

Rhodes University

Education Department

**An investigation of participative management in a museum in the
Eastern Cape, South Africa**

submitted by

Nozipho Madinda

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Education

August 2015

ABSTRACT

The purpose of my research was to investigate participative management at the Albany Museum with a view to generating knowledge and insights that can be used to support senior management's engagement with participative management at mid-management level. My interest was to investigate participative management with regards to five HODs of the Albany Museum with a view to generating knowledge and insights that can be used to support senior management's engagement with participative management at mid-management level.

The research was informed by the interpretive paradigm. The interpretive paradigm does not concern itself with the search for broadly applicable laws and rules but rather seeks to produce descriptive analyses that emphasise deep interpretation and understanding of social phenomena through the meaning that the people assign to them.

This study is mostly descriptive and presents the reality of participants from their own experience. Semi-structured interviews and observation capture 'insider' knowledge that is part of an interpretive methodology.

The study found that participative management was both understood and generally accepted as a good way to manage an organisation, and even members who were critical of it could see its benefits. However, the fractured and diversified structure of the organisation calls for a particularly skillful application of this management approach, one which would also demand leadership and a greater sense of working towards what are called collegial models of management. Whether this is in fact desirable for a museum is debatable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am especially thankful to Professor Hennie van der Mescht, my supervisor, my father for his valuable insight and his support.

I want to thank my dearest husband Mr Ndumiso Madinda for his support.

I want to thank my colleagues Ms Fleur-Way Jones, Amy Wenzel and Mr Musa Mlambo, Mr Lindinxiwa Mahlasela and Mr Manzandonga Vabaza for their support.

I want to thank my friends Clayton Zazu, Daniel Chacha, Rejoice Baartjie, ZukiswaKuhlane, Caleb Mandikhonza and Doctor Kenneth Ngcoza for their continuous support and encouragement.

I am indebted to the six HODs of Albany Museum for their willingness to participate in my research, namely Dr Helen James, Dr John Midgely, Ms Celeste Booth, Mr Pumlanani Cimi, Mr Thabang Tshobeni and Ms Khanyiswa Mhlele.

Finally, my gratitude goes to my whole family, especially sisters, who supported me in many ways to complete this task successfully.

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, Nozipho Madinda, hereby declare that this study is my own work, and that it has not been submitted for a degree or examination in any other university and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been acknowledged by complete references.

Signed:.....

August 2015

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Context of my research	3
1.3 History of the Albany Museum.....	4
1.3.1 Education	7
1.3.2 Governance	9
1.4 Research goal	10
1.5 Methodology	10
1.5.1 The research method	11
1.5.2 Data collection	11
1.5.3 Data analysis	12
1.6 Ethical issues.....	12
1.7 Structure of my thesis	13
Chapter 2: Literature review	14
2.1 Introduction.....	14
2.2 Museums as organisations	15
2.3 Management and leadership compared.....	16
2.2.1 Leadership.....	18
2.2.1.1 Transactional leadership	19
2.2.1.2 Transformational leadership	20
2.2.1.3 Visionary and organic leadership.....	22
2.2.1.4 Emotional intelligence	23
2.3 Management.....	24

2.3.1 Participative management.....	26
2.3.2 The roots of participative management.....	28
2.3.2.1 Participative management in practice	29
2.3.2.2 The limitations of participative management	30
2.4 Bush's collegial model.....	31
2.6 Conclusion	32
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	33
3.1 Introduction.....	33
3.2 Interpretive paradigm.....	33
3.3 Research method: A case study	34
3.4 Methodological implications	36
3.5 Sampling	36
3.5.1 The research site and the selection of the participants.....	36
3.6 Data gathering techniques.....	37
3.6.1 Open-ended questionnaires.....	37
3.6.2 Interviews.....	38
3.6.3 Observation	38
3.7 Data Analysis	40
3.8 Validity	40
3.9 Ethical consideration.....	41
3.10 Limitations of case study research.....	42
3.11 Conclusion	42
Chapter 4: Data analysis and discussion.....	43

4.1 Introduction.....	43
4.2The picture of the participative management that emerges from the data.....	44
4.2.1The benefits of participative management.....	45
4.2.1.1 Participative management encourages staff participation.....	45
4.2.1.2Participativemanagementencourages participation in decision-making.....	47
4.2.1.3 Participative management broadens HODs’ perceptions	48
4.2.1.4 Participative management extends management to different levels.....	48
4.2.1.5 Participative management enhances staff commitment and sense of responsibility	49
4.2.1.6Participative management leads to co-construction of knowledge.....	50
4.2.1.8 Participative management ensures a greater sense of ownership	51
4.5.1 Leadershipand participative management.....	51
4.3 Factors that hinder the development of participative management in the context of the museum.....	52
4.3.1 Lack of communication between HODs and other staff members	52
4.3.2 Lack of management competence.....	53
4.3.3 Lack of overall vision among museum departments	55
4.3.4 Shortage of staff.....	57
4.3.5Participative management is time consuming.....	57
4.4Concluding thoughts	58
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	60
5.1 Introduction.....	60
5.2 Findings.....	60
5.3 Suggestions for future research.....	62

5.4 Recommendations for practice	62
References.....	63
Appendices.....	67
Appendix 1: Letter to manager of the museum	67
Appendix 2: Individual interviews.....	68
Appendix 3: Invitation to research participants	69
Appendix 4: Declaration of participants	70
Appendix 5: Observation schedule	71
Appendix 6: Questionnaire	75
Appendix 7: Letter from supervisors	80
Appendix 8: Organogram of the museum.....	81

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

My interest in museum transformation stems from my professional experience and my Master's studies towards a degree in Educational Leadership and Management. I am the Head of the Education Department in the Albany Museum in Grahamstown. The Albany Museum was established in 1855 and is the second oldest museum in South Africa (*EduMuseum*, 2011). Along with other public and to some extent private institutions, museums have needed to engage with transformation in the past two decades. Before 1994 museums were perceived as being exclusive, serving mostly the politically dominant social economic group (Bredekamp, 2009). However, post-1994 museums have had to adopt transformative visions which in many cases translated into revised management structures. In some cases even the titles of particular posts have changed. For instance, the post of "Curator" changed to "Director" and eventually to "Manager" in 2009. This suggests a shift in how the role is perceived: "Curator" suggests a concern for artefacts only – cultural and natural resources - while "Manager" incorporates the notion of managing human resources as well. It is this concern for the management of human resources that is the focus of my study.

Alongside the changes reported above there were also observable changes in the management and administration of museums. Management approaches shifted towards becoming more participatory (Bredekamp, 2004; Gore, 2005). In the context of management and leadership 'participatory' refers to the practice of consulting co-workers and subordinates, sharing decision-making and generally adopting a team approach to management. On a purely structural level this shift is reflected in the managerial structures and processes of the Albany Museum. Before 1994 the Heads of Department (HODs) were represented in the management of the museum by research departments or academics. Since 2009 there has been a concerted effort to increase the

number of HODs as well as their participation in the day-to-day management of the Museum. Every department of the Albany Museum is now represented in the management structures and processes. Apart from structural changes in staffing, new initiatives such as the Mobile Museum were also set up to cater for interests other than academic. The Mobile Museum is an outreach programme where the museum is taken to the people. Hence the move from 'curatorship' to 'management' has gone hand in hand with a transformed and transforming vision of the role of museums, away from an academic, elite approach towards museums as spaces in which communities meet and share knowledge.

