflections inspired by the above described approaches

Looking at the three management approaches there has been a move from the task issues to the person and finally to a combination of the two. The last approach, open systems thinking, also acknowledge the importance of the environment an

organisation is set in. At the same time the approaches become more able to accommodate cultural diversity because “the perspective shifts attention away from the effectiveness of results to the quality of all aspects of the system” (Hoy & Miskel 1996:263). It still seems that it is mainly seen as an idea to pursue the maximum effectiveness and efficiency of the organisation, but with the change of scope of these two concepts from results to also include quality it opens up for cultural diversity. This leads me in the next to describe two approaches which I find are sufficiently open and sensitive to cater for and work with cultural differences.

2.2.5 Approaches which are sensitive towards cultural issues

The first is the Learning Organisation (LO) which Peter Senge (1997) describes in his book *The Fifth Discipline*. A LO is an organisation which is being able to cope with a rapidly changing environment. This again stresses the effectiveness factor. But what is interesting in this case is the five disciplines which must be mastered in a LO: “...personal mastery, mental models, building shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking” (French and Bell 1995:93). Mental models includes how we picture the world, shared visions are guiding principles shared and developed by the group, and team learning is to make use of the abilities of all the participants. When this works an enduring change/development will occur at a deeper level because it is associated not only with objectives, but also with values and beliefs. This approach is open for cultural differences and if it is a true LO it will be able to incorporate them in the organisation as an asset.

Another interesting approach is the idea of regarding an organisation as a community. “Communities are different by their centres. Centres are repositories of values, sentiments, and beliefs that provide the needed cement for uniting people in a common cause” (Sergiovanni, 1992:41). The participants: “...have a special obligation to help construct the centre of shared values” (Sergiovanni, 1992:42). By adopting this approach the organisation will need less and less formal structures and the function of a traditional management will be minimised. This approach is very much concerned with personal and situational aspects.

Both approaches are stressing that it should be deeper processes related to common values and beliefs which should be the driving force in an organisation. I find that both of these approaches could be appropriate for developing organisations which would be able to incorporate and make use of cultural aspects as a way to improve their operations. They are both mainly process oriented and not solely result orientated.

2.2.6 Leadership literature

Since I adopted the idea of leadership within management I will shortly elaborate on the functions and types of leaders. It will mainly be in relation to their possibilities to support incorporation of cultural values in organisations. In the literature about leadership there are trends similar to the above described in the management literature.

Hoy & Miskel (1996:372) say that leaders are important: "...because they serve as anchors, provide guidance in times of change, and they are responsible for the effectiveness of organizations". They further see leadership as "...a social influence process..." (*ibid.*:372). These two quotations contain the essence of much leadership theory, namely the relationship between the personal traits of the leader and the situation they operate in. Van der Mescht (1996:8) states that: "...The trait approach dominated leadership research until the middle of [the last century]" (my addition). This was later followed by the view that leadership was: "...entirely situational in origin..." (Bass 1990:98).

From these two directions the contingency approach to leadership was developed. It was an attempt to answer the question: "What particular style in what special situation?" (Hoy & Miskel 1996:392). To accomplish this they tried to explain the interrelationships among traits, situations, behaviours, and effectiveness (Hoy & Miskel 1996:372).

2.2.7 Two different value-based views on leadership

Earlier it was suggested that the community concept of organisations built on common values, beliefs and norms developed in the organisation. The ultimate situation would be that the leader role would disappear. It is to a big extent participant driven and therefore it will be able to include cultural values in its operations.

The other vein is based on Burns (1978) ideas of transformational leaders. Transformational leadership has its basis: "...in personal values and beliefs of leaders...transformational leaders are able to both unite followers and change their goals and beliefs in ways that produce higher levels of performance" (Hoy & Miskel 1996:393). What is interesting here is that it is the values of the leader which are the guiding principles. At the same time the leader should encourage: "followers to take responsibility for their own development and that of others" (Hoy & Miskel 1996:393). Seen in relation to accepting cultural differences, it will be possible. But it is dependent on what the created visions and goals of the organisation are and especially those of the leader.

2.2.8 Reflections on leadership theory

It is difficult to get a clear picture of leadership theory, except that it is developed in the tension between the person and the situation orientation. If I look at it with this study in mind where I also advocate leadership within management I will argue that cultural dimensions are more likely to be considered if the leader is democratic, open and responsive. The democratic leadership style refers to the three styles; democratic, autocratic and laissez faire, described by Lewin, Lippitt and White in 1938 (Van der Mescht 1996:10).

The leadership is to a large extent determined by the type of organisation it is set in. Some of these have been described earlier in this chapter. If the system is rigid and formal it is not likely that a democratic leader would be able to incorporate cultural values in the organisation. On the other hand, if the system is based on values, beliefs and norms, the leader is more likely to be able to take cultural values into

account. Such a situation would enhance the possible acceptance of differences. But still the issue has to serve the effectiveness of the organisation.

2.2.9 Summary

From this review it seems that Western management theories have developed models which often are based on the task and the personal dimensions. Cultural differences seem not to be of major interest if they do not serve the effectiveness of the organisations. Though the community type of organisation and the LO are the most possible models of accommodating it.

The leadership literature seems mostly confined to serve the function/effectiveness of the organisations and the literature indicates a great interest in the trait and situation dimensions described earlier under management theories. The leadership theory seems to supplement the management theory in its support to effectiveness and organisation goals. The overall impression is that leadership is an important factor in organisations and that the leaders personal styles, values and beliefs would be an important factor for the organisation to be able to accommodate cultural differences. The exception from this would be the community type of organisation which is described before.

An aspect which is of importance for this study is the cultural values and beliefs representing the African continent. Therefore I will in the next section take a closer look at the Ubuntu movement which claims to have an afro-centric approach to management based on African concepts and values.

2.3 UBUNTU, A SUGGESTED SYNERGY OF AFRICAN VALUES AND WESTERN MANAGEMENT MODELS

The *Ubuntu* concept is developed in a Southern African context. It acknowledges, like Hofstede, that it is not possible to export management theories directly from one country to another. It seems to support a synergy of the two: “In Southern Africa it

is essential to adapt Western management concepts to address our own daunting management challenges” (Mbigi & Maree 1995:84).

In *Ubuntu*, which is based on the African community concept (communalism) is regarded as accounting for African traditions and culture. The core values are: “group solidarity, conformity, compassion, respect, human dignity and collective unity” (Mbigi & Maree 1995:2). For an organisation this implies according to Khoza (1994:124) that team learning should be prioritised, a greater emphasis should be put on consensus in decision making and on social responsibility.

About management/leaders it is required that they should be approachable, the atmosphere should be informal, “Managers should strive to understand the world-views of those they manage and share the feelings of being human along with them” (*ibid.*:122), and there should be a free flow of information.

If we compare these ideas in *Ubuntu* with the management theories it is interesting to see that there are a number of them which in one way or another could be accommodated in some of the Western management theories. I have earlier described the LO (p 17) and the idea of organisations as communities as two models which would be able to accommodate cultural values. At the same time it seems that they are also built on assumptions/concepts which are very similar to the ones *Ubuntu* are built around.

The biggest difference seems to be that they come from two regions with a different understanding of what community means. The:

collectivist European society...is an assembly of individuals. The collectivist society inevitably places the emphasis on the individual, on his original activity and his needs ... African society puts more stress on the groups than on the individual, more on solidarity than on the activity and needs of the individual, more on the communion of persons than their autonomy” (Senghor cited in Shutte 1996:30).

This gives a different understanding of the group and thereby also to teamwork and participation, which are fundamental to both views of management approaches. The European will add the individuality to others individuality and by that create the community. The African community society is suggested based on the general activity of the group on which the individual then can act.

On the other hand I do not see this as an obstacle for using teamwork and the participatory approach in the daily running of organisations. By this I will argue that the *Ubuntu* concept not really presents a plausible alternative to existing management theories. But I find it though to be an important contribution to management thinking because it stresses the importance of understanding ones own cultural heritage before embarking on theories from other cultures. And it could stimulate organisations to assess their value background. By that I think it might be possible to create organisations built on what is shared in common and not on the differences. But it will have to be on the basis of existing management models.

2.4 SUMMARY

Hofstede in his survey, which was empirical and conducted in 40 different countries, argues that management theory, generally of Western origin, cannot be applied directly in another county.

He used four cultural dimensions to characterise national characteristics. The national characteristics could then be a background for understanding management theories applicability to other countries. His findings were and is still of interest for organisations that operate in different cultures or are multicultural as long as they are used with appropriate consideration of their contexts.

Western management theories have developed over a period of almost hundred years and are to a large extent products of the time and culture they were developed in. The theories describe the tension between the task, the person and the situation. In the beginning the theories were guided by the scientific approach to management and

its quest for obtaining results. Over time new approaches emerged which stressed the human side of management and later that organisations were to be regarded as more complex systems. This change implicated also that the goals of the organisations changed towards also including the quality of all aspects of the organisation. By this change organisations became more capable of accommodating cultural dimensions.

The leaders attitude and style in an organisation is often described as important. The more humane and democratic the leader is the bigger chance there would be for accommodating cultural values.

The *Ubuntu* movement in Southern Africa claims to represent a management system which is based on African values. It seems that it does not present a real alternative to the present theories, but has its value in raising awareness of the importance of knowing ones own cultural heritage, in this case the African community concept. This awareness would enhance the quality of the organisation as described above (p16).

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I will first describe four research paradigms. I will select the paradigm which I find is the most appropriate for my research question and discuss problems and main features of the selected paradigm. As the last part of the chapter I describe in details the path I decided to follow.

3.1 PARADIGMS

A research paradigm is defined by Bassey (1995) as:

A network of coherent ideas about the nature of the world and the functions of researchers which, adhered to by a group of researchers, conditions the patterns of their thinking and underpin their research actions (Bassey, 1995:12).

I believe that it is important to be aware of the distinction Bassey makes between the ideas, which is related to the underlying assumptions of the paradigm, and the research actions which is more related to the methods used during research. The assumptions, which are the ontological and epistemological assumptions and have to do with belief, are of such a nature that they will guide the researcher through the whole research process. The methods used in research processes are multiple and many of them can be used under different paradigms. Durrheim (1999) points out that it is important researchers recognise that their research is embedded in a paradigm and he also stresses that the research design is to be coherent. In the following I will describe the ontological and epistemological aspects of different paradigms to establish an understanding of them which enables me to choose the paradigm which will inform me through my research.

3.1.1 Positivism

Janse van Rensburg (1995) argues that the social sciences went through a period influenced by the research design of the positivist paradigm, which is rooted in the natural sciences. It was regarded as **the** scientific method. Further she claims that the thinking is still prevalent in much of the research done within educational research.

The purpose of research in this paradigm is to:

Discover laws and generalizations which explain reality and allow to predict and control (Cantrell 1993:83).

The ontological assumptions are characterised by Cantrell (1993) as a belief of a single reality which can be divided into fragments. These fragments can be measured and described through scientific methods. The epistemological assumptions are that events are based on facts and that there is a cause-effect relation between facts. The researcher is independent, separated from the researched and is value free.

3.1.2 The interpretive paradigm

Cantrell (1993) describes the purpose of research within this paradigm as to:

Understand and interpret daily occurrences and social structures as well as the meanings people give to the phenomena. (Cantrell 1993:83).

The underlying ontological assumptions of the paradigm Cantrell (1993) describes by saying that there are multiple realities, it is constructed in the mind through human interaction, it is holistic and divergent. The epistemological assumptions are that events are understood through the individual's interpretation derived in a social context. The researcher is a part of the research process participating in a dialogic

situation with the researched. It is recognised that the researcher has values which is a part of the process.

Janse van Rensburg (1995:31) argues that this paradigm is an attempt to avoid the technician and de-humanising elements in the positivist paradigm. Instead it is producing a wealth of descriptive data that highlight complexity and promote broad insights into situations.

3.1.3 The critical paradigm

The purpose of research informed by this paradigm is according to Cantrell (1993) to:

Emancipate people through critique of ideologies that promote inequity and through change in personal understanding and action that lead to transformation of self-consciousness and social conditions (Cantrell 1993:83).

The ontological assumptions described by Cantrell (1993:83) are, that there are multiple realities. Reality is constructed by the human mind and it is holistic and divergent. It is influenced by issues of equity and hegemony. The epistemological assumptions say that events are understood within a social and economic context with emphasis on ideological critique and praxis. The researcher is a part of the research process, which is influenced by society and committed to emancipation. The values of the researcher are paramount and devoted to ideological critique and concern for inequities.

The quest for working toward change makes this paradigm special useful when the research is based on participation of the researched in the whole process.

3.1.4 Deconstructive/poststructural approaches

It is more difficult to give a clear description of these approaches. It is a kind of overarching heading covering different directions. Language plays a central role in the approaches.

The common purpose of these approaches are that they:

Question totalising or unified interpretations and understandings. View them as partial. Seek to locate dominant interests and modes of producing and maintain them. How marginal positions are constructed with reference to dominant norms and what positions are possible for marginalized groups (Connole 1993:23).

Connole (1993:22) states that the ontological assumptions are, that there is no 'reality' and that 'reality' is constituted in and through language as discourse. Reality is represented through the discourse. Epistemological assumptions include that the researcher interrogates various discourses that constitute the area of investigation and analyses power relations generated through the discourses. The researcher is a part of a value system and is therefore included in power relations.

Through a discourse analysis the researcher is searching for the deeper meanings of what is expressed through language. I find that in this method the researcher has to be very confident in the language used in the study.

3.2 SELECTION OF PARADIGM

With these assumptions in mind I took the following into consideration when I decided which paradigm would be the most appropriate for my research: What the purpose of the research was, the context of the research and my beliefs and preferences.

I decided to conduct the research within the interpretive tradition. Bassey (1995) describes the tradition as:

Interpretation is a search for deep perspectives on particular events and for theoretical insights. It may offer possibilities, but no certainties, as to the outcome of future events (Bassey 1995:12).

It will allow me to describe leaders and participants perceptions of managerial aspects of the former LSP and it can provide data which add to the overall understanding of the project. It is a part of the picture of the project.

The approach is based on subjectivity and it does not have a theory which has to be confirmed through the research process. There is no agenda. This also means that the approach will allow me to let the research path develop throughout the process in accordance with what new discoveries emerge.

The circumstances under which the research was conducted also favoured this approach. The LSP terminated just before I started the research process. This put me in a situation where I only could get in contact with some of the persons from the former project. This favoured in depth interviews which is a common method within the interpretive approach.