This study looks at how management approaches have adapted to these expectations and how these responses align with contemporary, democratic notions of participation and delegation. Many of these structural changes reflect the theory of participative management, which has become the preferred management approach in post-apartheid South Africa, particularly in education (South Africa, 1996).

However, according to Bronillete (cited in Somech, 2002, p. 342) participative management is a concept surrounded by confusion, despite much research and practical application. There is certainly no one best way of applying this approach to management and each institution has its own demands and needs. However, the approach has some distinguishing features, one of which is that it is associated with a collegial rather than autocratic style of management (Coleman, 2005). This study therefore includes an examination of the collegial management model, as described by Bush (2009) in an attempt to make sense of the situation at the study site. There is also a tendency to regard participative management as a panacea for all past ills and injustices, and this is inclined to limit our need to understand how it unfolds across different contexts in post-apartheid South Africa. If we think of it as a wonder cure for all organisational problems we would naturally overlook its weaknesses. Hence this study attempts to be a critical examination of participative management. Most of the research into participative management has also been on schools and business; there is little research on the management of human resources in non-profits, like museums, and I could find none that addressed participative management *per se*.

Hence it is hoped that this study will make a contribution to a field in which there is very little research.

1.2 Context of my research

Since South Africa became a democratic society in 1994, many museums have undergone transformation. This is in line with the policy (South Africa, 1998) which expects South African Museums to be seen to belong to all South Africans, irrespective of colour, creed or gender. Most have implemented major policy changes, while others have undergone extensive restructuring (Gore, 2005).

One of the first of these was the Africana Museum in Johannesburg which changed its name to Museum Africa in 1994. Many others followed during the 1990s including the Kaffrarian Museum in King William's Town which later changed its name to the Amathole Museum. However, some museums can also be regarded as hardly transformed at all: many are faced with "chronic funding problems, frozen staff posts and strangling bureaucracy" (Bongani Mgijima, personal communication, 12 November 2011). This is an example of where the social and political imperative of transformation is hampered by the lack of resources and infrastructure, a condition prevalent in education in South Africa. In spite of these difficulties South African Museums continue to struggle to transform, to popularise themselves and to become relevant to as wide a section of the population as possible (Gore, 2005).

It is this thrust towards transformation that drew my attention to the topic I chose to pursue for this Master's study. Being a Head of Department in a museum in Grahamstown I have personally witnessed and been part of the Museum's growth and continued attempts to break from its pre-democratic elite position to an institution that belongs to all. I have also seen how attempts at restructuring the Museum – in terms of staffing in particular – have been met with huge challenges. In a sense, then, this study looks at how restructuring is happening, in particular how museum transformation and restructuring plays out within management approaches adopted by a museum's leadership.

To enrich a sense of the context for this research project I now provide a brief history of the Albany Museum. The history tells the story of the museum's journey from its elitist, colonial origins to its present new identity.

1.3 History of the Albany Museum

In July 1855 four doctors, Hutton Edmunds, Armstrong, Atherstone and Mr A.L. McDonald got together for the purpose of forming a medical society. Dr A. Hutton proposed the objectives of the society, namely: Firstly, to facilitate intercourse on professional subjects and secondly to collect specimens in the various departments of Medical Science in all its branches with the view of forming the nucleus of the Museum. They wanted to accommodate members from Grahamstown. On the 11 of September 1855 a resolution was proposed by Dr Hutton and seconded by Dr Edmunds for the establishment of a "General Museum" to be instituted solely for the purpose of aiding in the promotion of scientific pursuit and of affording to the public of this City a greater facility for the diffusion of general education.

The first museum in South Africa was the Iziko Museum. The Albany Museum opened for the first time to the public in a room in Dr Edmund's house on the 2nd and 4th February 1856. The Albany Museum was the second museum to be founded in South Africa. The foundation members of the Albany Museum are worthy of special mention, not only because of their contribution to the Museum but also through their impact on South African scientific development. As finance was the major problem, the funds for the museum first had to be obtained from the annual subscriptions of members to the Literary, Scientific and Medical Society who would be entitled to free admission to the Museum whenever it was open.

The curator of the Albany Museum in 1889 to 1910 appointed was Dr Selmar Schonland at the annual salary of 200 dollars per annum. He was a botanist from Franksehausen in Germany. He had been educated at the University of Berlin and the University of Kiel, where he obtained a PhD in 1883. He brought the necessary experience, knowledge and perseverance to make the Museum a recognised scientific research institution both in South Africa and overseas.

In 1895 there was a change in the title of the head of the Museum from Curator to Director; this was an effort to rearrange the Museum on a professional basis. In 1901, 46 years after being founded the Literary, Scientific and Medical Society was dissolved in part because it had ceased to perform any function other than the management of the Museum. During Dr Schonland's time more staff were employed and a new building secured. In 1900 he had an idea of founding the University College in Grahamstown to employ the services of the University science staff. He succeeded and the University courses ran at St. Andrews College for many years, and it was those teachers in 1904 that formed the first Rhodes University College Senate. In 1910 he was forced to step down as the Museum Director. Since Schonland had difficulties with balancing his obligations to the Museum and the duties at the University College, although he continued as Curator of the Herbarium until 1926. In 1983 the Museum became an Affiliated Research Institute of Rhodes University.

On the 8th of September 1897, the Governor of the Cape Colony, Lord Alfred Milner, laid the foundation stone of the new museum. The entire building was eventually completed by the end of 1901 and the new Albany Museum was officially opened on 22 January 1902 by Sir Walter Hely-Hutchinson, the Governor of the Cape Colony.

Dr Schonland was succeeded in 1910 by Dr John Hewitt as the Director of Albany Museum. Dr Hewitt served for forty eight years. He came from the North of England where he had been educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he achieved first class natural history in 1903. Dr Hewitt was a zoologist specialising in spiders, scorpions and lizards. Furthermore, during his time at the Albany Museum he became a recognised expert on rock art, archaeology and local history and he wrote numerous papers on a variety of subjects. Hewitt's first impressions of the Albany Museum were far from good. He found a museum too small for his contents and overcrowded in each Department. The Herbarium was excellent but needed funding from Government. Through much of its long history, the Albany Museum has been forced to survive on inadequate finances. This became a particular problem after 1910. Before 1910 this museum had relied to a large extent on grants from the Colonial Government, but at the time of South

African unification it was decided to recognise only two National Museums, one in Cape Town and the other in Pretoria. Dr Hewitt retired in 1958.

In 1941 the Albany Museum burned down and most of the collections were damaged. Efforts towards the reconstruction of the Museum began immediately. The Second World War slowed progress, but help came from around the country and building continued. The Albany Museum, despite the difficulties, re-opened to the public in June 1944.

The Albany Museum has seven buildings but I will talk about two historical buildings namely, the Albany History Museum and Observatory Museum. The Albany History Museum is the 1820 Settlers Memorial Museum that opened in 1965 and was a cultural history museum, but concentrated solely on white non-indigenous South Africans. The collections and displays relating to Black South Africans remained in the Natural History Building of the Albany Museum. The Settlers Museum's immediate origins lay in 1958 when a professional officer, Rita Snyman was the first to be appointed to take charge of the Department of History. There was a change in the History Museum as a Contact and Conflict exhibition was added, the Makhanda Exhibition, showcasing the important history of our heroes.

The Observatory Museum was originally the home of Henry Carter Galpin, a watchmaker, jeweler and astronomer who lived in Grahamstown from 1850 to 1890. The first diamond was identified at the Observatory Museum. The restoration of the Museum was in 1980 to 1982 to commemorate the running of the diamond industry in South Africa. Mr Harry Oppenheimer, Chairman of De Beers, officially opened the Museum in February 1983.

Dr John Hewitt was succeeded by Dr T.H. Barry, a lecturer in zoology at Rhodes University. Dr Barry added several wings at the Albany Museum Natural Science and he subsequently retired in 1965. Mr Charles Guillardmod who had been appointed Professional Officer in charge of the entomological collections in 1958, took over the post in 1965. His period as Director was one of consolidation before a new period of growth was initiated by the appointment of Mr Brian Wilmot as director.

In 1977 Founder of the Scifest, Mr Brian Wilmot was the Director of the Museum but his post was upgraded in 1992 to Director of Museums in the Cape Provincial Administration. Mr Brian Wilmot was succeeded by Mr Wouter Holleman who resigned in 1999. Dr Lita Webley, an archaeologist who was working in the Museum, was then appointed as the Acting Director. In 2007 she was finally appointed as the Director of Albany Museum after being Acting Director for seven years – the first female Director. She resigned in 2008 and Mr Cecil Nonqane, who was the Assistant Director at the time, was then appointed to act as the Director. In 2009 Mr Bongani Mgjima was appointed as the first ‘black’ Director, the tenth Director, now called the Manager. He made many changes such as increasing the number of HODs and improving their participation in the day-to-day management of the Museum. Every Department of the Albany Museum is now represented in the management structures and processes. He was an able administrator and as a result there was an increase in the funding of the Albany Museum by the Department of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture. He managed to control the backlog that had developed at the Albany Museum. Strategic planning for five year periods took place first in discussion meetings and then were fine-tuned in formal documents. This is now standard practice and also an indicator of participatory management unlike in the past when the structure was “top-down”.

He resigned on 31 December 2012 and Mr Zandisile Matshoba the Communication Officer was then appointed as the Acting Manager on the 1st January 2013 and resigned in March 2013. On the 1st of April 2013 Mr Phumlani Cimi was appointed as an Acting Manager. He stepped down and Department of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture appointed Mr Manzandonga Vabaza on the 1st of October 2014 till today.

1.3.1 Education

Education in the Albany Museum has a long history. The collection of a series of objects started in 1856. The idea for a school service was put forward in 1928. Dr John Hewitt, the Director at the time, suggested lending collections to the Cape Education Department and applied for a grant

to pay education officers. In 1935 the funds were available. The +Carnegie Corporation of New York made funds available for the improvement of museums in South Africa and recommended that they be used for the initiation of educational schemes in selected areas of the Cape Province. The Trustees of the Albany Museum chose to use their grant by providing loan cases for schools. In November 1935 Miss Anna Rothmans MSc, was appointed at the Education Department of the Albany Museum to start and organise the service in Grahamstown. The Albany Museum School Service was the first regular and effective service in South Africa. The motivation behind the loan service was to provide schools with a regular distribution of museum objects and up-to-date information. Even now the Albany Museum Education Department provides strong educational and outreach programmes for teachers and students. A Mobile Museum provides services using a panel van containing some of the loan artefacts in containers together with a lesson prepared by the Museum educators.

Since 1994 many museums have undergone considerable transformation with the aim of becoming more relevant and accessible to their entire community. Most have implemented major policy changes, whilst others have gone under extensive restructuring. Many older museums refurbished their displays to provide a more balanced presentation of South African History. One of these was the African Museum in Johannesburg, which changed its name to Museum in Africa 1994. Many others followed during the 1990s, including the Kaffrarian Museum in King William's Town which later changed its name to Amathole Museum. Some museums can also be regarded as hardly having transformed at all. They are faced with chronic funding problems, frozen staff posts and strangling bureaucracy.

The main problem has been the freezing of posts resulting in reduction of personnel and increased pressure on existing staff. In the Albany Museum, this also resulted in the loss of the Ichthyology Department due to freezing of Dr Cambray's post after his retirement. Recently, several of the posts have been filled which is excellent but we have a young age pyramid now, with few people in senior positions. Albany Museum has the following display galleries: bird gallery, earth and space gallery with pendulum, fossil heritage of the Eastern Cape gallery,

indigenous plants exhibition, blue planet hub gallery, mammal's gallery, invertebrate gallery and Bushmen gallery.

1.3.2 Governance

Albany Museum is governed by the Board of Trustees consisting of local elected representatives from institutions and Local Government representatives. The Board of Trustees act as the custodians of the buildings, finances and general changes. It is a legislated controlling body (according to the Museum Bill of 1975 because the Museum Act of 2004 was not implemented) for finances, buildings, collections, opening hours and all major issues. Board Members are appointed by the Member of the Executive Council responsible for Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture.

The Museum is subsidised financially by the Department of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture (DSRAC) whose mandate, amongst others, is the preservation, conservation and development of heritage in the province. DSRAC provides personnel to the Museum and also provides finances to assist in the day-to-day running of the Museum.

The Board approves large expenditure and discusses major issues, like opening times. A staff representative attends Board meetings. A Board representative is part of any appointment panel.

The organisational structure of the Albany Museum consists of Museum Manager, Assistant Manager and museum Departments such as PRO (Public relations officer), Exhibitions, Library, Education, Anthropology, Archaeology, History, Fresh Water Invertebrates, Ichthyology, Entomology, Paleontology, Herbarium, Finance, Administration and Technical Services. Each department has a HOD and assistants. Those departments are grouped together, for example PRO, Exhibitions, Library and Education fall into one category - Outreach; Anthropology, Archaeology, Education, History, Fresh Water Invertebrates, Ichthyology, Entomology, Paleontology, Herbarium are research Departments – in another category, Research; Manager, Finance and Administration are grouped together in another category - Administration. Technical

Service or Maintenance is an “all-rounder” which means it works with all the Museum Departments. In addition to these categories there are internal Committee structures such as the Health and Safety Committee, Education Committee, Wellness Committee, EPMDS Committee and also advisory committees, such as the Accessibility Advisory Committee (Disabilities).

Management approaches shifted towards becoming more participatory (Bredekamp, 2004; Gore, 2005). This shift is reflected in the managerial structures and processes of the Albany Museum. Before 1994 the Heads of Department (HOD) were represented in the management of the Museum by research Departments or academics. Many of these structural changes reflect the theory of participative management, which became the preferred management approach in post-apartheid South Africa (South Africa, 1996). Participative management was widely promoted as a new approach to improve participation of different “actors” (in the case of the Museum, staff members) within the management of educational institutions (Johnson & Ledbetter, 1993). Leonard (1993, p.45) argues that the assumption underlying the devolution and redistribution of decision-making authority is that greater ownership and commitment among stakeholders will result and that decisions made at the local level are likely to be more responsive to the specific, individual contexts.