I firmly believe in social constructivism which says, that we construct our own view of the world in interaction with our social context. Therefore the personal perceptions of the interviewees will contribute to others as well as my own understanding of the world.

By locating the research within the interpretative paradigm, by others called hermeneutic, symbolic or naturalistic, I recognise that 'reality' is constructed in and by the human mind and also that I as a researcher bring my values into the research. The acceptance of these assumptions means that I will have to be open and conscious about my role in the process.

This paradigm has some ontological and epistemological similarities with the critical and post modernist paradigms. And I recognise that these two directions might have influenced me during the research process. Issues like: equity and personal emancipation, power relations and the role of the language, have in one way or another had an impact on me when I decided to study this particular topic. I find that the interpretative paradigm, which by some are characterised as being holistic, contextual, inductive or dialectic; pluralistic or relative, cater for this by its

rummelighed, which is a Danish word that expresses it can contain many things, and acknowledgement of subjectivity in the research process.

By embarking on the interpretative approach I also adopt a subjective or qualitative research stand. Merriam in Winegardner (2001) says that in qualitative research meaning is mediated through the investigator's own perceptions and that the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. This has implications for key issues like objectivity, validity and reliability as well as on ethical issues which I will deal with in the following.

3.3 KEY ISSUES RELATED TO THIS RESEARCH METHOD

3.3.1 Objectivity

In qualitative research the researcher is put into the context of a situation to understand it. At the same time the respondent is an active participant in the process of getting knowledge. Popkewitz (1984) says:

Objectivity is not a law that guides individuals, but the result of an intersubjective consensus that occurs through social interaction (Popkewitz 1984:42).

This means that objectivity in the traditional scientific (positivist) sense, where the researcher is separated from the researched and claims to have no biases, has lost its meaning. Objectivity is relative and can only be seen as related to the particular cases.

3.3.2 Validity and reliability

Validity generally refers to the accuracy and value of the interpretations and is normally linked to objectivity. If we look at the concept of validity in qualitative research Winegardner (2001) says that since objectivity is rejected in the qualitative research there will be other criteria for validity. She further says that there are no uniformly agreed criteria but anyhow gives examples of criteria which might be

useful for this type of research. From these I have selected the criteria I find might determine the interpretive validity of this research. In the part of her paper where the criteria are mentioned she describes case studies when they are conducted in qualitative research and the following criteria will therefore also be valid for the qualitative research used in this study:

- Research positioning, a demonstrated sensitivity by the researcher to how he or she relates to the case studied.
- Reporting style, the ability to reconstruct the participants' reality credibly and authentically.
- Member checking, the corroboration of data by participants in the case study.
- Usefulness, the extent to which a case study is enlightening and liberating.
- Chain of evidence, meaningful links between research questions, raw data, and findings.
- Pattern matching, the extent to which patterns discovered in case study data correspond to predictions from the pre-determined set of theoretical propositions (Winegardner 2001:8).

Reliability generally refers to the extent to which other researchers would arrive at the same results if they studied the same issue using exactly the same process. Both validity and reliability are assessed in the context and not against external and objective standards. In the subjective research Winegardner (2001) says there is little distinction between the two. She argues further that:

Reliability is less a function of replicability and more a function of credibility of the researcher's knowledge claims and acknowledges claims of his or her central role, relationship, and biases in the research (Winegardner 2001:9).

Merriam, cited in Winegardner (2001:9) says:

Rigor in qualitative research derives from the researcher's presence, the nature of the interaction between the researcher and the participants, the triangulation of data, the interpretation of perceptions, and rich, thick description.

In the writings about qualitative research it is often argued that triangulation should be used to assure trustworthiness. Triangulation is defined by Cantrell (1993) as:

Triangulation involves cross-checking data and interpretations by drawing upon different data sources, methods, and perspectives (Cantrell 1993:100).

This study works with perceptions, it is subjective in nature, and I will argue that it is not possible and justifiable to use triangulation, cross-checking, in this research. To me it is a way of imposing the positivistic assumptions, described earlier in this chapter, onto a research based on a completely different ontology and epistemology. I will not use other sources as a means of cross checking but instead use it in a way which will add to and illustrate the issues brought forward. My use of triangulation is that of “completeness” described by Arksey and Knight (1999) as:

The completeness function of triangulation is also relevant to work that adopts an explicitly qualitative stance, where investigators tend to dislike structured approaches and instead welcome any information that add depth and breadth of understanding (Arksey and Knight 1999:22).

3.3.3 Ethics

In a subjective research the ethic aspects needs a special attention. I will shortly describe two ethic dimensions which I find are important for this study.

The first is related to the persons who participated in the process. It was important for me that these persons have got all the information about the intention of the research, what their role was, and what they might benefit from it. At the same time it was important that the anonymity of the persons and any sensitive information is presented in a way that secures this anonymity.

The second ethical aspect is that of going through the research process with what Bassey (1995) calls respect for truth:

Researchers are expected to be truthful in data collection, analysis and reporting of findings (Bassey 1995:16).

To abide with this I will be as open as possible about the research process and my involvement in it as possible. I will therefore in the next section where I describe the research path include a discussion of the key values as they occurred.

3.4 THE RESEARCH PATH

3.4.1 The background and start of the research

When I started this research I could see that there could be raised questions about my impartiality in the whole process. After many years in the project I would have developed a personal understanding of the project which might come out in the research. It was of great concern for me. A way of dealing with this is that I, as open as possible, will describe the process, so the reader can judge by him or herself if there is rigour, as described before, in the research.

I have ideas about management from my studies in that field and when I looked at the management of the LSP I could see that I was on my way to classifying the project even before I started the research. To avoid this pitfall I decided that I would have to investigate the perceptions of the two groups of participants, and that the best method for this would be through in-depth interviews. I didn't know at that stage how I would conduct the interviews. To keep my own opinions or biases out as much as possible I decided to construct a questionnaire (see Appendix 2) that would guide me to develop questions for the later interviews based on the premises of the participants.

I found that some of the questions Hofstede (1980), described in chapter 2, used in his research on management in different cultures, would be useful in this research. The result was a questionnaire with 52 questions covering the areas from: power relations, uncertainty avoidance, the masculinity, and individualism. The questionnaire was sent to 7 Danish and 14 Namibian staff members and I got 7

answers back from each group. One could argue that the English used in the questionnaire was very advanced and that the two groups were too small etc. The purpose of this was to give ideas for the interviews and not a scientific survey in the positivist sense.

The questionnaires showed that the Danes were a very homogenous group and that the Namibians were more divergent as a group in their answers. This could lead to that the interview questions would be constructed according to what the Danes were very 'strong' about. To give all the interviewees an equal starting point I embarked upon using focussed questions and open-ended questions (see Appendix 1). Focussed questions are often used when the interviewees have been involved in the same process, here the LSP. Guba and Lincoln (1981, cited in Cantrell 1993:96) say that open-ended questions are most appropriate:

When the issue is complex, the relevant dimensions are unknown, or the interest of the research lies in the description of a phenomenon, the exploration of a process, or the individual's formulation of an issue.

I also felt that by adopting a phenomenological attitude as far as possible during the interviews and in the writing of the Data chapter, I would allow the interviewee's perspectives to come out more articulate. The attitude I am referring to is explained by Stones (1988) as:

Phenomenological reduction – a process of suspending, or bracketing, of personal preconceptions and presuppositions by making them explicit ... through this process the researcher attempts to approach the phenomenon of investigation from a position of conceptual silence (Stones in Van der Mescht 1996:46).

For the interviews it meant that I would let the interviewees direct the interviews as much as possible, trying to keep my personal preconceptions out. My task would be to be an attentive listener who would ask for deeper explanations of areas that seemed to be of special interest for the interviewee. I would have a list of open-ended questions related to the topic ready as a kind of back-up in case the interview

would stop prematurely or that it would not touch upon management and cultural issues at all.

For the writing of the data it meant that I would try to let the data speak for themselves before I in a later chapter would do the data analysis. It also meant that I decided to leave the literature studies until I finished the data writing for not to be influenced by different theories and research.

I of course acknowledge that it is not possible to enter a research as this without being influenced by previous experiences and knowledge, but my intention was to bracket my personal beliefs and preconditions as much as possible.

3.4.2 Sampling

The question of who should be interviewed was very clear to me from the beginning. I would have some from the managerial group to express their perceptions of their role and the overall management of the project and a Namibian group of ATs from the normal staff to explain how they saw the management. It would allow me to incorporate managerial as well as cultural aspects in the research. Some, especially positivists, would probably say that these two groups cannot be compared, it is like comparing apples and pears. The idea of this research is not to compare, it is to describe and understand a phenomena and for that purpose as many and also different perceptions add richness to the data. If you want to give a picture of an orchard you get a better and a more comprehensive understanding of it if both apples and pears are described.

The actual persons interviewed, 4 females and 3 males, was a question of who I could get in contact with. The sampling was thus guided chiefly by convenience and was largely purposeful, since contacted the persons I knew could contribute rich data. In qualitative research you look for where you can get the information you need for the study.

The interviews took place in Denmark and in Namibia. In Namibia I had originally planned 4 interviews with people from 4 different regions, but after 3 interviews I found that the material was sufficient for the purpose of the research. Cantrell (1995) says:

Identifying a realistic ending point, based upon redundancy, becomes a critical issue for the interpretive inquirer (Cantrell 1995:91).

The managers group represented the whole time span from the start of the project until its termination. The ATs were connected to the project the last six years of its existence.

3.4.3 Interviews

Stones (1988) expresses very clearly my ideas of how to conduct the interviews:

The research interview should be open-ended and conducted in an informal, non-directive manner, the interviewer attempting to influence the subject as little as possible. If the researcher fails to understand a particular point made by the subject, it is imperative that clarification be sought, with the proviso that leading questions be avoided (Stones cited in Kruger 1988:151).

I did the selection of the interviewees as described previously. All the interviews took place at times that would suit both the interviewees and me. Three of the interviews were conducted at different places in Denmark, two of them in their private homes and one at a school after working hours. In Namibia one was at an office during the day and three in connection with a workshop after the days program was completed.

The interview technique I used was new to me, and I decided to let the first interview work as a pilot interview. It would allow me to assess my interview skills and also to find out if I was able to elicit the rich data I hoped for, if important new issues would emerge that should be included on my interview guide, and how the respondent would evaluate the method and my involvement. As Stones says:

Since it is crucial that an appropriate focus question be asked, a pilot study is often necessary adjunct to the main endeavour (Stones cited in Kruger 1988:151).

This interview was so full of information and insight that I included it in the data collection. I found that it was possible not to go into a conversation, even though at times I would like to comment issues, and that it was difficult to be a good and attentive listener when the interview got too long. The interview provided two new items for the interview guide.

The participants were contacted either on phone or personally before the interviews for me to explain the purpose of the research and to get their acceptance to participate. I explained in detail the method I would use because it was a new approach for most of the participants. It was stressed that it was **their** story of the LSP that was important and also that their anonymity would be secured and that I would do the transcription of the interviews myself.

I did not feel that it was a problem to create rapport. I have worked with all but one for several years and the atmosphere during the interviews was relaxed. The fact that we all had an intensive knowledge of the project helped to establish the rapport.

Each interview would typically start by short repeating the purpose of the session, especially stressing that it was their personal perception/story which was important. As the point of departure for the interview they were asked to tell how they got involved in the LSP.

In most of the interviews I did not have to interfere much after the start since the items in the questions guide in general were covered during the sessions. I just had to tick off on the guide when an issue was done. In two of the interviews I had to make more use of the guide.

After each session I asked them to assess the method, my role and interview technique, and what they experienced through the process. All expressed that it was **their** interview and not mine and that I did not control it. One asked if I was sure I

got the information I wanted. The answers also opened my eyes for how deep/strong the narrative works. It could be illustrated with comments that it was almost like therapy and that it gave a chance to revise deeper assumptions. In my personal notes, which I compiled after the interviews, I reflected on this since it will have an impact on the outcome of each interview.

When I decided to use the interview as a research tool I also had to consider its weaknesses. One is that my personal bias and interests will emerge through the sessions. Above I explained my intentions to be unbiased, but I can see that certain areas at times were allowed more attention than others. For example the issue of ownership to the project. It could be because of my interest in the issue, but I also found that it was important for the participants. In cases like that I tried to let the interviewees explain deeper by using examples and their personal experiences. I found it was a way of keeping my person in the background.

Another problem is that interviews are dependent on the respondents' ability to recall and communicate. The interviews were all conducted in English which is a second language for all. This limits the diversity of expressing oneself as clearly as you could in your mother tongue. The further an event is away in time the more likely it is that it will affect one's perceptions. Often it becomes more rosy or more thorny. Some interviewees left the project some years ago and others have stopped just few months before the interviews. This I had to consider when I wrote the Data and Data Analysis sections.

The physical and emotional state have influence too. Even though some were just from work or workshops I found that when the first few minutes had gone, the issues were so interesting and catching that it was me who in the end got tired concentrating on what was said.

Even though I feel that the interaction during the interviews was open and relaxed I also acknowledge that it is influenced by the role I had in the project, the role they had. In the interviews with the ATs, it could have an influence that I am from another culture, that I might be seen as representing the project, and my age and sex. These

issues are difficult to avoid but I feel that they were not influencing the interviews in a way that would invalidate the research.

As the last but not the least, interviews are heavily dependent on the interviewing skills of the researcher. I found that it was easier to interview participants from my own country. A lifted eyebrow would indicate that you could elaborate more on an issue. I had to 'work' more in the interviews with the ATs. It could be because of the already mentioned problems but also be related to cultural issues as well as my questioning technique. I do feel though, that the data I collected using the interview tool were sufficient rich, comprehensive and valuable for the purpose of the research. In the end it will be up to the reader to judge if my efforts were successful.

3.4.4 The data

When the data from the seven interviews were transcribed I could see that there were many pages. The interview technique I have used produced data which clearly mirrored that it was seven very different personalities who was interviewed. The data were rich and covering many aspects. This left me with the problem of what and how I would present it. Bogdan & Biklen say:

Analysis involves working with data, organizing it, breaking it down, synthesizing it, searching for patterns, discovering what you will tell others (Bogdan & Biklen cited in Cantrell 1993:97).

Throughout the interview period and especially when the transcripts were typed the first patterns and themes started to emerge. More reading of the transcripts told me that at this point it was necessary to organise the data. I could see that the statements in the transcripts, concerning managerial and cultural issues, could be accommodated in the following areas which are areas inspired by managerial theory: 1. Focus of the project. 2. The structure of the project, 3. Management of the project. 4. Human capacity building in the project, and 5. LSP in the Namibian context. Each of these sections would contain several themes represented by quotations related to the heading. It was a difficult task to place the quotations in the sections. Some of them

would fit into more than one section and sometimes I had to put quotations into a section where other researchers probably would have preferred another section. With this in mind I still find that the result of this process gives a fair and comprehensive impression of the interviewees' perceptions.

I wanted to present the data in a form that was as loyal as possible to the transcripts and at the same time would be reader friendly. It could be linked to Terre Blanche and Durrheim (1999) when they say that research becomes a creative activity. I embarked on a narrative where the respondents would give voice to the 'story of management in the LSP' and I linked their quotations together to make it coherent.

I acknowledge that my selection of the quotations and the writing of the data, the narrative, is crucial for the research. It could be presented in a way where my biases and hidden agendas are dominant. I only embarked on this form of presentation when I realised that the more I read the transcripts the more I was able to keep my own person out of the stories told by the interviewees. I adopt Patton's thoughts (1990):

There are no absolute rules except to do the very best with your full intellect to fairly represent the data and communicate what the data reveals given the purpose of the study... (Patton cited in Cantrell 1993:97).

I can only hope that the readers will accept my selection and judgement as sound and written in accordance with the spirit of the interviewees.

3.4.5 Data analysis

As described in the previous section the data analysis actually started by looking at and presenting the data. In the data analysis I elaborated on issues/themes in the data. I let these themes together with the research goal guide me in selecting the literature for the literature review. I find what Popkewitz (1984) explains:

The notion of theory, however, shifts from a search for lawlike regularities about nature of social behaviour [as in positivism] to the

identification of social rules that underlie and govern the use of social 'fact' (Popkewitz 1984:41).

supports my use of additional information as a way of identifying underlying social rules. The purpose is to develop theory not to test theory. To illuminate aspects of the project and not to evaluate it. The literature review should add to and supplement the interviews to give a better understanding thereof. The literature which is of relevance for this research was drawn from management theory in general, management in different cultures, cultural studies, and material from the LSP archives.

3.4.6 Discussion of the research method

I have already in this chapter described the model and discussed some of the critical aspects of my research and I will not go more in details with them.

The persons in the interview have given one picture of the management. If I have had other respondents I am positive that new and different areas of interest also would have emerged. This would most likely have added new dimensions to the research. Especially it would have been of interest to have all the educational regions in Namibia represented. But logistical, time and expenses wise it was not possible. These limitations also excluded me from going back to the interviewees to get further clarifications of issues. The interviews had to be done in 'one go'.

I thought that the questionnaire would have given me many ideas about areas which could support me during the interviews. It was not the case. I should have been stricter on what to include in it so it would have been shorter and more focussed. However the process of developing it was a way for me to think deeper about the cultural implications in organisations and it was also useful in the data analysing process.

The method of letting few respondents talk as freely as possible and then use it for research is a controversial issue. Critics with roots in the paradigms described before

would probably say that by using this method one would take for granted whatever perception the interviewees air and that this is naive. I can see the point but if the purpose, like in this research, is to describe what some participants have perceived I find it acceptable because it is context specific and it is up to the reader to find themes/experiences that can be related to their own experiences and thus facilitate greater understanding of the phenomenon in question. This touches upon the important issue of making generalisation from a research which, like this research, is subjective in nature. Stake describes:

...the generalisability [of qualitative research] as “naturalistic” that is, context specific and in harmony with the reader’s experience, and thus a natural basis for generalisation (Stake cited in Winegardner 2001:12).

With these critical points and with the description of the path with its strengths and weaknesses in mind, I feel that the method has been useful and that the findings from it serve the purpose of the research.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE DATA

In this chapter I will work with the data I have collected through interviews in Denmark and Namibia of the two groups of staff members from the former Life Science Project, managers from Denmark and Namibian advisory teachers. The interviews were conducted in such a way that it would allow the interviewees to express themselves as freely as possible without many guiding questions from my side. All the interviews would start with a question about how they got involved with the LSP. From then it was the interviewee who was in charge of the direction of the interview. My task was to stimulate them to explain more deeply when they went into areas which seemed to be of special interest for them. I had prepared some supporting questions (see Appendix 1) covering aspects related to management of the project in case the interview got into a deadlock or did not touch on anything about management.

Before the actual interviews the interviewees were contacted on the phone or personally to get their acceptance and at the same time I explained which area I was researching. I explained which method I intended to use and also that it was important that they would talk of what they found was important for them

Embarking on this method I ended up with a lot of data. Each of the 7 interviewees had their main areas of interest, but at the same time general themes emerged. Some seemed more of interest for Namibians, others for the Danes but in general most of the themes were dealt with by both groups.

At times the Namibians are described as one group and the Danes as another. By this it is not the intention to create a feeling of two groups competing with one another, but it is only for the purpose of writing the data in a more accessible form. I acknowledge that the two groups have different backgrounds, but perceive it as an asset for the project that different values have contributed to its development.

In recognition of the big amount of and variety in the data I have decided to group it in the following sections, which very much express the main areas the interviewees touched upon: (1) The goals of the project, (2) The structure of the project, (3) Management and leadership of the project, (4) Human capacity building in the project and, (5) The project in the Namibian context.

Each section begins with a short description, written in italics, of what themes emerged from the data. From there I will use quotations from the interviews to add substance to the themes. Some of the themes are of such a nature that it is not possible to illustrate them solely by quotations within the limits of this paper. In these cases I have extracted the essence thereof.

To make the chapter more user friendly I have after each quotation indicated with a (M1, M2, M3, M4) the different managers and (AT1, AT2, AT3) when it is from Namibian advisory teachers.

4.1 THE FOCUS OF THE PROJECT

/ The managers express themselves mostly on the content of the subject Life Science. They talk about a project document and also about the sustainability of the project. The ATs focus on the area of capacity building and link it to the sustainability of the subject. Both groups acknowledge that the function of the LSP is to implement a new subject and that it is a part of the new educational reform /

From the beginning there was drafted a project document. It was meant to be the guideline for what would take place in the project. The data show that it was in a difficult political situation right after independence and that it was done in a very short time.

In the beginning of the project what happened

... was very often determined by the things which happened in the Ministry rather than within the project. (M3)

The guidance from the project document in the daily work is described as follows:

It somehow means that this project document does not mean a lot in the daily work. It means something for the framework where you are working within and also for the economical side of it. But how each of us worked in our daily life was according to how you and I, each of us was thinking practically. Within our own philosophy. Not according to the high wording. And I think it is always like that. You can only hope that the people that are selected for that kind of job they are selected because of some resources some thinking which is in line with the project document.(M2)

The project document is likely to have a big influence on the reports which are produced at certain intervals. What was to be reported was,

...how many books were distributed, how many teachers attended your in-service training, how many schools did you visit. But you were never asked how are you dealing with the ownership, how was the sustainability of the project, never. Which to me indicate that it was not a part of the thinking. And it was not required from Ibis in Copenhagen and Danida that these things should be high in the agenda. Then of course the project coming to an end, those questions are more frequently heard. But they were not there in the beginning. (M2)

It would be of interest to see how the managers looked at their work. It will add to the understanding of the focus, the direction of the project:

... my first thinking of the project was, that it was a project where we had to educate, (M2)

... we came here to develop a system for ...life science at that time and in-service training for teachers..., (M2)

It [LSP] was in Namibia and it was about biology and ecology. (M1)

and

It was at the end of my time, when you started to let the counterparts teach at the workshops, where we started to say: Now it must be time for them to take over. (M1)

These quotations indicate that, for a period of the project, there was a big emphasis on the subject itself and that the foci of activities were not so much guided by the

project document as they were a result of things happening elsewhere (e.g. the Ministry) or the thinking of the individuals working in the project at a particular time. There was a job to do, to implement, but questions concerning the ideas underlying the project, how the project could be run in a Namibian context and the impact a new subject could have on it seem not to be dealt with. Towards the end of the project it occurs to be more focussed, which here is linked to the issue of the sustainability of the subject, here mentioned as more involvement of the counterparts.

There are not that many comments from the ATs about the overall goals of the LSP. What they see as a main issue is how the activities can be sustained when the project is over:

...that...for me [what was important] was the capacity building that was made by the LSP to the advisory teachers to sustain the LSP after it has left, (AT2)

...it was the building of human capacity (AT2)

and

...there were many things we were doing, but the project itself was only busy to see to...which can be sustained when the project comes to an end. (AT2)

There is another comment on the direction of the project:

...There was some times I was a bit sceptical ...as to whether the project knows where it is going about. Knows the direction it is taking if something is lengthy it might become a bit zigzagging because it is not condensed, there is a lot of room for zigzagging... (AT1)

There seems to be an understanding of the goal as that of sustainability and there is an indication of a lack of a clear direction of the project in periods.

As the last part of this section I first quote a manager and then an AT:

But when it came to discussions about the overall questions of what we were doing and topics as such I do not think they thought

it was their business. Because we invented it, we came with it, we paid for it. It was ours. Not less. (M2)

and

... [there was a] change from 99 to 2000 because it was the time close to the project close so we had to raise the issues of how to go about everything in the project. Our counterparts [Danish advisory teachers] also felt that we have to go up to issues like the budget and all kind of things. (AT3)

These two comments could give the impression that the overall goals were not really discussed in the project and that it was an issue which was the domain of the Danes who by the end of the project would introduce some of the ideas to help the subject to be sustained.

4.2 THE STRUCTURE OF THE PROJECT

/ The interviews give raise to looking into how the system or organisation was constructed. Especially it will be of interest to investigate the structure in terms of rigidity/flexibility. /

The project had a structure where there was a Danish component consisting of a manager with the overall responsibility, two advisors with responsibility for in-service training and for each of the two main offices, one in Windhoek and one in Ongwediva. The Danish volunteers in Ongwediva who would report directly to their immediate supervisor there and the volunteers with responsibility for offices in the rest of the country would report to the Windhoek office. The Namibian component consisted of Namibians working as counterparts together with the Danish volunteers. The Namibians were released from the normal duties as advisory teachers and could follow the program of the LSP.

The described structure was when the project was at its peak. There were changes in the number of Danes especially towards the end of the project where it was scaled down considerably. When the interviewee refers to structure it is against the above described background.

The above mentioned structure can work in different ways. As a manager expresses it:

...It was at that time I really saw that the only way to manage a project like LSP, was to let the different offices have as much autonomy as possible. They could not be managed in the same way. There were so many local differences. At that time I could see that it was very important to decentralise. And give a lot of decisions out there. (M2)

One could read this as the project in the beginning was guided by the idea of uniformity, that it was important that all should achieve the same from the project wherever you were in the country. The new approach, decentralisation, takes into account that the country is very different from region to region and that makes it difficult to run a uniform program. The overall structure of the organisation was not changed to accommodate this.

The decentralised approach required,

...that there was a lot of communication both ways. But it was very important that the different LSP offices were reporting what they were doing. That was the only way we could keep the project together. The more you decentralise the more you need to report. (M2)

Communication vertically and laterally is important to ensure that the organisation still has an identity, as well as that the staff, Namibians and Danes, were dedicated and able to take responsibility,

...I was in charge of the projects activities in the region. I could decide. I could plan and I could make the final decisions. All that I had to do was to make a final phone call asking for money. I was involved in meetings where I had ample opportunities and time to air my views and make proposals ... (AT1)

and *...we all knew what our tasks were and we did it. (M1)*

The few comments in the interviews about structure of the project could mean that it was not high on the agenda for the staff. Like one AT expresses it:

... I don't think I had the time and energy to do it [to think about management issues]. . I was thinking about a lot of better things...what can I get out of the project in terms of development of life science education in Namibia. (AT1)

It could be that the work itself was so important and interesting that matters like this were of no major interest.

4.3 MANAGEMENT OF THE PROJECT

/ The main themes emerging from the data are, what is perceived as being a manager and a leader, how do the managers see themselves as managers and leaders and how do the ATs perceive it. Another issue in connection with this is the process of decision making. Who is taking the decisions and how it is accepted and understood by the two groups of interviewees.

Another important issue that emerges is how previous experiences could influence the way management is carried out and understood.

The question of ownership of the project is a frequent topic mentioned. What the perception of it is and to what extent it is seen as important for the project that the ATs are incorporated into the project. /

In general there is an understanding of a difference in being a manager and being a leader. But, like what I have experienced in other environments, the two terms are often used interchangeably in the interviews. In the following I will try to be loyal to what is said in the interviews and when needed I will distinguish between the two.

The managers' views of themselves as managers can be illustrated through the following quotations: *I have really never thought of myself as a manager. I knew that I got the post as a manager, but I have not done much thinking about this (M2)* or *To tell you the truth I am a bit uncomfortable thinking of myself as a manager (M4).*

It is interesting to see that they more or less downplay the managerial role. And certainly they do not like to see themselves as leaders. What is emphasised is:

...I don't see myself as a leader.. I see myself very much as a team player... I am not comfortable to take a leading role. (M4)

and

...it is not up to the manager to make the effective running of the project, it is the people in the project. (M2)

This contains in essence the expressed views of the managers. They stress the importance of the team and being a part of the team. Another issue seems to be that the Danes do not like the fact that leaders hold power, *...you feel you are doing it because that you have some power. It is not special nice. (M2)*

It is the role of being a leader, a strong leader, which appear to be a problem. The managing part of the job they do not seem to have had problems with,

...Management is something we can all do. It is a matter of getting some tools to do whatever you are supposed to do in an adequate way...I am very comfortable with taking decisions, professional decisions...and if your decision is based on conviction and sound arguments then I have no problem. (M4)

The managers are there to do a professional job, and that they will do. And they know they can do it.

Even though the managers do not like to talk about their leader role there are some indications of what their leadership styles were:

I have sometimes been thinking that being a teacher you are a sort of being educated as a manager. This about being able to overlook the situation in a class room is the same as trying to do it in the situation in Namibia. It is different but it is the same things going on. I am not a manager I will not be a manager I will like to be a teacher that is what I am.

And further:

The most important part as a manager is trying hard to keep the business running, so...a lot of...employers are satisfied happy and all their potential being utilised most effective and this is about the potential. But that is the same as to teach. Maybe it is a teacher thinking about managing. But that is how I think it. To create situations where my people do their outmost are happy and are learning. That is important... My style of managing comes close to the learner centred education thing. (M2)

and later related to this:

...In fact I think that what I did was, I reacted to what came up in a way that I thought that must be the right way to deal with it. So I was not very proactive in that way. More reactive. (M2)

This reveals that the background, education and previous jobs, might have influenced the manager's approach, in this case a job as teacher. All the interviewees are or were teachers. The last quotation suggests a style which let circumstances lead the way.