1.4 Research goal

Against this background, this research set out to investigate participative management in the Albany Museum with a view to generating knowledge and insights that can be used to support senior management’s engagement with participative management at mid-management level.

1.5 Methodology

The research was conducted in the interpretive paradigm. The interpretive paradigm emphasises description and interpretation of the phenomena of the world in order to gain insight into shared meaning (Patton, 2002; Creswell, 2008). According to Bassey (1999) interpretive research is research that looks for deep perspectives on particular events and for theoretical insights. This thinking is therefore critical for this study, with its objective of wanting to explore and

understand the manifestation and experiences of participative management within the context of the Albany Museum.

1.5.1 The research method

This study was carried out using a case study method. According to Yin (2003, p.97), a case study focuses on “a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context”. Since my research will focus on my own institution I believe I will be studying the phenomenon within its ‘real-life’ context in the sense that nothing I investigate will be contrived or removed from its natural setting. Bassey (1999, p.75) describes a case study as the “study of a singularity which is chosen because of its interest to the researcher”. Since participative management interests me I made that the focus of this study. Robson (1993, p. 40) defines a case study as “the development of detailed knowledge about a single case or a small number of related cases”. He points out that the case study research method is of particular interest to a researcher wishing to gain a rich understanding of the context of the subject being researched. In this study the particular context of the museum – a public institution serving a broad community – needs to be a key factor. In addition case studies allow for the generation of qualitative data which when analysed can provide a deeper understanding of the studied phenomenon (Cohen &Manion, 2008, p. 181).

As such this method is most suited to the aim of my study. Basing the study in my place of work is convenient for me (Cohen &Manion, 2000) though it raises ethical issues which I discuss later.

1.5.2 Data collection

Data was collected using three methods, namely questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and observation. These data collecting techniques were chosen specifically because of their potential to generate rich qualitative data. In interpretive research multiple sources of information are sought and used because “no single source of information can be trusted to provide a comprehensive perspective” (Patton, 1990, p. 224). Therefore the combination of different data gathering techniques provides mechanisms for triangulation. Triangulation entails cross-checking data for validity, trustworthiness and reliability (Davies, 2007). This is an attempt to

answer the charge of subjectivism or relativism which is often leveled at interpretive research. Drawing on multiple sets of data makes findings more believable.

1.5.3 Data analysis

Since data were derived from three different sources it was necessary to explore themes across these data sets. Primary themes were drawn from my interviews which I regarded as my key data generating tools. These themes were then enriched by data drawn from observation and documents. This could be described as the traditional content analysis approach (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, p. 559) to analysing qualitative data. Analysis of this kind is essentially inductive, working from specific detail to broad themes and usually results in rich descriptions. These descriptions were then developed into answers to the research questions.

1.6 Ethical issues

For ethical considerations I was mindful of participants' rights. These include the right to privacy, anonymity and confidentiality (Bassey, 1999) of participants. In order to address these ethical issues I fully explained the purpose of the research and thus fostered a sense of confidence and trust among my respondents by assuring their anonymity as well as the confidentiality of data collected. Ethics agreements were signed by both the researcher and the respondents. The agreements also included reference to participants' right to withdraw from the research at any point in the process. A copy of the agreement is appended. Since I employed a dual role of a co-worker and researcher I was aware of the need for openness and transparency. I felt sure that my colleagues were prepared to assist in this research process when they realised that its purpose was simply to learn and not to judge.

1.7 Structure of my thesis

Chapter Two presents an overview of the literature on participative management. The Chapter argues that it is useful to look at management as well as leadership since these are closely related in practice.

Chapter Three is devoted in more detail to the methodology I have used in my research. The Chapter also looks at validity threats.

Chapter Four presents an analysis and discussion of my main findings in the light of the literature.

Chapter Five concludes the study by presenting a summary of my main findings and recommendations for both practice and research.

Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1 Introduction

As mentioned earlier in Chapter One, the purpose of my research was to investigate the participative management practices in a museum in the Eastern Cape. In this Chapter, I provide an overview of literature on the field, drawing on literature from an educational leadership and management context as well as museum management. This is because the research on museum management is limited. In the literature on museums, ‘management’ usually refers to the management of artefacts, displays, educational initiatives and so on, rather than human resources. Hence, I argue that the small body of literature explicitly focusing on museum management and leadership needs to be supplemented by reference to educational leadership and management, a much more developed body of theory. It is also true that museums have a strong educational component and education is one of the museum’s functions and outreach programmes. Also, the literature on participative management in schools is rich and more applicable to museums than literature on management in business or industry, since museums are also non-profit organisations, rather like schools. Indeed, museums are uniquely ‘different’ from most other organisations, and this needs to be taken into account when management and leadership are being discussed. For this reason I thought it necessary to include a section on what it is that makes museums unique, so that subsequent explorations of leadership and management are contextualised.

The decision to include literature on leadership as well as management is driven by the fact that leadership and management are difficult to separate in practice. In theory there are several key differences which I come to later in this Chapter, but as this study focuses on practice it seems likely that management will often be shaped by leadership (or the other way around). Hence this Chapter will also look briefly at relevant leadership theory.

In view of these arguments, this Chapter is structured as follows: I begin by characterising museums as organisations, showing how and why they have unique features that complicate management and leadership. Next, I do a brief comparison of leadership and management, since

both will be looked at in this study. Thereafter I focus on participative management, trace its origins and look at how it manifests in practice. The Chapter concludes by reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of a participative approach to management.

2.2 Museums as organisations

One look at the organogram (Appendix 3) is enough to show the complexity of a typical museum structure, in this case not even a very big one. What is noteworthy – and important for this study – is not the number of offices but the significant differences between their functions and roles within the organisation. A museum has managers (people who manage and lead through administration with the usual subdivisions, such as finance and human resources); it also has officers, usually HODs, who head up divisions, such as Education. Their roles are less administrative and more strongly located in interacting with the community, taking programmes to schools and so on.

Then there are scientists, and this is what makes museums unusual and interesting. All the scientific branches represented in a museum – such as Ichthyology, Paleontology and so on – are led and managed by scientists who are essentially academics responsible for neither community projects nor administration. Then of course there are the usual auxiliary staff attached to all divisions and senior staff. The diversity of staff functions and responsibility – often cutting across levels of seniority – is what makes museums unusual and perhaps uniquely challenging as organisations.

This diversity may help to explain why management of museums has received so little attention over the years. It seems inevitable that different officers working away at entirely different kinds of work rapidly become ‘silos’, so that each begins to develop its own approach to ‘management’ and there is little sense of a shared vision. According to Moore (1999), museum management has only recently begun to receive attention, both as a field of practice as well as an area for research (p. 1). He goes on to point out that the field’s tardiness to develop its own literature has led to mainstream management and leadership being inappropriately applied to museums (*ibid.*). This means that the unique characteristics of museums are often overlooked or misunderstood, such as

the fact that they are non-profit, are strongly educationally-oriented, and are complex in structure as described above.