There were also other types of managers as one interviewee expressed that, *...I see [X] and [Y] as real managers and both were real strong ... both very different and both managers and people professionals... (M4)*

In the context this statement is related to areas like innovation, having visions, perception of policy and politics and, to be result orientated. In this opinion to be a 'real' manager is a strong person and you have to be able to deal with the managerial side as well as the people in the organisation. The person further says that the managers of the LSP had different styles and that the style of each was appropriate to where the project was at the particular time when they were in charge of it.

The ATs views of the management and the leaders can be described as being positive and they all use the word "good" in that connection. To give examples of what it could entail they say for example, *...I didn't have much problems with each leader... (AT2), and*

...Not for a moment I had the feeling that I for example couldn't air something because it would hurt one of the management. In

short I had a quite relaxed relationship with the management...
(AT1)

and further,

So I was really acceptable...even if it was privately or at general staff meeting I was free to come to him [the manager]. That is why I didn't have any difficulties with the managers. (AT3)

The manager is seen as a person you can approach in professional and personal matters. They like that there were not many problems with the leaders. It clearly indicates that they have experienced that leaders are difficult to associate with.

There are also a few statements about the management styles which are not appreciated by the ATs: *...and a no was a no, if he say yes it is a yes. But he was a good guy* (AT3), and about a manager which is described as a good person manager by one of the managers: *...I don't know if I just could go in and talk to him and say I want this and I want that.* (AT2)

It appears that a manager should be open for discussions and not scare people away even before a talk could take place.

The Managers do not directly say how decisions were taken but some of the answers I have cited earlier in this chapter indicate that the team is important. There are some comments showing that decisions, not necessary all, are being taken at the general staff meetings and/or after consulting other staff members.

The ATs recognise that the manager has to make decisions, but what is really appreciated is that many things are debated and decided upon either at staff meetings for the whole project: *...how decisions are made...how it developed, it could be a common decision of the house, that is what I perceive as leadership* (AT2), or at a local LSP office:

... [it was not] always the management taking the decisions. Sometimes we are called to a subject meeting to be created or something to be done, the management will discuss it and the

leaders will call one person to ask if they are supportive with the ideas. Even though there are some issues the management has to take by themselves. (AT3)

The last comment indicates that not all decisions were dealt with in a forum like staff meetings, that managers could make a decision and then consult others.

If many decisions have to be taken at staff meetings or in consultations with others, it is important that people really do speak out freely. Here it seems that some of the managers have a concern,...*We experienced all the way that at meetings we talked about how can we make them to speak up (M1), or:*

I remember we had some persisting meetings where we were very concerned about asking them what their opinion was of different things, and I can remember that they, not in the beginning, but when later they attended all the staff meetings. But still I have the feeling that they did not say when they felt that something was wrong. (M2)

The managers did not like that the ATs, in their opinion, contributed too little at the staff meetings. It looks like it was a problem for them and that they tried to get the ATs involved. It was even an issue that was discussed between the managers and/or between the Danish staff.

One of the managers reflects on this issue:

... but I think that they all the way had the feeling that they were there to learn...I felt it did not have much to do with our performance like that, I do not think that we made obstacles for them, I think that it was inside in themselves, thinking about white people those with the money and that kind of things. I think that it is some cultural thing, more than just us not letting them. (M2)

This expresses the belief, that the ATs did not add their views because they were impeded by cultural norms/values and that they were in a learning position and therefore they could or would not contribute much. There are other comments from the managers to support a view of possible cultural background for the ATs participation/contribution in the staff meetings:

...it could be because the Namibians did not say what they meant. It is a problem that they keep a very kind --- attitude, even if they did not agree at all with what you were doing and what you were saying. (M1)

and

I don't know if it has developed into a myth. It might well be. But I ... quite often I have talked to other Danes about that it appears that Namibians do not enter into conflicts if they can avoid it. Or open conflicts ... and through discussions, dialogue, arguing try to solve that or come to terms with it. That is possible one perception. (M4)

At the same time the last person continues:

...have often talked about that some of the Danes have been too loud at meetings. There will be other cultural differences, but I have never seen them as obstacles that is insurmountable. (M4)

These quotations indicate that the Danes see the Namibian staff as being kind and trying to avoid conflicts. The last comment states that the Danes are talking a lot at meetings and that it could be a cultural thing.

The ATs comments related to this are broader in their scope, not only covering staff meetings:

In the workshops e.g. in some cultures people believe people should go into the room sit still listen and just receive. That is in some peoples culture. Other people e.g. it is a part of their culture they should question things and they should manoeuvre things, whatever materials are in there, that they should play with things, they should be more mobile. You are coming from Denmark with that kind of perspective. I am Namibian. Raising up in a classroom set-up which is portraying my social life and also my culture where I should sit and listen and not question --- it is difficult. (AT1)

and

We derived out of a very autocratic system a very autocratic political dispensation and we are formed in that dispensation. (AT1)

According to this there are cultural as well as historical issues that might influence the way one behaves in social situations.

The same person airs this comment about the atmosphere in the project:

Expatriates they came from Denmark they came from another cultural set-up economic and social set-up and indeed I think a whole lot of time was wasted to avoid conflict of whatever nature just so that understanding could be consolidated. I can see it.
(AT1)

and

The project staff they ... let me put it straight, they allowed a lot of things. They were very tolerant towards the Namibian teachers and so the Namibian teachers could see on the other side that these people are willing to contain us, to accommodate us, and through those two processes I think they could come together were they could get a common understanding what the expatriates want and what they want, what is the important things what both of them tried to achieve. (AT1)

This express the view that the Danish staff also spent time on avoiding conflicts with the Namibians and that this could create an opening for a situation where both parties could achieve something.

As some of the previously mentioned quotations say, it seems that the ATs felt that they could air their views and they felt that they freely could express themselves if they wanted to. It is in line with the aired view from one of the managers. However there are no indications from the ATs of how much they actually contributed to the discussions at the meetings. It appears that different cultural and historical background might have influenced the way the processes in the project took place.

4.4 HUMAN CAPACITY BUILDING IN THE PROJECT

/ The ATs are regarded as the persons to sustain the subject life science by both groups. To this end the interviewees express themselves about the ATs relation to the

LSP in terms of ownership to the project as well as capacity building and teambuilding. /

It emerges from the interviews that the Namibian element in the project was very important. As one manager expresses it:

The one thing that means a lot in the whole project was when we had those counterparts appointed. That was a sort of turning point from then on we put a lot of effort into using those persons as key persons in whatever we were doing. (M2)

The selection of the ATs was something that the project did, they were chosen because *...they had worked with the LSP and had done well and we knew them to be good people. (M2)*

One AT expresses it like this: *I was told by [Z] that they have got me in their plans, I was regarded as one of these people [ATs] (AT2), and further:*

But I think that the LSP had a say [in the appointment of the ATs] because all of us who by then were identified [by the project] were appointed. All the 7 that was identified were appointed.... (AT2)

The criteria for being selected seems to be based on their work performances in relation to the project and their personality rather than on formal qualification. The data clearly show that it was of big importance for the project to upgrade the ATs so they would be accepted in the formal educational system since some of the ATs did not meet the formal criteria for becoming an AT,

...everybody was getting a category C, which was required by the government. Even them without qualifications were given qualifications. (AT2)

and it was the training I got. It was a good training because I was really far far... and then the project trained me... (AT3), and one of the managers, ...But I can also see that the people we selected spend half their time when they were educating themselves. They spend a lot of time upgrading themselves. (M2)

The qualifications and training of the ATs were seen by both Danes and Namibians as extremely important for the subject life science to sustain after the project terminated.

When the ATs were asked about what they found was of great importance for them, the answers were:

...that was very important for me are firstly the capacity building that was made by the LSP...[and] the counterparts [the Danes] were given to us and we were working with counterparts, we were working with them and vice versa. (AT2)

or

...I was also introduced to a lot of pedagogical reasoning and those things...I could use to built around my professional capacity. (AT1)

or

...I am not scared to organise workshops and all the things needed to be with my fellow adv. Teachers. We were trained in such a way that we can deal with things like that. We were trained in professional development that I have for my own, I can now come to be an inspector or something. That is what Ls gives me. (AT2)

It means a lot for the ATs to get qualifications, to upgrade themselves to be professionals. . The last quotation indicates that the training also can have an empowering effect. The qualifications could be obtained through studies but also by working together with the Danish staff.

The partnership between the ATs and their Danish counterparts is described in very positive terms which are captured in these two quotations: *...We learned from each other, I learned from him and he learned from me... (AT2)*, and *We were working hand in hand. (AT2)*

The partnership at times gave cause for misunderstandings which could be related to the different cultural backgrounds or cultural insensitivity as the following quotations from an AT indicates:

...those who came they were very young than those I have mentioned [before] they were very very young. And their way of explaining things, it is not bad, but sometimes it is very strong. What I meant with the strong voice is that sometimes they don't like to share. They just say this is this. And some of the things we have experienced we could be shared with them, but they found their own way of doing it. They just tell you to do this. So that is what I mean with strong voices. (AT3)

and

And maybe sometimes it is because of culture. ... In my culture we are not so fast sometimes if you speak I have to wait until you finish and the way I'm going to answer is maybe another approach which is not common in your culture ...for example if we disagree because of some cultural issues I wait until a favourable time to come and then I talk to him. No, I was not happy because of this and this. In my culture when we say like this it means this. So step by step they got to know (laugh) how to approach someone. (AT3)

Using strong voices and doing things by yourself without regard to the cultural norms about how you communicate could be an obstacle for sharing experiences.

The same AT also says: *We Namibian counterparts we tried by all means to let our colleagues know some of the things in our culture. (AT3)*

and

...[X] was struggling to be involved ... we tried to help him ... [said to the person] we need some changes, change his style...but it took time. So later we found that he was becoming good... (AT3)

and further

[about other Danish colleagues] They left their culture but they tried to know some parts of our culture and they could even discuss with parents. (AT3)

This suggests the importance which the AT put into trying to understand cultural values and also that efforts were done to share them. It also suggests that there was a difference in the approach to the Namibian culture by the expatriate staff.

Another important issue for the ATs is that of teambuilding. They find it important that they have had chances to meet the ATs from the other regions of the country so they can share and exchange ideas. One says:

... trips organised by the project so that we come together all the ATs countrywide that let us to know one another through really discussing our experiences because the regions are different we can share our exp. We can hear from other regions and vice versa. So we know one another in the project the project heads and the adv. Teachers. (AT3)

A special event was a study tour to Denmark. One AT says,

...so I count that study tour to Denmark as extremely valuable. The theories were quite new in an Namibian context and I think that I had a bit more than the teachers had...I was a bit more equipped to train them when I came back. (AT1)

and a manager says,

...they had a month stay in a university in Denmark. Perhaps they got a little bit more sure about...their own position, their own power. It has also to do with their own power. I hope they found out they were in charge more and more...But it was important to let them get to know each other very well and to accept each other. It could strengthen them to say more.. (M1)

These two quotations show that the manager wanted the ATs to gain more self-confidence and one of the ways to achieve this could be through knowing one another better and obtaining more knowledge.

Both groups see the ATs as the link to the future and the sustainability of life science and they bring in the question of ownership to the project. The data show that the concept of ownership has different meanings for the interviewees. The ATs are rather uniform in their views of what they feel ownership to be:

I can say that I have got a lot of ownership in the project. Meaning that... .. when [the Dane] left I was in charge of the projects activities in the region. I could decide. I could plan.
(AT1)

and ...when it comes to the workshops the circuit meetings and the school visits, that one, -yes I feel ownership of. (AT3)

It is in the daily work in the regions that they feel in charge. The more overall ownership of the project is not so important for them. The answers in the interviews indicate that it could be that they feel that they have to say something about ownership of the project in the interview, rather than it being of importance for them.

The managers have different views about the ownership of the project. One points out:

...for instance the participation. That was not talked about very much in the beginning...then of cause the project coming to an end, those questions are more frequently heard. But they were not there in the beginning. (M3)

and

...there has never been a part of that report telling about how it was going with the ownership thing. Never. That was not what we reported on. (M2)

and

...the N. they did not do thinking on that [the issue of ownership] on their own they just followed the Danes for many reasons. Because I am sure that they all the way thought that we were the experts we would know better. there was no reason for them to discuss it. (M2)

and

...But still it was not really their project. It was ours. I do not think that it ever became their project. They were Namibians working for the government. and they worked in close connection to LSP. and I think they were not really. (M2)

Other views are:

So it was actually important to build up that ownership part slowly. What I have seen later is that you get closer and closer to have a structure in place for taking over. But perhaps haven't used that many efforts in actually ensuring that it also could take place. (M3)

and

I think it has been an equal partnership. There has been a lot of respect from both sides ... for the other parts point of view for the agenda or their background and experience. (M4)

There are words like participatory, partnership and ownership. The rhetoric and the time when it actually was dealt with in the project, could indicate that it was an issue that was not taken up for a thoroughly debate.

An interesting remark in that connection is from one of the ATs:

...the ownership issue was something that was really talked of at one meeting that I remember. Where it seems to me that Namibians wanted to have someone in a managerial position. Not the manager maybe one of those managers or whatever.. but I don't know it was at one meeting in 98 towards the end. (AT2)

It suggests that at a time there was an idea of trying to have the Namibians represented in the management of the project but also that the idea did not materialise.

4.5 LSP IN THE NAMIBIAN CONTEXT

/ The interviews showed that managers of the LSP and the ATs had a clear understanding of what the purpose of the subject was and also how the subject could contribute to the new educational reform. They saw it as an important tool to move from an autocratic and top-down educational system towards a system with access, equity, quality and democracy as the goals. To reach the goals the project had strategies at different levels in the system. From the ministries to the classrooms.

There was much resistance to change, and the wordings and examples in the interviews bring me to describe the implementation of life science in a battle metaphor. The project fought for the ideas described above. It was more likely to win the battle if logistics is working, if the staff is loyal, well trained and their background is recognised and if you have the right connections. The battle was at all levels and included politics, educational structures, educational theories and assumptions, values and beliefs which in a deeper sense link up to perceptions achieved in a cultural context. /

In the struggle for the implementation of the new educational reform and the subject life science, LSP had connections to the highest positions in the Government, especially in the initial phase just after Independence:

There were some political problems in 91-92. There was a fear that there should be a take-over by some of the more conservative people. So Nahas [Nahas Angula, the then Minister of Education, Culture, Youth and Sports] pushed. There was a necessity politically. (M3)

and ... *The minister needed something that could spearhead the reform (M3), and:*

... because we had this quite narrow co-operation at the personal level and the political level, which you seldom find in other situations, it was possible to go further and faster than you could have done in any other setting. (M3)

The project was a part of the political showdown between the old and the new system. It was the spearhead.

One manager gives the following view on the reform in the Namibian society and thereby also the position and function that the project had:

One thing that there might only have been one person in Namibia having a good concept of the educational reform. I think that the ed. reform was cooked up between Nahas and maybe [a named expatriate] and then imposed on the rest of the country. The concept of the educational reform and of cause also the life science is so far away from the idea of a good education in Namibia. And

the wish for the reform that it was implemented was not a wish from the broad population and even from the majority of the government. So you are trying to implement some thinking that are very few people in Namibia would be behind. Doing it was not unknown to me or the Danish but for the rest for all those 1,5 million people in Namibia. It was tough to implement and a lot of people did not agree that it was good. That is the problem. When you make a reform that only a handful of people even some ministers agree on so when you have a school system with a lot of teachers and ...of course they could not agree on the apartheid system of education, but they certainly also had difficulties adjusting to the new ideas. (M2)

This indicates that the project represented change, that there was a broad resistance to this change and also that the project was helping in imposing the change.

This brings in the question of the LSP being a loyal and confidential partner in a difficult situation:

... having been working with SWAPO in exile, having drawn down the Namibian teachers from Loudima to discuss with Namibian teachers... you do manage to signalise that we can rely on these people. (M3)

There are also other ways of securing that the project was trustworthy. You could employ Namibians in the project:

...but to work without close co-operation with Namibians would be dangerous like hell, ... I managed to change [money] into two posts for two Namibians in the project...so that even before people from Ibis came into the project had these two Namibians teachers to be the watchdogs of what we were doing...it also increased the credibility of the project. (M3)

There are no comments to these issues from the Namibians. It could be related to my questioning or that these issues are not of interest for them.

Further down in the governmental system, at the regional level, there was used power when needed:

...we selected four of the best facilitators. They should be appointed. I am not sure that it was the right thing to do ...I joined

the meeting at the regional office...It was a bit difficult. To sit with that group of 15 black Namibians in government positions and me one white advisor with some millions behind me. It was my decision which was counting. I did not feel good about it. Not at all. ...They were not able to understand how I could come up with people with less than grade seven or whatever. But when we had those discussions I referred to that paper from the minister.... and then they said that it was better LSP got it right. And we got our people in. (M2)

There is a doubt about if it is the right thing to do but the decision was made:

...it was my task given by the project manager, that those people [the ATs] should have the posts. (M2)

An area where the project was supposed to support the new educational reform was to help implement what in the governmental policy paper is called learner centred education, which represented a completely change of paradigm. One manager explains how he/she perceived the process of finding out what learner centred education was:

The first years when I was a manager there were a lot of discussions in Namibia between the Nordic people the Danish, the Swedish and one Norwegian on what was learner centred education. Because the American system is much more linked to tests more than we think in Denmark. Tests and goals. What we call teaching technology in Denmark. We would also say that it was undemocratic. And I know that there were a lot of fighting there. So what is this? The Nordic experts and the American experts fighting over the bodies of the Namibians over which direction to go. And the Namibians are just spectators. Who will win, we will follow the winner. And if nobody wins then ---. There were a lot of that. I am saying that because ... it has been a pity for the whole development of the reform that the fighting between the different groups of experts were going on. (M2)

The view expressed here is that different expatriate groups tried to impose their understanding of the new approach and that the LSP was a part it. The Namibians were spectators to the fighting.

Some views about how was it to introduce the new ideas in the field are:

It was almost the most difficult thing to tell them, to change some teachers' idea, that they could do it in another way. Some were very open, but some had their own opinion about how it should be done, ... but they changed their attitude to learning our methods. (M1)

and further,

...we had a fight with them and we were not giving up the first time we met them. It was not only me, it was the staff I was together with, --they could not change our ideas about how to learn. I think we were so consistent. We managed to present our ideas so that they changed because we had very big discussions about how things should be done. (M1)

This expresses that the project worked hard to get the teachers to change the way they were thinking. It is called a fight and it also says that the LSP staff was jointly working on it and were not giving in to the old ideas. A view of the ATs role in that process is:

It was very powerful when some of their own stood up and said, it is very important that you do not have that much cattle because ---- -- it is more powerful than if I do it. It is why it was so important for them to—be on the battlefield. (M1)

It is recognised that the Namibians are powerful fellow players in the 'battle' for introducing the new ideas. At workshops and in the classrooms.

The quotations above are all from managers. How do the ATs see the project in the Namibian context and how does it/did it influence them?

The things introduced to us did not come to us a sudden thing. We were introduced through the project through programmes that study programme in Denmark. Very slowly. And I think it could give us time to sit to assimilate absorb what we hear and to make it part of our thinking and a part of our own self ...I had ample time to make the things a part of myself. Associate myself with that information. (AT1)

The ideas were new, but over time they became a part of the way of thinking. It was not always easy to introduce the new ideas:

Immediately when I came back from Denmark ... Those things were stupid things I was talking ... It was frustrating. At first it was very frustrating because a lot of my colleagues did not know what I was talking about. And for them it was all taboo. It was not something that could be built into a Namibian educational system. It was just a [unclear voice] ... and so also for my supervisors at some occasions ... I was perceived as ... a kind of enemy coming with strange ideas. (AT1)

and *It was what happened, that you were alone. (AT2)*

The ATs were often alone with their ideas of how to teach. It was “taboo” and they were the “enemy” of the established system. Another related issue which caused concern for the ATs is the relationship to the regional offices:

The relationship with the Regional Office. It was not so strong. We were two different bodies ... The project stand on its own, planned its own activities and they also planned activities on their own. We were pulled to this side and the other. The relationship was not so good between the two. (AT3)

and

I felt that it was tough because when I go to the region and I was from the project it was really tough. So when I come to tell the project manager or the co-ordinator of the project something from the region, it takes time for him or her to understand what I am saying. And vice versa. (AT3)

This indicates the project had its own schedule which seemed to be different from the rest of the regional offices. It could put the ATs in a situation where they were split in loyalty between the project and their formal employer and it could cause misunderstandings. When the ATs were asked what they would do differently if they had a chance to start a “new” LSP they all indicated that they would work closely together with the gatekeepers like the Regional Office and the principals.

To be a Namibian working for the project was not always easy. I will let two ATs comment on the way they have experienced other Namibians' perception of them as partners in the LSP:

We will probably hear that the LSP were giving. They will likely think that we were spoilt. But for us, the LSP has done its job.
(AT2)

and

When the project was here ... they were saying aoh, who are you?!!! Because we started saying we could share, we could tell how we did our school visits. ...Some times they would say, life science people who are you to come and tell us? And we also promoted learner centred education. It has started in life science, so we also passed this information to others. We invited people to come together. But when we find that people were saying, ahh who are the life science advisory teachers? Do they think they are good in learner centred education? So we found other ways of calling them. We get through the managers of this to take the responsibility of inviting people, so they invited them ... all these ways of sneaking and finding ways, it is because of this project.
(AT3)

The ATs here express that the project has provided a lot, material and educational wise, and that has caused situations where these “privileges” could give raise to feelings of inferiority and jealousy among their colleagues.

There are many examples above which support the idea of describing the LSP in the Namibian context as that of an organisation in battle. The impact of this on the educational system and in the end on the society as such, is a source for reflections for especially the Danes:

...in general I am quite sceptical about many of these projects going on in education in developing countries. And the kind of pressure put on the projects to produce results in a very short time, which can make such projects extremely stupid. (M3)

and

...that is where I think that the philosophy of the project was wrong, because it was more like we Danes we had the science without (.....) and we know the good practices because we have

developed that and of course we can transfer that stuff to the Namibians and that would make the Namibians happier and wiser. But we forgot to think that the Namibians were very wise from the beginning in their own way. And what should then have been the concept? How could the two wise the good things from the two countries be merged together to make it better, that was not the concept... the LSP was seen as from Copenhagen was seen as the most important the project with a PR value much more than any other project that Ibis had ever had. So there were a lot of interest from Copenhagen in presenting good results from the project. And that was a bit of a problem because the way that the way Copenhagen presented the project, the results, to the Danish public, was not always in line with the real thing in Namibia. (M2)

and

I do not see LS as a massive import from Denmark. I am not uncomfortable with a massive intervention as it has been. On the contrary I have got a belief that if you want to move things ... like things in education which is a very big institution ... then you have to do it on a massive scale ... and without that kind of personnel ... input the financial input, without the political will ... your impact will become so much less ... in my mind. And with our defined task as it was supporting the reform developing LS as a national subject I don't think we could have done it with less. (M4)

The quotations from the managers cover a spectre from being very sceptical about projects in developing countries in general to air the belief that ideas from both sides should be merged and as the last that if you want to move things you have to work in a big scale.

The ATs do not directly deal with this. But the quotations in this chapter about capacity building, teambuilding and the co-operation with foreigners indicate that the project to a certain extent is justified, even though there have been setbacks for instance in the relationship to other Namibian colleagues, in the relations to the formal educational system, cultural differences within the LSP as well as the impact of the project in the Namibian society.

The data presentation in this chapter has shown that there are many sides to the LSP. The next chapter will discuss and analyse the findings in relation to relevant research and theory within management and leadership. The findings show that an area of special interest will be how multicultural organisations function.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF DATA

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In chapter three I explained that this research is qualitative in nature and by adopting this approach, the researcher is both the collector and the interpreter of the data. I also argued that rigour in the research was created by the researcher being as truthful as possible in the whole research process. Therefore I will shortly explain how I decided to work with the data in the chapter.

In my writing up of the data in the previous chapter I tried to bracket myself, (see chapter 3 p.33), as much as possible to enable the interviewees' interpretations to come forward. At the same time I argued for my method of writing it as I did.

The discussion of the data in this chapter also leaves me with the same problem of keeping my personal opinions and perceptions at bay. The only way to test my way of interpreting the data is that the reader first will read the chapter with the data and then read this. I can only hope that the way I have dealt with it has revealed aspects of the LSP that the reader also will find in the data. I do not pretend to have written the story of the LSP but it is my presentation of and discussion of some person's interpretations of the project. This compels me to emphasise that the purpose of this study is to try to understand and interpret managerial aspects of the project through the meanings the interviewees give to them. It is to illuminate these aspects of the project, not to evaluate it and not to look at the consequences of the findings. With this in mind I will shortly explain how I present the discussion.

The information in the data is rather comprehensive covering issues of different organisational and personal experiences, from beliefs and values to more daily occurrences. The reading thereof left me with one overarching feature related to management which I will discuss further in this chapter namely: How could it be that an organisation like the LSP which was rather democratic and able to accommodate regional differences, which is a reality in Namibia, and even individual differences at

the same time was not showing the same openness towards its partners (ministry and regional offices) and recipients (teachers)? This tension or inconsistency in the project I will pursue further by firstly discussing the processes in the project and relate it to relevant management theory and material produced by the LSP, and secondly I will highlight the project's way of handling the above mentioned relationship to partners and recipients.

Italics are used to indicate the main findings from the data which I afterwards will discuss further.

5.2 DISCUSSION OF THE GOALS AND STRUCTURE OF THE LSP

/ The data indicates that the overall goals of the project stated in the project document was not really discussed. The managers acknowledge the project document, but it seems like it does not mean a lot in the daily work. The ATs seem to be unclear about the goals but do however see it as related to the sustainability of the project. /

It is interesting to see how a guideline as a project document is used, or not used. It could be that an important document like this is something you read when you apply for a job and then never come back to it again except maybe for report writing. There might not be time to go back and see what it says. Another thing could be that it was written very fast because of the political situation right after Independence in Namibia, and therefore was either a snapshot of a particular time or was produced to support the political issues at that time.

An interesting comment to this is that in 1993 at the minutes from the general staff meeting (GSM) on April the 16th a question was raised about having specific plans which could help the project to be more focussed. The answer from the then manager was that the focus at that moment was clear but that the issue might be taken up later. What appeared to be the focus was the activities which were running at that time. The minutes from later staff meetings show that the issue was not dealt

with later; until the last Project Proposal in 1998, which was mostly concerned with the phasing out of the project.

If the situation is like indicated before I find it likely that the daily work will guide what is going on. It will to a great extent be the individuals' personality or the different LSP offices' policy which would be the guide. An alternative guide could have been the job descriptions which date from February 1992 (LSP 1992). These are very task oriented and describe what qualifications are needed. If this would be the guide, then it could turn out in a way where the project would be concentrating on what quotations from the managers in chapter 4 (p 44) say: "We had to educate", "We came here to develop" and that "it was about biology and ecology". Deeper discussions to create a common understanding of ontological and epistemological issues, what the project stands for, the ideas behind it, what it actually said, the role of the project and its implications for the Namibian society etc. were not taken. It could give the impression that the task was the overarching purpose of the project at the expense of personal and situational issues.

/ The organisational structure of the project did not change throughout the projects lifetime even though official decentralisation took place halfway through it. It seems that the decentralised approach is appreciated by the ATs, since it brings decisions out to the regions. This indicates that the structure was flexible and able to cater for regional differences. /

The managers did not spend much time in the interviews on this issue. It could be because it was of no real interest to them or that it did not mean a lot for the way the project ran. An interesting point here is that it is seen as a necessity for the project to be decentralised because it was realised that there are many local differences in Namibia. In the interviews with the managers it came out clearly that they acknowledge that there are big regional differences and one could ask why it took so long before decentralisation was officially implemented. Maybe having a Danish background would make it more difficult to understand the issue until the practical situation forces you to do it.

Another reason could be that when the decision was made to decentralise it just mirrored what was actually happening in the project. An example of this is from a GSM March 27th 1995 about which criteria should be used for admitting people to the project's upgrading workshops for under- and unqualified teachers. It was found that the different LSP offices used different criteria for the admission. A work group was established to produce a coherent approach for admission which was presented at the following GSM. It indicates that the local offices already were rather autonomous.

In the staff meeting in November 1996 a co-ordinating group of managerial staff was established for the purpose of co-ordinating project activities and discuss administrative matters and to enforce the intra-project communication and a monthly internal newsletter was started.

Each LSP office made their own year plans and they had to be made in a way it did not interfere with the overall plan for the project. After the more official decentralisation took place there were less common activities where the whole project staff were together.