This study attempts to bear these important truths in mind. As a researcher I needed to remain cognisant of museums *as organisations*, and not be surprised to find, for example, huge divergences of views regarding management between museum administrators and scientists. I needed to bear in mind that current mainstream approaches to management and leadership will often not address museum contexts satisfactorily.

Nevertheless, my study intends to look at how management is experienced and perceived in a museum, and I now need to turn to the next issue: why and how management and leadership are often conflated and commonly misunderstood.

2.3 Management and leadership compared

It is important at the outset to distinguish between the terms 'leadership' and 'management', since they are used by many writers as either interchangeable or synonymous. It is not my intention to treat the two concepts synonymously, but to regard them as two different, yet complementary activities, existing side by side in a mutual and logical relationship.

According to Schön (1984) leadership and management are not synonymous terms. While I agree with this view I do believe that leadership and management are closely linked and can be conceived as two sides of the same coin. I will develop this argument by first defining the two terms and giving examples drawn from the educational system in South Africa.

Nanus (1992, p. 11) emphasizes the differences between management and leadership by citing Bennis (1989) who suggests that:

The manager administers, the leader innovates ... the manager relies on control, and the leader inspires ... the manager focuses on systems and structure and the leader focuses on people.

While this is obviously an oversimplification it has value, pointing to the essential functions of managers – maintenance – as opposed to the function of leaders – innovation. Furthermore, it is true that we expect control and monitoring from managers, but not from leaders whose role is perceived as being inspirational and motivational. Of course it is not true that managers *never* innovate, or that leaders *never* simply maintain systems, but the dichotomy points to the essential differences between the two.

These differences are often presented in tabular form emphasising the contrast even more strongly, as in the following example:

Table 1: Qualities of Leadership and Management (drawn from Coleman, 2005; Clive, et al., 2005, Johnson, 2006).

GOOD LEADERS	GOOD MANAGERS
Are humane and empathetic	Are non-humane and technical
Lead by example	Manage by directing
Work with people and have social skills	Work through people and have control skills
Are visionary and inspiring	Goal orientated and strategic
Are charismatic	Are authoritative
Are influential and motivating	Are effective and efficient
Do the right thing	Do things right

A more subtle argument is presented by Van der Mescht (1996, p. 15) who believes that organisations need both management and leadership qualities in the same person. He cites Schmuck (ibid.) in support of this argument:

Administrators should combine both leadership and management skills into their repertoire...leadership bring the energy, enthusiasm and commitment...management brings the efficiency, the concern with detail and coordination.

This is a more realistic and holistic picture, reflecting the reality of organisational life more accurately. Leadership and management need not, therefore, be conceived of as separate things, but rather simply *different from* each other as the Schmuck argument suggests. This is the view I support, and I will therefore be open to findings which also comment on leadership rather than only management. While I accept that management is about control and ensuring that the educational goals are met, leadership is what an effective manager will need to motivate co-workers to greater heights.

I now take a brief look at each in turn.

2.2.1 Leadership

The theory of leadership is, as pointed out by Coleman (2003 p.155) “complex and evolving”. Lambert (2003, p. 422) also calls it “an elusive idea”. Hence, trying to define leadership is not always an easy task since our understanding of leadership varies across contexts and also changes over time. Nevertheless, there are some common themes and trends one could highlight.

Contemporary leadership theory emphasizes working *with* people, and notions of distributed and shared leadership are finding general support (Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004). Harris and Lambert (2003) suggest that leadership capacity in schools involves developing a shared vision of the schools. The work involves reflection, enquiry and conversation. In this sense leadership in education is therefore a long-term commitment rather than just meeting immediate school goals. It is concerned with the sustainability of the school and requires that leadership is developed amongst different teachers in the school. This characteristic is probably equally applicable to museums. Museum staff may not all be single-mindedly driven by the same goal as the teaching staff in a school - effective teaching and learning - but museums are also goal-

seeking organisations committed to attaining specified visions. As discussed in Chapter One, museums in South Africa have taken on board a transformative agenda, and this role – to serve a broader and more diverse community – serves as its driving vision. This vision is subsumed in the important function of educating and enlightening, a role very similar to that of schooling. The role of leadership – in both school and museum contexts - is thus to bring people together and be committed to a central vision, and to involve others in working towards attaining that vision. Hence, contemporary leadership theory with its emphasis on developing shared visions and team work depends heavily on the leaders' ability to foster good relationships (Fullan cited in Harris & Lambert, 2003). This is also referred to as a constructivist approach, a problem-solving style focusing on the leading of learning, rather than being authority-based (Senge *et al.*, 2000, p. 404, pp. 414-418).

In line with the imperatives of social transformation, as observed by a number of scholars (Suchy, 2000; Bush, 2003; Moloi, 2007; Paulsson, 2008 and Van der Mescht, 2008), the aim of this section is to look at how approaches to leadership have evolved. One way of approaching this task is to distinguish between 'transactional' and 'transformational' leadership.

2.2.1.1 Transactional leadership

Transactional leadership – as the name suggests – is characterised by a transaction, or an exchange. Subordinates perform specified tasks assigned by the leader, and receive some kind of reward in return (promotion, salary increase, and the like). This approach assumes that leaders are key stakeholders in an organisation. Transactional leaders recognize talents, skills and knowledge that their followers might possess. To this end, they direct, coach, support and develop followers, who tend to be regarded as passive players in the organisation (Paulsson, 2008, p.14). While the decision-making process is characterized by consultations with followers in order to bring about better solutions to problems and improving implementation, transactional leaders have the final say. Transactional leadership further emphasizes monitoring and

supervision since there needs to be evidence of achievement before subordinates can be rewarded. Additionally this paradigm focuses on short-term goals and hence fails to anticipate the future. Paulsson (2008), writing in the context of museum leadership, distinguishes transactional leadership from what he calls 'visionary' and 'organic' paradigms of leadership. I return to this argument later. For now, I look at how transformational leadership differs from transactional.

2.2.1.2 Transformational leadership

According to Mungunda (2003) the theory of transformational leadership holds that transformational leaders elevate the needs of the follower in line with leaders' own goals and objectives - followers place trust and confidence in the vision and values espoused by the leader. Transformational leadership offers a comprehensive approach to leadership able to respond productively to the significant changes facing them (Leithwood *et al.*, 1999, p. 21). To Harris (2003), the transformational leadership perspective focuses on the moral value and value-laden activities of a leader and how these are disclosed to the colleagues. In this sense it differs profoundly from transactional leadership which focuses on goals and rewards.

Furthermore, Harris (2003) argues that transformational leaders not only manage structure but they purposefully impact upon the culture in order to change it. The term 'transformational' is not necessarily linked to what we have come to understand by transformation in this country. In South Africa we think of redressing inequity and bringing about far-reaching change for the common good. In leadership theory, transformation is concerned with relationships and the complete engagement of individuals on pursuing their work. In contrast to transactional leadership, transformational leadership entails a change in the leader-follower relationship for mutual benefit and good (Leithwood, 1999). Leithwood defines transformational leadership as including charisma, inspiration, motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration. This form of leadership assumes that the central focus of leadership ought to be

the commitments and capacities of organisational members. Higher levels of personal commitment to organisational goals and greater capacities for accomplishing those goals are assumed to result in extra effort and greater productivity (Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1999, p.9).