Yet another issue which appeared during one interview was that the books which were developed by the project could not be used directly in all the regions because of the enormous differences between them. A suggestion to try to take regional differences into consideration was turned down by the main office. Even though it was turned down it was also a beginning to move away from a more centralist way of running the project.

The above indicates that there were decentralising tendencies in the project working against what was said in the Project Document (LSP 1991: 26): "the project constitutes a whole, not just a number of independent input elements", and that these were finally recognised. The regional differences were finally officially acknowledged. The structure did not have to be altered. It seems that it was sufficiently flat, with few levels between top and bottom, and rather loose, with little formal control of the different units, which allowed it to accommodate the change.

An interesting addition to this is that the ATs in their interviews clearly indicate that there are regional differences and also that they are big. The project had to adjust more to this fact. The ATs do not say much about the structure as such, but they all talk about having ownership of the project when it is at the local level. This I would interpret as an approval of the decentralisation.

5.2.1 The LSP as a loosely coupled system

This seemingly vague idea of the goals and the decentralisation process, which both have been described above, with its loose structure is in many ways similar to what Weick describes as a system with loose coupling: “the image that coupled events are responsive, but that each event also preserves its own identity and some evidence of its physical or logical separateness” (Weick cited in Hoy & Miskel 1996:77). It is further explained that the organisation exerts little control over how well the work is done, there is no inspection of quality, and there is a more tight control over who does the work. If this is compared with the LSP many decisions about activities were taken at GMSs, what should be done and who is going to do it. After that it was up to the different regions staff to execute the decisions, and there was no control of how it was carried out. From my experience most schools in Denmark operate in this way and it would be easy for the Danish staff to work in an organisation which was similar to what they were used to.

A loosely coupled system is based on the “logic of confidence” (Hoy & Miskel 1996:77) which indicates that there is a trust in people that they will do their job because they are professionals. It is clear from the interviews that professionalism is taken for granted by the managers and the ATs in the project.

Seen in relation to this is the way that the ATs were selected and trained a supportive factor for this type of organisation. The project selected the persons whom they found had shown most initiative and had an attitude which was seen as supportive. For the ATs with less education than required the project would either train or pay for their further education. The ATs clearly indicate that they find the training important and also that it might have an empowering effect. Yet another thing could

be that it is likely to have a positive effect on loyalty towards the project and in the end also on sustainability of ideas from the project after its termination.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF MANAGEMENT/LEADERSHIP ROLES OF THE LSP

/ The managers downplay their role as manager. And they do not like to see themselves as leaders. The administrative and planning part of the job is not seen as a problem. They see themselves as competent in this area. They would like to see themselves as a part of a team. The ATs appreciate that the leaders in general are easily approached and open for discussions. They like that many decisions are common decisions of the staff. /

The managers downplaying of their leader role is for me one of the most interesting findings in this study. It has many implications for how the project was running. The managers' role in the project was one way or another to be in charge of it. With responsibilities towards external partners, donor organisations and the people working in it. It is stated in the managers' job descriptions as well as in the project documents where e.g. reporting is one of the functions.

One could ask why people would apply for or occupy a managing job when there are certain important functions they do not like. It could have to do with modesty. When you are asked how you see yourself as a leader then you do not say that you like to be the boss, - to possess power. The managers have a background as teachers. In Denmark it would not be an appropriate statement if you as a teacher say that you enjoy the power of being in charge of a class, even though you really do.

Maybe you do not see it as something special in the job. The interviews clearly indicate that the task to implement a subject and introduce new teaching methods is prioritised highly and then the management/leadership part of the job may play a minor role?

The leadership attitude, which I would call an anti-leadership attitude, is much in line with what Sergiovanni (1992) describes in connection with a community organisation (chapter 3 p.17). He says that there should be paid attention to substitutes for leadership which means that people should be more self-managing. To accomplish this he argues that: “The more professionalism is emphasised the less leadership is needed” (Sergiovanni 1992:42). As described before is professionalism a corner stone in the LSP and therefore there is maybe not that much a need for the traditional strong leaders. The anti-leadership attitude would enhance the participation and responsibility of the participants and also support the decentralisation of the organisation which actually took place. The attitude could also be related to what Bush (1995:104) says about leadership in “subjective” management models. About these models he states that: “leadership fits rather uneasily within the framework of subjective models” (Bush 1995:104). He claims that the type of leadership, even though down prioritised, is a product of personal qualities and skills rather than the product of organisational functioning. Organisations are seen as collections of individuals, and the structure and technology of the organisation are aligned with the overarching goal of enabling individual development and fulfilment. It is thus possible to argue that LSP developed an identity which has elements of both the ‘community’ and ‘subjective’ models of management. But whether this development was a result of conscious planning and decision-making is difficult to answer from the data available.

The ATs state they appreciate that the leaders are easily approached and open for discussions. They see decisions taken in the group as good and they accept there is diversity in the project and they like to share ideas with the other persons in the group including the expatriates.

The expressed attitude of leadership could be cultural motivated. Therefore I find it at this point relevant firstly to draw Hofstede’s description of cultural values into the discussion and secondly to look at the *Ubuntu* movement which claims to be based on African values.

If we look at Hofstede's four cultural dimensions (chapter 2 p.7), Denmark is ranked low on Power Distance (Hofstede 1980:51), which favours a more egalitarian ideal with the leader regarding subordinates "as persons like me" (Hofstede 1980:46) and further, "Those in power should try to look less powerful than they are" (*ibid.*:46). Participation and initiatives from the subordinates are appreciated. At the same time Denmark is the lowest of all the 40 countries survey on the Masculinity dimension which indicates that feminine values like modesty, informal personal contacts and trying to obtain consensus are highly valued. Hofstede's classification with its strengths and weaknesses was discussed in chapter 3 and one should be cautious as I mentioned not to use them uncritically. But if we look at what was described earlier in this chapter about goals, the structure and now the leadership, it is striking how close they are to Hofstede's dimensions for Denmark.

As a *curiosum* it is also interesting that the answers I got back from the former Danish staff members from the questionnaire (chapter 3 p.32 and appendix 2) confirm the two rankings of Denmark for Power Distance and Masculinity that Hofstede found. The question of the value of the questionnaire for proper research I discussed in chapter 3 pp 32-33, so I will only take these last findings *ad notam*.

There are not as far as I have found out not done any research on Hofstede's dimensions in Namibia. And the answers on the ATs questionnaires are very diverse, maybe because of the cultural diversity in that country or as mentioned before (chapter 2 p.11) that the questions are developed on the basis of a Western way of thinking.

If we have to look at a deeper level, at values and beliefs, from an African perspective it might be appropriate to see how the value system of the *Ubuntu* movement, which was discussed in chapter 2 (pp 20-22), matches with the way the LSP functioned. I acknowledge that there is a standing discussion about the generalisation of Afro-centric values which I will not participate in this paper, but I can see that there are many articles and books supporting the idea of a special African value system. With this knowledge in mind I find it worth noting that the *Ubuntu* values described in chapter 2 like team learning, consensus seeking, that

leaders should be approachable, the atmosphere should be informal etc. firstly are very similar to what the ATs express in the interviews and secondly that when these values are compared with the projects internal processes and functions and the values for Denmark found by Hofstede there is a rather interesting overlap. So maybe the cultural background for the ATs, as Hofstede suggests for black South Africans (chapter 2 p.10), is 'tender' and not so much 'tough'?

From what has been revealed until now I find it relevant shortly to establish if the LSP has its emphasis on either the task, the person or situation, which is of great importance to how organisations function. The discussion so far indicates that the LSP had a task element which was to implement a new subject. It had a concern for its staff by for example upgrading staff, downplaying the role of leaders, teamwork etc. The relationship to the internal environment/processes was characterised by e.g. the informal atmosphere and letting the local LSP offices have a great extent of autonomy, which allowed it to accommodate the diversity in the project and respect the professionalism of the staff.

5.4 DISCUSSION OF THE LSP AND ITS RELATION TO PARTNERS AND RECIPIENTS

The next question is how an organisation which to a large extent could cater for internal diversity would cope with its partners and recipients. One could expect a similar openness and inclusiveness towards them. The interviews gave rise to a description of this relationship in a battle metaphor (chapter 3 pp 60-67), which indicates there might have been a tension between them and the project.

I will here discuss the relationship with the partners, at ministerial and regional level and the teachers. As the last part I will look at how open the project was towards input from the external environment.

5.4.1 LSP and the Ministry, NIED and the Regional Offices

/ The project implemented a new subject and was a major partaker in introducing the new educational reform which represented a complete transformation of the educational system. /

First I will try to establish the framework and the conditions the project worked under in relation to the political level and the level where the curriculum development was carried out.

The initial phase of the LSP was described in chapter 1 (p 1). WUS' involvement in the SWAPO school in Loudima, Congo, and the ideas from that school turned out to create the basis for the new subject Life Science in the newly independent Namibia. This indicates that the project's start in one way or another was linked to its connections with the ruling party, SWAPO. Education is often seen as an important instrument in shaping the society and it is likely that the new government saw a rapid change in that field necessary. In an interview (1998) the former Minister of Education, Culture, Youth and Sports, Nahas Angula; said that the new government was busy to present results and that it gave latitude to people if they just would do the job and that government never interfered in what they did (Angula cited in Jacobsen & Morgenstierne 2000:31). If this was the case then there must have been a lot of trust in the people who did the job. It could be that there was a scarcity of funding and/or human resources. In the Project Document (LSP 1991:9) it says that in May 1991 there were 16 permanent employees in the ministry. The project could provide both funding for implementation of Life Science as well as the necessary staff. From this it appears that the project was in a situation where it to a great extent could define what should be done to implement the subject.

NIED was established in 1991 to be "the prime vehicle for development and introduction of the new reform" (LSP 1991:5). One of the aims of the LSP was also

to support NIED in this (*ibid.*:5). Curriculum development took place at NIED. The project had for a period a person positioned there to develop the LSP curriculum. NIED was hardly mentioned in the interviews. Is that because it was seen as a new institution and therefore weak and without real influence? Maybe that there were disagreements with other stakeholders in education? One manager says for example in chapter 3 (p 63) that there were a lot of discussions with the other donor organisations about what LCE is. If disagreements are frequent and insurmountable would the project then prefer to spend the energy on its own activities instead?

It gives me the impression that the relations to the Ministry and NIED were running rather separate from other activities in the project. The work in the field, the regions, with the teachers could be what really interested the staff.

The next level in the educational system, the regional level, is more visible and explained in the data.

/ It seems that the LSP did not work very much together with the regional offices. /

The LSP was a part of the educational structure in the regions and had the Regional Director as immediate superior. One could have expected that the project, presenting new ideas and a new subject, would establish a close co-operation with the Regional Offices to create support and understanding for it and its activities. The data show little of this. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, many decisions about project activities were taken on GMSs and then implemented in the regions. This leaves reduced space for what plans others could have e.g. the regional office, the inspectors, the schools etc. It seems as the Minister also expressed above that there was not an official requirement of co-operation between the two. The project could do more or less as it liked. It seems that the project was aware of this situation because the Project Proposal (LSP 1998:16) says that the LSP “cannot any longer be seen to have a special status as compared with other subjects” and that all planning activities from then on should be done with the Regional Offices. The relative autonomy of the LSP offices would have enabled each single region to create co-

operation at local level but it seems that project's own planning was the most important in the end.

Another feature which could have made the co-operation more difficult was if the expectations from the donors or the project staff themselves to see results, to fulfil the activity plans in the project documents and to reach the stipulated outcomes were difficult to accomplish. It could make it more difficult to plan together with others or consider their planning to a greater extent. One of the managers is quoted in chapter 3 as saying that project reports were mainly on quantitative features like how many books were distributed, how many teachers attended workshops etc.

A project is often followed by an extra input in the form of money, staff and logistics. In a case like that the project will be able to accomplish more activities in a shorter time than what is possible to do within a normal governmental framework. This is not a situation which creates the best platform for co-operation and it could also be a way of creating a feeling of 'us and them'. One AT mentioned, that others might think that the people in the project were spoiled because "the LSP were giving"(See chapter 4 p.64).

In the Midterm Review (LSP 1997:11) there is a beginning understanding of the importance of including others outside the project in the target groups for the project namely circuit inspectors and principals. And the last Project Proposal from 1998 states that the idea is to move away from being a "project" to be fully regional based and that activities should be planned together with the regional offices (LSP 1998:16). From the interviews it seems that this did not occur to the extent it was intended. What could support this notion is that most of the interviewees, but all the ATs, when asked what they would have done differently if they could start a new LSP, said they would have worked more closely together with gatekeepers like the regional office and the principals.

The ATs had a special position as "belonging" to both the project and the Regional Office. They would be good indicators for any discrepancy between the two employers. They all indicate that there are problems. Especially one AT, (chapter 4

p.65), expresses that the ATs “were pulled to this side and the other. The relationship was not good between the two”. This is a rather strong comment but it indicates a tension. This tension differed most probable from region to region depending on the local conditions.

5.4.2 The LSP and the teachers

/ The project tried to convince the teachers that the new teaching methods and ideas about learning were the best. The LSP staff was unified in this effort. /

In the daily work of the project it was most often the teachers that the staff would be in contact with. The teachers represented a major target group for the project. They were influenced by the old educational system as they all were educated in it and most have taught in it as well. The teachers would also to a great extent represent the prevailing ideas of teaching in the teaching community.

There are many responses related to how the project worked with the teachers. They show that there are different levels where they had to be convinced. It was about teaching methods and also as one manager says, about “changing their attitude” (chapter 4 p64).

I think it is possible to change teaching methods rather quickly if you just look at the methods themselves and you have more or less the same understanding of what teaching encompass. But when it comes to the underlying assumptions and values it might take a very long time as Hofstede is quoted for saying in chapter 2 (p 7). Looking at the Midterm Review 1997 (LSP 1997:10) it seems that the process of changing the teachers’ classroom performance was progressing at a slow speed. It is likely if the understanding of teaching is different. A factor which might have added to this could be that when the teachers came back from the projects workshops with new inputs they would come back to a teaching environment at their schools which was not supportive and was the same as when they left. After a while it could be that you will discouraged from changing your teaching. One of the ATs says for example, that he/she had enough time to adapt to the new methods and thinking so they would be “a part of our own self” (chapter 4 p.64). The AT worked full time in

the project, and it even took time for him/her to learn the ideas. How would it then be for an ordinary teacher who would only attend few workshops and not work in a supportive environment such as LSP could provide?