According to Coleman (2005 p.16), transformational leaders do more than transactional leaders in a number of ways that have been identified as the four “I”s. These are:

- Idealised influence: Transformational leaders are role models and their followers emulate them. The leader considers the needs of others rather than his or her personal needs. The leader demonstrates high standards of ethical and moral conduct and avoids using power for personal gain.
- Inspirational motivation: The leaders inspire followers by providing meaning to the work of others through the development of a vision for the future. Team spirit and enthusiasm are encouraged as the vision for the future is communicated.
- Intellectual stimulation: Leaders encourage innovation and creativity and question the existing state.
- Individual consideration: The needs of each individual are considered and coaching and mentoring are the norm.

Hence, as Coleman (2005) argues, transformational leadership leads to building the capacity of members of the organisation. For example, everybody in the organisation must take part in decision-making processes. Consequently, everyone’s commitment to the development and the welfare of the organisation at large is expected.

2.2.1.3 Visionary and organic leadership

As mentioned earlier, Paulsson (2008) saw the need for leadership that goes beyond transactional in museums. He referred to these as “visionary” and “organic” (p. 12).

What distinguishes visionary leadership that they are emotionally committed to their work and have a view of a desired future to motivate the followers (ibid)? The critical element of visionary leadership is to “inspire people to work towards a shared vision and a common strategy rather than managing operations, systems and processes” (Paulsson, 2008, p.14). Like all public institutions museums have visions and strategic objectives that are supposed to guide the attitudes and behaviours and actions of employees. But visionary leaders go beyond institutional visions and objectives. They articulate a “grand vision that calls upon their followers’ intellectual and moral capacities” (ibid.) to whole-heartedly commit to organisational purpose. In turn this makes followers ambitious and confident to take risks because they are intrinsically motivated. Visionary leadership does have limitations though, and these come about chiefly because developing grand visions requires strong individual, perhaps even charismatic leadership from the leader. This limitation is to some extent countered in organic leadership.

In organic leadership the principle of collective leadership takes centre stage. Power and authority are shared by all the members of the group. Grand vision building is less important than total commitment and participation by all members. This approach encourages and expects individuals and groups within the organisation to participate in the decision-making process. Close and informal relationships are cultivated by a high degree of co-operation between members. Individuals feel they possess increased levels of confidence. Consequently, workers are not threatened by unfamiliar situations, but instead welcome new challenges as they view them as opportunities to grow and develop. Growth and development implies the acquisition of skills and knowledge that would yield high output. However, organic leadership is also not without its challenges. Although it is beneficial for workers to have a sense of autonomy this may also contribute to a sense of uncertainty in the absence of strong, directive leadership (Paulsson, 2008, p.15).

My experience and observations in other museums suggests that leadership in public sector museums seems to be a combination of the three paradigms proposed by Paulsson (2008). Strong overhead control by government inevitably leads to transactional approaches to leadership. If museum officials are simply carrying out their duties as specified by policy there is little room for innovation, and leadership may well be sacrificed to a pervasive managerial approach. In the presence of state control, visionary and organic leadership approaches are less likely to flourish. Even more challenging is the fact that visionary and organic leadership are strongly dependent on the personal leadership qualities of the museum's official leaders. One of these qualities is emotional intelligence.

2.2.1.4 Emotional intelligence

Defined as a leader's ability to monitor his/her own emotions and those of his/her followers, emotional intelligence is the leader's ability to discriminate between different emotions and use this emotional 'information' to guide his/her thinking and actions.

Writing in the context of museum leadership, Suchy (1999, p. 60) argues that one of the important emotions inherent in museum leadership is passion, "a deep feeling in the heart for the work in hand". Its importance is that it sustains museum directors on a daily basis and contributes to the vision of the organisation. He further argues that Museum Directors need charisma, which is "a characteristic/behavior that emanates from passion" (ibid.). Combined passion and charisma influence leadership and the management style of Museum Directors. The model of leadership that they would most likely use is organic or visionary leadership. These two inspire followers to contribute as they are involved in decision-making and have the confidence to take risks. What is interesting here is that these qualities highlighted by Suchy are generic leadership traits, not specific to museum management, and have in many ways been supplanted by contemporary theories which dominate leadership thinking in other contexts.

An article by Abraham, Griffin and Crawford (1999) reports on a study conducted in 24 museums in Australia, Canada, the UK and the USA. The study investigated change management – since museums worldwide had undergone transformation the researchers wanted to know how change was managed and led. Respondents overwhelmingly thought the ideal leadership style was consultative, rather than directive, collaborative or coercive. The article also acknowledged the complexity of museums as organisations: staff exercise high degrees of autonomy and often act independently of each other. Hence, leaders consult rather than dictate since they are usually involved in their own different projects. This approach is illustrative of contemporary views of leadership, where participation and collaboration are the order of the day. It is, however, not impossible to imagine a visionary, charismatic leadership also committed to collaboration and consultation; but whether such a leader may go so far as to invite participation is perhaps open to question.

In summary: contemporary leadership thinking has moved beyond the heroic and the transactional. Leadership is increasingly seen as a collaborative, shared activity, guided by moral imperatives. In this sense leadership is transformational, in that it may bring about profound change in people. There is, however, still a place for transactional leadership, a more ‘managerial’ approach to leadership, without which organisations are in danger of failing to meet their organisational goals. This is precisely where management and leadership overlap, and I now turn to management.

2.3 Management

The key principles of management embrace the principles of effective leadership. Griffin and Abraham (2000) argue that these principles include shared goals, good communication, staff development and focusing on clear objectives. The fact that museums have had to undergo fairly

radical change – as discussed earlier – suggests the need for change management, where the museums become learning environments through group interaction and the sharing of information (Paulsson, 2008, p. 17). Paulsson (ibid.) concludes:

From this perspective competence is neither primarily an attribute of an individual nor primarily an attribute of a job, but rather a dynamic interaction between the two. Hence, both factors related to the person and factors related to the work may either facilitate or limit the extent to which an individual uses his or her potential capacity to successfully complete a certain task in a specific job situation.

The classical depiction of management as the task of controlling and directing people, and distributing resources to ensure that the goals of an organisation are achieved (Bush *et al.*, p. 2011), does not always apply. Managers are usually people who are experienced in the field and who have worked their way up the company ladder. Managers also know how each layer of the system works and may also possess a good technical knowledge which they use to improve production and achievement of set goals. Managers often use control instruments, for example policies, rules, time-tables and statutory instruments to co-ordinate and effectively use resources. As Schön (1984) says, management is a more formal function, involving planning, controlling, directing and monitoring, all aimed at ensuring that educational goals are met. However, it is equally possible to find descriptions of management which make it sound very like leadership. For instance, Khandekar and Sharma (n.d.) define management as:

The effectiveness with which organisations manage, develop, motivate, involve and engage the willing contribution of the people who work in them is the key determinant of how well those organisations perform.