One could ask how much the project was sensitive to the background and experiences of the teachers. One AT says, that in some cultures (referring to Namibia) you sit and listen while in other cultures (referring to Denmark) “they should question things” (chapter 4 p.53). By looking at the responses quoted from interviews, where it for example was expressed by a manager that it was difficult to convince the teachers about the new ideas and that “they changed” (chapter 4, p.63) and by an AT who says about his/her colleagues’ view of the new ideas that “It was not something that could be built into a Namibian educational system” (chapter 4 p.64), it could be interpreted that the project was not very sensitive towards what the teachers represented. If that is the case there is an interesting dichotomy between the project which claims to introduce learner centred education and at the same time seemingly did not take the teachers’ value systems in consideration. It could be of interest here to refer to Kristensen’s (1999) thesis about the project where one of his conclusions is that the LSP was promoting a child centred approach and not a learner centred approach (Kristensen 1999:144-45), as the interviews and some of the official papers could give the impression of.

The staff seemed to be united in their efforts to bring about change and it seems from the quotations that there, at that time, was little doubt that the way of teaching and thinking about teaching the project presented was not the “right” way. The ordinary teachers would be confronted with the new ideas from both the Namibian and the Danish. It seems almost to be a kind of mission for the staff. One of the ATs said that the LCE was started by the project and many of the other responses give the impression that the project more or less saw itself as being equal with or identified with this approach. The project documents show that the LCE was highly prioritised. In 1996 in an internal workshop for the LSP staff it was recommended to prioritise pedagogical issues higher than content issues (Jacobsen & Morgenstjerne, 2000:38).

What has been described in this section, the relationship to the teachers, and also to a certain extent the relationship to the partners from the previous section gives me the impression that the new ideas and methods were to a great extent imposed by the project. I have described that it was a part of a political battle but anyway the new ideas were a result of educational thinking developed elsewhere and introduced into Namibia. Bourdieu, a French sociologist, has described the cultural transmission of ideas and knowledge from groups which are dominant in society to other groups. Broady (1989:2) explains two main concepts in Bourdieu's thinking. (1) Symbolic capital is what social groups recognise as having value and (2) Cultural capital which is the type of symbolic capital which is dominant in a culture and representing the dominant group or groups. Individuals with the same cultural capital as the dominant groups are likely to be more successful than people with a different cultural capital. For example people with a certain education will be favoured.

It seems that the LSP had the sanction of the ruling party and could thereby transfer the ideas which had value for the ruling group. The ideas were the new paradigm within teaching, which as far as I can see had its roots in Western educational thinking. So to what degree was it a transfer of Western, or for that matter, Danish values to Namibia? The responses from the managers (chapter 4 pp 66-67), where they express different views on if it can be justified to come to Namibia with a project like the LSP, one being very sceptical about projects in developing countries in general, another expressing that the best from the two systems should be merged and the third that if the educational system has to be changed a massive intervention will be needed, definitely brings one to think of what Bourdieu wrote. I will leave this question to the reader to judge from his/her own perception of the world.

Earlier in this chapter it was indicated that the LSP as an organisation had many similarities with a loosely coupled system. The described relationship to partners and recipients makes it interesting to discuss the project in relation to the systems thinking which is described in chapter 2. The last section of this chapter makes it relevant to discuss to what extent it is either an open system or a closed system.

5.4.3 The LSP in terms of systems thinking

I have in chapter 2 (p. 15) shortly described systems thinking. Here I will firstly elaborate more on theory to establish an understanding of what a closed and open system is.

French and Bell (1995:89) explain that a “*system* denotes interdependency, interconnectedness, and interrelatedness of a set of elements that constitute an identifiable whole or gestalt”. A system has its purposes and goals. A system can be seen from the perspective of classical management theories which Morgan (1986) says: “devoted relatively little attention to the environment. They (the classical management theorists) treated the organisation as a closed ... system and became preoccupied with principles of internal design” (Morgan 1986:45). An open systems view suggests that “we should always organise with the environment in mind” (*ibid.*:45). He further explains that the environment has two components namely “the immediate ‘task environment’ defined by the organisations’ direct interactions..., as well as the broader ‘contextual’ or ‘general environment’” (*ibid.*: 45). What I have described in my study is the ‘task environment’ consisting of the Ministry, NIED, Regional Offices and the teachers. An open system will have a continuous exchange with its environment. The exchange is described as an input (from the environment), throughput (processing the inputs) output (products to the environment) mechanism.

With this background in mind I will discuss to what extent the LSP considered the inputs from its task environment.

There are quite a number of reports on the project. They are often meant to check if the outcomes stipulated in the Project Proposals have been reached and they also feed information into the proposals. The proposals were written on the basis of an evaluation of activities and on what the objectives of the project were. I have earlier in this chapter (p.80) given the example where it was found that there was only a small change in what happened in the classrooms. The project then recommended to put more emphasis on teaching methodology and less on content issues. Reports,

Project Proposals and reviews are examples of inputs from the task environment. Did the project mainly use them for more than reporting back to donor and partners? If it is as one manager said (chapter 4 p.44) that the Project Proposal did not mean a lot in the daily work, then the answer would be: No. If they were pointing at important issues like the classroom praxis which could give a new direction of the project, then the answer would be: Yes. Is it the projects' own monitoring of the environment or has it also incorporated the partners' ideas in them? I find especially the Project Proposal from 1993 (LSP 1993b), the Midterm Review from 1997 (LSP 1997) and the Project Proposal from 1998 (LSP 1998) to have incorporated inputs from the environment in them.

It was earlier described that the project made its own plans and only in 1998 (LSP 1998:16) it was the official policy of the phasing out period of the LSP to work together with the Regional Offices in the planning. So until that time the set-up was not favouring a grate deal of interrelationship. The last project period 1999 – 2000 is more difficult to picture from the interviews it could partly be because it was a phasing out period.

The way the interpersonal relationship between the teachers and the staff was not present in the responses in the interviews and this element would be an important input to how the daily work was planned and carried out. From the interviews it is only possible to comment on two main components, one, the fundamental ideas behind the teaching and two, the teaching methods. These two areas it seems to be of extreme importance for the project. They were not areas where the project would compromise. In chapter 3 a battle metaphor was used to describe the project in the Namibian context. A battle is against something and in the fight you might get more and more convinced that your own ideas are "right". It could be more and more difficult to understand or accept others' ideas. So even though a manager reflecting upon what happened at that time (chapter 4 p. 66) suggested that "the good things from the two countries be merged together to make it better", it was not what happened.

These are only a few selected examples but the reader will hopefully in the data find other examples that support my interpretation of the project as a predominantly closed system which means that it, as Bush (1995) explains, “tends to...take little account of external opinions determining the purposes and activities of the organisation” (Bush 1995:34). This does not mean it did not have interrelations with the environment, but in the continuum between an open and a closed system the project seemed to be more in line with the closed systems approach.

5.5 REFLECTIONS

I have so far in this chapter illuminated two trends, the processes in the LSP and the projects’ relationship to its task environment based on the perceptions of the two groups of interviewees. The expressed views indicate that there was an inconsistency between the two trends. The project itself which, through its structure, the relative autonomy of its regional offices, the low profile of the managers, its caring for the staff etc., could accommodate individual and regional differences seemingly did not show the same openness and inclusiveness in its relations with the task environment.

I will here reflect on what could have enhanced this dichotomy in the project. The data and the data analysis give me the impression that the project, - the project staff, did not really establish what the values and beliefs and the underlying assumptions of the project were. The ontological and epistemological aspects of the project. If these were clear, would a consequence of this not be that the focus of the project would be clearer? The data indicate different understandings of the goals of the project. Would this understanding not have created a platform for a dialogue and mutual understanding with all the stakeholders, internal and external, with relations to the project? Would it not have helped in clarifying the issue of ownership to the project that the expressed views show different perceptions of? When this discussion of and clarification at a deeper level seemingly did not take place, would it then not be the task elements of the project that would decide the projects activities and relations to its internal and external partners? Would this focus on tasks leave sufficient space to accommodate the values, beliefs and practices of the partners and recipients? The

battle metaphor (chapter 4) and the description of the LSP as a rather closed system in this chapter indicate that it could be difficult.

What could be the reason for not clarifying the value basis of the project? Was there maybe not time for it? Were the Project Documents only concerned about with measurable outcomes? Did the rather frequent change in Danish staff make it difficult to create a common focus? Maybe nobody really saw the importance of a clarification? Answers to these and related questions are important for understanding processes in the project, but it is not in the scope of this research to seek answers for them.

In the methodology chapter I acknowledged that my personal views and values in one way or another are present in the data and the data discussion. I also acknowledged that it is difficult for me, the researcher, to discover how my own experiences are present in the study. In recognition of this, I will leave it to the reader to judge to what extent my writing of this chapter and interpretation of the findings can claim to have the rigour (chapter 3 p. 30) that has been my intention to establish throughout the study.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

This chapter combines and draws together the information which have informed the path and content of the study. The research findings illuminated trends and features related to management of the former LSP based on the perceptions of former managers and ATs working in the project. The findings were enriched by literature from management theory which could highlight the importance of recognising values and beliefs in management. In this study it was of special relevance because it involved interviewees from two countries and also that the project studied was Danish funded but based in Namibia. Against this background I find it appropriate as the beginning of this chapter to present the main threads from the literature chapter (chapter 2) as these add richness to the findings of the following section which presents the findings from the data discussion.

6.1 FINDINGS FROM THE RESEARCH

6.1.1 Literature analysis

The purpose of the literature analysis was to establish how cultural values could influence and/or were important for management in an organisation like the LSP, which had staff with different cultural backgrounds and also was introducing new methods and ideas in Namibia about teaching which were very different from the prevailing ideas at that time.

Hofstede, as described in chapter 2, argues that management theories which are developed in one country cannot be directly transferred/ exported to another country because the two countries have different cultural values. I argued that even though there are a number of weaknesses in his approach that his ideas which highlight the importance of underlying cultural values could be useful for organisations which contain different cultural aspects.

This is in line with the *Ubuntu* movement which claims that management models developed abroad cannot be directly used in Africa without considering the values of the African societies. Management should be based on African values. In chapter 2 I argued that the *Ubuntu* way of management is not a real alternative to Western management models and that there are management models which will be able to accommodate different cultural values like e.g. African values. But I recognised that the *Ubuntu* movement for stressing the importance of knowing ones own cultural values.

In the analysis of Western management and leadership theories I described how the theories changed over time, moving from being mostly concerned about results towards including all aspects of an organisation. To be more process oriented. This shift could allow organisations to accommodate cultural values. But at the same time I also argued that cultural values are not of major interest of organisations if they do not serve the effectiveness of the organisation.

6.1.2 Data interpretation

The study is based on 2 groups of interviewees', former managers which are Danish and ATs which are Namibian, interpretation of the management of the LSP and can and will therefore not claim to give a complete picture of these aspects of the project. It has illuminated certain features.

The data were very comprehensive expressing the different personalities of the interviewees and also their cultural backgrounds. In spite of this variety it was possible to identify themes which are presented in the Data chapter (chapter 4). These themes could feed into two main trends, as shown in chapter 5, that seem to be opposed to one another.

The first trend is related to the way the project functioned as a system, the internal processes and structures which would characterise the LSP as an organisation.

In the LSP there was an understanding that the task of the project was to implement a new subject and to support/spearhead the new educational reform in the independent Namibia. At the same time, though, it seems the focus/direction of what took place in the project was rather unclear. The project's organisational structure was without many levels between top and bottom. In the beginning of the project many decisions were taken at GMSs and then carried out in the different regions by the staff there. Later a major decentralisation took place with the regional LSP offices being rather autonomous. It would in that way be possible to cater for the big regional differences in Namibia. It appears from the data that this decentralisation was a reaction to processes in the project which already were going on, rather than a proactive decision. This type of organisation with a rather loose structure resembles what in management literature is called a loosely coupled system.

The Namibian ATs are by all interviewees seen as an extremely important element in the project. The project selected the Namibian staff from persons they would prefer to work together with and took also the responsibility for upgrading their qualifications if they did not meet the official requirements for the position they held. The ATs found that the building of their capacity was very important. They expressed that the management of the project was easily accessible and that they could express themselves openly and freely at meetings, which could indicate that they were not so much used to that in Namibia.

All the managers expressed that they did not see themselves as leaders. They took a kind of 'anti-leader' position putting emphasis on the team. By comparing this with Hofstede's cultural dimensions as described in chapter 2, I suggested in chapter 5 that this attitude could be culturally determined. At the same time the managers felt confident in performing the more formal management tasks e.g. planning. The expressed views about the internal processes and structure of the project could suggest that the LSP was taking personal and regional differences in consideration and also was rather flexible to adapt to changes in its own organisation.

The second trend is the project's relationship to the external or task environment, which comprised institutions and professional persons with whom the project worked.

The project should implement a new subject, life science, and was also a partner to the Namibian government in implementing a new educational reform after the country gained independence in 1990. The data indicate that the project did not meet many restrictions from the Government's side. The interviewees expressed themselves mostly about the projects activities at the regional level with the Regional Offices and the teachers. The data, supported by the projects official documents, show that the project to a great extent did its own planning rather independently from other potential partners. For the phasing out period of the project it was stressed that matters such as planning should be done together with the Regional Offices. However, both the LSP documents consulted and the expressed responses indicate that this was not always the case. The ATs were in a double position, as part of the project and as part of the formal educational system. Their expressed views on the project's relationship to the Regional Offices could indicate that it was not always as it should be since they all indicated they would have worked closer together with the Regional Offices if they would have had another chance with a similar project.

The project introduced new teaching ideas and methods which were very different from what was prevailing in Namibia at that time. From the interviews it emerges that it was not always easy to do; there was a resistance towards it. The responses from the interviewees gives the impression that it was a 'battle' to introduce the new teaching methods and ideas as it was described in chapter 4, and that there seemed to be little acceptance of divergent opinions and methods from the teachers build on their previous experiences and practices. In chapter 5 I suggested that this showed similarities with transmission of cultural ideas and knowledge from one group to another as expressed by Bourdieu (Chapter 5 p. 81).

The findings from the interviewees' responses about the project's relationship to the task environment could support an interpretation of the project as taking little account of external opinions determining the purposes and activities of the

organisation as Bush is quoted for (chapter 5 p. 84) when he describes an organisation as a closed system.

The two divergent trends lead me in chapter 5 to reflect on and suggest that the LSP seemingly did not establish an understanding of what the ontological and epistemological aspects, the underlying assumptions as well as values, of the project were.

This research has illuminated 2 major trends and drawn the attention to a number of themes. It was not in the scope of this study to draw consequences from the trends or themes. But the findings could be an impulse to consider what it is projects which, like the LSP, introduce/implement new concepts and methods in another society, actually are doing. It is only to accomplish a task or are there other important issues to take into account? Are they sufficiently aware of the cultural context they operate in? Will they be able to work with and accommodate cultural differences into the organisation as well as those from its task environment?