Words like ‘motivate, involve and engage’ suggest leadership, though the writers do not explicitly use the word. What seems clear is that effective leadership **and** management are vital if schools and other educational institutions, such as museums, are to be successful in providing

quality education (Bush *et al.*, 2011). It is also clear that it is not necessarily desirable to separate the two too distinctly.

The paucity of management and leadership literature set in museum contexts has compelled me to look more thoroughly at a context where these concepts are well established and deeply researched, namely the field of educational leadership and management. I have already made a case for including references to this field in this Chapter.

2.3.1 Participative management

Current educational leadership and management thinking in South Africa tend to focus on increased participation of different stakeholders in the management of educational institutions. It is this change in approach that has resulted in the establishment of new structural bodies such as School Management Teams and School Governing Bodies to run the schools in the country (Bush, 2000). Even learners have been included through Representative Councils of Learners. Museums similarly have platforms for participative management, namely boards of trustees and management teams consisting of the Manager, Deputy Manager and HODs. In practice it therefore means that management in South Africa has shifted from being autocratic towards being participative (Moloi, 2007) and this probably applies, to a lesser or greater extent, to all organisations. One of the discourses in which this trend has been evident is participative management, the focus of this study, and I now turn to this theme.

Participative management refers to an open form of management where employees are actively involved in decision-making processes. The concept is applied by managers who understand the importance of drawing on employees' intellectual and professional skills and seeking a strong relationship with their employees. The concept of employee participation in organisational decision-making is not new as pointed out earlier.

It is, however, a trend that is receiving increased attention today. Hargreaves (cited in Somech, 2002, p. 342) postulates that the increasing emergence of participative management reflects the widely shared belief that shared management and decentralised authority structures carry the

potential for achieving outcomes unattainable by the traditional top-down bureaucratic structures and procedures. By involving workers in organisational decisions, management reflects recognition and trust. As French and Israel (cited in Sagie Koslowsky, 2000, p. 20) argue:

When management accords the workers participation in any important decision it implies that workers are intelligent, competent, and valued partners. Thus participation directly affects such aspects of worker management ... It satisfies such important social needs as the need for recognition and appreciation.

Brewer, Seiden and Facer (2000) suggest that policy makers and public managers should consider employees in decision-making processes as one of the strategies for advancing public service motivation. In essence participative management is a management style where managers work rather than just consult with the rest of the members of the organisation in matters that relate to the management of the institution. Khander and Sharma (2002) observe the improvement of employee involvement participation when companies want to improve the global competition to increase the level of performance. According to Khander and Sharma (cited by Ulrich, 1997 and Guest, 1997) employees need to have the skills and abilities to do their job. The employee's behaviour has a great impact on the performance of the organisation.

Participation has been defined as a "process which allows the employees to exert some influence over their work and the conditions under which they work" (Heller *et al.*, 1998, p. 15) and also, "a process in which influence in decision-making is shared between hierarchical supervisors and their subordinates" (Wagner & Gooding cited in Heller *et al.*, 1998, p. 67). In business the renewed interest in employee participation in decision-making in management is often seen as companies' response to increasing competitive pressures arising in international markets during the 1990's (Markey & Monet, 1997). However, it is unlikely that this is true of schools and other educational institutions, including museums. While there is always some degree of competition among schools (for 'better' learners, fee-paying parents and better resources) schools are essentially not businesses and their main product is learning. Why then would schools opt for participative management practices? Museums, similarly, are non-profit organisations and have a

strong educational mission, hence it could be argued that the same question applies. To find an answer we need to look briefly at where the notion of participation stems from.

2.3.2 The roots of participative management

Participative management has been widely promoted as a means of formalizing a new conceptualization of management to bring about school improvement (Johnson & Ledbetter, 1993). Leonard (1993, p.45) argues that the assumptions underlying this devolution and distribution of decision-making authority are that greater ownership and commitment among stakeholders will result and that decisions made at the local level are likely to be more responsive to the specific, individual school context. The idea of participative management is often traced back to the work of Kurt Lewin, a behavioural psychologist, who conducted numerous research projects during World War II to study the effects of participative decision-making. A brief look at some of his work will help to trace the chief theory underlying this study. This summary has been adapted from Weisbord (2004).

Lewin conducted several research projects to see whether involvement in decision-making would make any difference to people's commitment and participation. One of his most famous projects involved housewives in Iowa. During the war good cuts of meat were hard to obtain and very scarce, yet housewives' demand for quality meat continued to rise. Lewin realized that if housewives were *instructed* to buy cheaper, more readily available meat cuts they would resent this and probably refuse to cooperate. So, instead, he consulted them, set out all the challenges and asked for their advice. Naturally, they chose to change their buying habits because they now saw the bigger picture and wanted to do what was best for the country. Hence, by involving the real decision-makers – the 'supervisors of households' – Lewin was able to break lifelong buying and eating habits. Many other experiments – such as his work with clothing factories – illustrated and confirmed this principle.

Lewin's tireless efforts and generosity led to the founding of many practices now regarded as routine in contemporary management, such as team development, system change, cultural change, organisational development, action research and even the use of newsprint to capture group discussions. At the root of his belief system was the conviction that everyone's opinion mattered, and that those most likely to make good decisions were the workers, those closest to the problems and challenges. Naturally this attitude was a far cry from the prevalent hierarchical, 'scientific management' approach pioneered by Taylor (1890) and it would take decades before participative – or democratic – management became a viable option. However, part of his legacy is the famous research he and colleagues conducted with a group of boys, in an attempt to discover the ideal leadership style. This landmark study led to the naming of three different leadership styles – autocratic, democratic and *laissez faire* – concepts we still use today. The research proved that democratic leadership was the most effective, but again, decades would pass before this notion gained acceptance. In essence though, democratic leadership involves group consultation and joint decision-making leading inevitably to group ownership and satisfaction, which in turn leads to greater productivity.

In educational research participative leadership and management has been the subject of many studies, all aimed at highlighting the benefits of consultation and cooperation. This trend has been strongly supported in policy, as well as by the worldwide sense of democratic governance being the preferred political system. Today it is virtually impossible to read any management or leadership text without finding constant reference to the virtues of 'participation'. Finally, to answer the question posed earlier, the underlying reasons for participative management's prevalence today seems to be allied to democratic ideals, developing notions of ownership and promoting human dignity in the workplace.

2.3.2.1 Participative management in practice

Literature attributes the proliferation of participative management approaches to a range of explicitly stated or underlying causes. The power of developing a common vision is one such

cause (Harris, 2000). It would clearly be impossible to develop a common vision across members of an organisation if the leadership did not actively seek other members' input.

Furthermore, participative management is characterised by a number of factors. According to Bhatnager (2007), participation leads to commitment. In other words, as Kuo *et al.* (2010) argue, it is unlikely that members of an organisation -in this case educators and museum practitioners - would resist change or be reluctant to implement decisions which they had agreed upon. Consequently, managers become effective and efficient in running their institutions due to their subordinates' commitment to it. In public institutions such as schools and museums, involvement needs to extend beyond immediate organisation members. Community involvement in the museum is very important. The museum must be accessible to everyone; hence ways need to be found to involve the community in decisions. This study has not included this dimension in its scope, focusing instead on internal management structures; broader community involvement would be an excellent choice for further study in this field.