6.1.3 Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research

Returning to the discussion in chapter two about methodology it would be appropriate at this stage to consider the limitations of the research. The research is carried out on a limited number of interviewees from the former LSP. For example are ATs from all the regions in Namibia, former Danish volunteers in the project and representatives from the donor organisation Ibis not represented in the sampling. The study can be said to be a snapshot of the project, providing in-depth insights about certain issues of the project, based on the interviewees' perceptions and is therefore only a part of a bigger picture. By using other data gathering methods or a combination of methods it would have been possible to give a broader perspective of the researched issues, but it was not possible under the given circumstances and not the intention and scope of the study.

A number of descriptions and evaluations of the LSP describes the project as a success. This study has illuminated an inconsistency in the management of the

project which might be related to a failure to clarify the ontological and epistemological assumptions of the project. However, the limited scope and level of this investigation leads me to suggest several other issues which could fruitfully be researched to add to our understanding of cross-cultural management. Perhaps this study could stimulate awareness of these issues which could give rise to further investigations, such as

- Research based on a broader sampling and using different data collecting methods;
- To what extent project proposals are open for cultural aspects in the recipient country;
- To what extent project proposals are clear about cultural values they represent and how these values correspond to the recipients' value system.
- A closer examination of the values the donor chooses to transfer to the recipient as well as how these values are being transferred.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N.J. (1983). Organizational development in a multicultural environment. *Applied Behavioral Science*, 19 (3): 349-365.
- Arksey, H. & Knight, P. (1999). *Interviewing for social scientists: An introductory resource with examples*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bassey, M. (1995). *Creating education through research*. Newark: Kirklington Moor Press.
- Broady, D. (1989). *Kapital, habitus och fält. Några nyckelbegrepp i Pierre Bourdieus sociology*. Stockholm: Institut foer Paedagogik.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bush, T. (1995). *Theories of educational management*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Cantrell, D. (1993). Alternative paradigms in environmental education research: The interpretive perspective. In R. Mrazek (Ed.), *Alternative paradigms in environmental research*. (pp.81-104). Lethbridge: NAAEE.
- Connole, H. (1993). The research enterprise. In H. Connole, B. Smith & R. Wiseman. *Issues and methods in research: Study guide*. (pp.7-27). Underdale, South Australia: Distance Education Centre, University of South Australia.
- Durrheim, D. (1999). Research design. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in practice*. (pp.29-53). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- French, W.L. & Bell, C.H. (1995). *Organization development: Behavioral science interventions for organization improvement*. Washington: Prentice Hall International.
- Golembiewski, R.T. (1991). OD applications in developmental settings: Four perspectives on action research in an important locus. *Research in the Sociology of Organisations* 9:201-225.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics* 9(1): 42-63.
- Hofstede, G. (1994a). Cultural and other differences in teaching and learning. In A. van der Walt (Ed.), *The principles of multicultural tertiary education*. (pp. 71-79). Vanderbijlpark: Vaal Triangle Technikon.

- Hofstede, G. (1994b). Foreword in Kim, U., Triandis, H.C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S. & Yoon, G., *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications. Cross-cultural Research and Methodology series*. (p x). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hoy, W.K. & Miskel, C.G. (1996). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Random House.
- Jacobsen, G. & Morgenstierne, C.M. (2000). *Schools at the sharp end of democracy in Namibia*. Copenhagen: U-landsorganisationen Ibis.
- Jaeger, A.M. (1986). Organization development and national culture: Where's the fit? *Academy of Management Review* 11 (1):178-190.
- Janse van Rensburg, E. (1995). Trends in educational research. *Discourse* 6 (1):30-33.
- Khoza, R. (1994). The need for an Afrocentric approach to management. In P. Christie, R. Lessem & L. Mbigi. *African management*. (pp.117-124). Randburg: Knowledge Resources.
- Kim, U., Triandis, H.C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S. & Yoon, G. (1994). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications. Cross-cultural research and methodology series*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kristensen, J.O. (1999). An evaluation of the Life Science curriculum in Namibia and its development through stakeholders' perception of "Learner centred education". Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown.
- Kruger, D. (1988). *An introduction to phenomenological psychology*. Cape Town: Juta.
- LSP. (1991). *Introduction of Life Science in Junior Secondary schools*. Project Proposal 1991. Life Science Project, Namibia.
- LSP. (1992). *Job descriptions for Senior Advisors*. Life Science Project, Namibia.
- LSP. (1993a). *Minutes from general staff meeting April 16th 1993*. Life Science Project, Namibia.
- LSP. (1993b). *Project proposal second phase. Life Science Project. 1993*. Life Science Project, Namibia.
- LSP. (1995). *Minutes from general staff meeting March 27th 1995*. Life Science Project, Namibia.
- LSP. (1996). *Minutes from general staff meeting November 1996*. Life Science Project, Namibia.
- LSP. (1997). *Midterm review 1997*. Life Science Project, Namibia.

- LSP. (1998). *Project proposal: Phasing out of Life Science Project, Namibia*. Life Science Project, Namibia.
- Mbigi, L., & Maree, J. (1995). *Ubuntu: The spirit of African transformational management*. Randburg: Knowledge Resources.
- Michael, V. (2000). The changing faces of organizational theory. Unpublished M.Ed. assignment, Rhodes University, Grahamstown.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Popkewitz, T.S. (1984). *Paradigm and ideology in educational research*. London: Falmer Press.
- Schein, E.H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist* 45:109-119.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, & H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi & G. Yoon (Eds.) *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications. Cross-cultural Research and Methodology series*. (pp. 85-119). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Senge, P. (1997). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. London: Century Business.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shackleton, V.J. & Ali, A.H. (1990). Work-related values of managers: A test of the Hofstede model. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology* 21(1):109-118.
- Shutte, A. (1996). *Philosophy for Africa: Community and individual freedom, and conceptions of humanity*. In M.E. Steyn & K.B. Motshabi, *Cultural synergy in South Africa* (pp. 27-36). Randburg: Knowledge Resources.
- Terre Blanche, M. & Durrheim, K. (1999). Histories of the present: Social science research in context. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds), *Research in practice* (pp.1-16). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Van der Mescht, H. (1996). A phenomenological investigation into leaders' perceptions of themselves, their followers and their organizational contexts. Unpublished PhD. thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown.
- Winegardner, K. (nd) The case study method of scholarly research. The Graduate School of America, <http://www.tgsa.edu/online/cybrary/case1.html>. Accessed 9 May 2001.

APPENDIX 1

1. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS TO MANAGERS.

1. WOULD YOU TRY TO EXPLAIN YOUR REASONS FOR JOINING THE LSP AND MAYBE ALSO DESCRIBE WHAT THE PROJECT WAS ABOUT?
2. WHAT WERE YOUR TASKS IN THE PROJECT? (THE PROJECTS BUT ALSO YOUR PERSONAL PREFERENCES)
3. IF YOU LOOK BACK AT YOUR TIME IN LSP WOULD YOU THEN TRY TO DESCRIBE ONE OR TWO EVENTS WHICH YOU REALLY FOUND WERE IMPORTANT? (PERSONAL OR FOR THE PROJECT)
4. DO YOU FEEL THERE WERE ANY CONTRAST BETWEEN YOUR PERSONAL GOALS AND THAT OF THE PROJECT (EXAMPLES)?
5. WHAT WERE THE MAJOR STUMBLING BLOCKS? (EXAMPLES)
6. ONE OR TWO INCIDENTS WHERE YOU FELT YOU MADE A REAL BREAKTHROUGH.
7. WHERE THERE TIMES WHERE YOU FELT THAT YOU WERE NOT GETTING ANYWHERE? (EXAMPLES)
8. HOW WILL YOU DESCRIBE YOURSELF AS A MANAGER? (EXAMPLES)
9. HOW SUCCESSFUL DO YOU THINK YOU WERE? (EXPAND/EXAMPLES)
10. IF YOU HAD A CHANCE OF DOING IT ALL OVER AGAIN, ARE THERE THEN THINGS YOU WOULD HAVE DONE IN ANOTHER WAY? (ELABORATE)

CHECKLIST.

COUNTERPART INITIATIVE.
OWNERSHIP.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS TO THE ADVISORY TEACHERS (ATs).

Some of the questions for the Danish managers cannot be used directly with the Namibians. I will try to stick to the content as much as possible and then change the questions a bit.

1. WOULD YOU TRY AND EXPLAIN HOW YOU CAME INTO THE LSP?
2. IF YOU LOOK BACK AT YOUR TIME IN LSP WOULD YOU THEN TRY TO DESCRIBE ONE OR TWO EVENTS YOU FOUND WAS REALLY IMPORTANT?
3. WOULD YOU DESCRIBE ONE OR TWO EVENTS WHICH YOU FOUND TO BE VERY DIFFICULT?
4. HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PROJECT?
5. HOW WILL YOU DESCRIBE YOUR RELATIONS TO THE MANAGEMENT?
6. IF YOU WERE THE MANAGER OF A SIMILAR PROJECT AS LSP ARE THERE THINGS YOU WOULD DO IN ANOTHER WAY?

REMEMBER:
OWNERSHIP
FOCUS OF THE PROJECT/RED TREAD.

APPENDIX 2

Questionnaire

When you fill in the questionnaire I would like you for each row to look at and compare the two opposite statements in the columns A and B. Then you should indicate with an **X** how you would describe features, issues and prevailing ideas in your country of origin.

(Number **2**, closest to column **A** indicates that you agree with **A**, number **1** indicates that you partly agree. **0** indicates that you do not find the statements of importance or that they are equally balanced. Number **1** closest to column **B** indicates that you partly agree with the statement and number **2**, closest to **B** that you agree with it).

	COLUMN A	2	1	0	1	2	COLUMN B
1.	All people should be interdependent.						A few people should be independent; most should be dependent.
2	Inequality in society should be minimised						There should be an order of inequality in this world in which everybody has a rightful place; high and low are protected by this order.
3.	Hierarchy means existential inequality.						Hierarchy means an inequality of roles, established for convenience
4.	Superiors are accessible						Superiors are often inaccessible.
5.	Powerholders are entitled to privileges.						All should have equal rights.
6.	Superiors consider subordinates of being of a different kind and want to be treated with respect by them.						Superiors consider Subordinates to be people like me.
7.	Subordinates consider superiors as being of a different kind and perceive them potentially with mistrust.						Subordinates consider superiors to be people like me.
8.	No inherent respect for old age.						Respect for old age.
9.	Status important to show power differences						Status unimportant to show power differences
10	Powerful people should try to look as powerful as possible.						Powerful people should try to look less powerful than they are.

11	People at various power levels feel less threatened and more prepared to trust people					Other people are a potential threat to one's power and can rarely be trusted.
12	Latent conflict exists between the powerful and the powerless.					Latent harmony exists between the powerful and the powerless.
13	Co-operation among the powerless can be based on solidarity					Co-operation between the powerless is difficult to bring about because of low faith in people norm
14	Greater centralisation, low degree of delegation.					Less centralisation, high degree of delegation.
15	Tall organisation pyramids, with many levels.					Flat organisation pyramids, with few levels..
16	Small proportion of supervisory personnel.					Large proportion of supervisory personnel.
17	Small wage differentials					Larger wage differentials.
18	Manual work the same status as clerical work.					White-collar jobs valued more than blue-collar jobs.
19	The way to change a social system is by dethroning those in power.					The way to change a social system is by redistributing power.
20	The uncertainty in life is more easily accepted and each day is taken as it comes.					The uncertainty in life is felt as continuous threat that must be fought.
21	Aggressive behaviour of self and others is accepted					Aggressive behaviour is frowned upon.
22	More showing of emotions is preferred.					Less showing of emotions is preferred.
23	Conflict and competition can be contained on the level of fair play and used constructively.					Conflict and competition can unleash aggression and should therefore be avoided.
24	Acceptance of dissent, more tolerance.					Need for consensus, intolerance of deviant ideas and persons.
25	There is a great concern with security in life.					There is more willingness to take risks in life.
26	The search is for ultimate, absolute truths and values.					The accent is on relativism, empiricism.
27	There should be as few rules as possible.					There is a need for written rules and regulations.
28	If rules cannot be kept, they should be changed.					If rules cannot be kept, we are sinners and should repent.
29	Belief is placed in experts and their knowledge.					Belief is placed in generalists and common sense.
30	The authorities is there to serve the citizens.					Ordinary citizens are incompetent compared with the authorities.
31	Organisations should be as uniform as possible (standardisation)					Organisations can be pluriform

32	Managers are more interpersonal oriented and flexible in their style.					Managers more task-oriented and consistent in their style
33	More ritual behaviour (procedures)					Less ritual behaviour.
34	We consciousness holds sway.					I consciousness holds sway.
35	Identity is based in the individual.					Identity is based in the social system.
36	There is emotional independence of individual <u>from</u> organisations or institutions.					There is emotional dependence of individual <u>on</u> organisations and institutions.
37	The involvement with organisations is moral.					The involvement with organisations is calculative.
38	The emphasis is on belonging to organisations; membership is the ideal.					The emphasis is on individual initiative and achievement, leadership is the ideal.
39	Private life is invaded by organisations and clans to which one belongs; opinions are predetermined.					Everybody has the right to a private life and opinion.
40	Autonomy, variety, pleasure, and individual financial security are sought in the system.					Expertise, order, duty, and security are provided by organisation or clan.
41	Belief is placed in individual decisions.					Belief is placed in group decisions.
42	Value standards should apply to all (universalism)					Value standards differ for in-groups and out-groups (particularism)
43	People try to avoid loosing face.					People try to avoid loss of self-respect.
44	More explicit verbal communication.					More implicit verbal communication.
45	Organisations are not expected to look after employees from cradle to grave.					Employees expect organisations to look after them like a family – and can become very alienated if the organisation dissatisfies them.
46	The organisation has great influence on member's well-being.					The organisation has moderate influence on member's well-being
47	Employees expect organisations to defend their interests					Employees are expected to defend their own interests.
48	Sex roles in society are clearly differentiated.					Sex roles in society are more fluid.
49	Performance is what counts.					Quality of life is what counts.
50	You work in order to live.					You live in order to work.
51	Money and things are important.					People and environment are important.
52	Interdependence is the ideal					Independence is the ideal
53	One admires the successful achiever.					One sympathises with the unfortunate.
54	Big and fast are beautiful					Small and slow is beautiful.