In terms of these internal structures participative management needs structural support to be effectively implemented, and in the case of museums this would include the establishment of committees.

2.3.2.2 The limitations of participative management

Participative management is, however, not without its challenges and problems. One of these is lack of clarity on what it actually is. According to Bronillete (1997), participative management is a concept surrounded by confusion which can result in management not knowing what to do and how to do it.

A study by Cotton (1996) found that notions of participation can be seen as a threat to managers' control and authority. A similar finding emerged in a study by Van der Mescht and Tyala (2008), where principals were frequently shown to resist participatory approaches for fear of losing control. This is one of the reasons why principals – and heads of other institutions – cling to outdated top-down management approaches. In the context of museums, management of people has received scant attention. Management has not been regarded as a core function and therefore

museum educators' views regarding the management of museums have not really been considered or critiqued - hence the museum structure has been top-down and is only now being challenged to be more participative. Lack of exposure to management training and contemporary thinking would obviously inhibit less traditional practices.

Lawal and Yusuf (2014) also point to a number of limitations as far as participatory decision-making is concerned. They found it may lead to a lack of accountability, domination by a few strong members, and “groupthink” (Lawal & Yusuf, 2014, p.10.) Hence, what appears to be good practice may in fact have detrimental effects on an organisation.

Meaningful participation also assumes high levels of competence, which is becoming increasingly challenging as organisations become ever more complex. The transformation of museums, as discussed earlier, has brought new demands to bear on staff, and it may not always be advisable to add the additional responsibility of taking part in key management and decision-making processes (Management Study Guide, online).

To place participative approaches to management in a broader conceptual light it may be useful to give a brief account of what Bush (2003) refers to as “collegial” models of management. Hence, I now briefly turn to an explication of what this model may look like in an educational and a museum context.

2.4 Bush’s collegial model

According to Bush (2003), collegial models are theories which argue that power and decision-making should be shared among some or all members of the organisation. Brundrett (1998, p. 305) similarly says that, in a school context, “collegiality can broadly be defined as teachers conferring and collaborating with other teachers”. Brundrett (1998, p.308) goes further in referring to the importance of ‘shared vision’ as a basis for collegial decision-making. Collegial models assume that decisions are reached by consensus rather than division or conflict.

Some of the advantages of promoting collegiality in an organisation include: Firstly, decisions are likely to be reached by consensus. Consequently, implementation of decisions and carrying out of organisational programmes are likely to accelerate as role players are involved in the

planning stages. The practice of involving people in the decisions that affect their professional lives is about more than effectiveness or good practice. Williams (1989, p. 80) argues that:

The moral character of an exercise of authority is based on the presence of consent on the part of those subject to its jurisdiction... the consent of the obligated is necessary for authority to assume moral status.

Secondly, collegiality enhances confidence and trust amongst colleagues. Additionally, professional enrichment or development is promoted as colleagues share expertise and experiences among each other. Brown, Boyle and Boyle (1990, p.320) concur that collegiality is also “claimed as a way for teachers to benefit from the support and expertise of their colleagues”.

Thirdly, collegiality assumes that every member’s opinion in the organisation is valued. Members need to work in groups, each with a team leader. Important discussions take place in those small groups and team leaders will carry mandates and represent their teams to the upper structures of the organisation. This model seems appropriate to school structures, but perhaps less so in museums where there are usually fewer staff members and therefore fewer Committees. In this sense the organogram provided earlier may be misleading as it suggests a vast organisation with many Committees and large numbers of staff. The opposite is in fact true. Nevertheless, the principles of collegiality would apply equally to museum management.

2.6 Conclusion

This Chapter has attempted to provide the reader with an overview of thinking in the field of participative leadership and management practices, both in schools and museums. In the process the argument has driven towards the conclusion that participatory approaches are desirable since they promote ownership and collegiality. However, participatory approaches are not without their problems, and this study needs to remain alert to these, especially as they pertain to museum systems where management of human resources have received little attention in research as well as training. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that museums are undergoing a process of transformation, politically, socially and economically. The next Chapter presents the research design.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The Chapter explains the steps that were taken to facilitate the research process. These include an explanation of why the case study method was chosen for the study, how research participants were selected and how data gathering occurred. The research paradigm that underpins this study and the data collection tools I used are also discussed and justified. Ethical issues as well as considerations of validity conclude the chapter.

The goal of my research was to investigate participative management in the Albany Museum. To achieve this goal I sought to answer the following questions.

- What is management's understanding of participative management?
- What are the benefits of practising participative management?
- What challenges do HODs face in using participative management approaches?
- What factors enable or constrain participative management practices?

3.2 Interpretive paradigm

The research was conducted in the interpretive paradigm. The interpretive paradigm emphasises description and interpretation of the phenomena of the world in order to gain insight into shared meanings (Patton, 2002; Cresswell, 2008). Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007, p.22) state that the interpretive paradigm aims at "understanding the subjective world of human experiences". Furthermore, they argue that an interpretive approach is characterised by a concern with the individual's actions or interpretations during a certain process. This emphasis on the individual and personal experience is what gives the interpretive approach its strength. According to Bassey (1999), interpretive research is a search for deep perspectives on particular events and for theoretical insights. This thinking is critical to this study, with its objective of wanting to explore and understand the manifestation and experiences of participative management within the context of the Museum. The research can also be described as qualitative as it does not deal with

objective facts but subjective meanings, and hence will generate data of a qualitative nature through methods such as interviews and observations (Stake, 2000, p.242).

This study is mostly descriptive and presents the reality of participants from their own points of view and experience. The only exception to this was my use of observation. Hence, research participants' experience becomes a key source of data. In a sense research of this nature looks at everyday life experiences (Rennie, 2011, p. 11) to help researchers add to the body a scientific knowledge. She further argues that scientifically literate people are interested in understanding the world around them (ibid.).

The interpretive researcher realises that observation is fallible and that theory does not hold true forever (Henning, 2002). The interpretive researcher believes the goal of science is to seek the 'truth', or what is true for people, even if we can never establish what is objectively true and beyond question. For this reason a variety of data collection tools and different sources and analysis methods were used which also strengthen the validity of one's findings. In this way the limitations of one tool may be compensated for by the strengths of others. The use of multiple perspectives and different kinds of data collection is characteristic of a high quality case study and lends weight to the validity of the findings. Stake (1995) describes this kind of case study as 'holistic' as it captures the essentials of what the case constitutes. My study does not fit the model described as "instrumental" (Stake, 1993, p. 3) because I did not explicitly aim to intervene and bring about change in the organisation. Whatever change occurs as a result of this project is therefore incidental.

3.3 Research method: A case study

This study was carried out using a case study method. According to Yin (2003, p. 97), "a case study focuses on a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context". Since my research focused on an institution in which I work I believe I was able to study the phenomenon within its 'real-life' context. I observed meetings, interviewed museum staff members and read museum documents as they naturally occurred in the museum context. To this end Bassey (1999, p.75) describes a case study as the "study of singularity which is chosen because of the interest to the

researcher". Judging by my reading I believe notions of participative management may well be unusual in museum contexts, as discussed in Chapter Two. Robson (1993, p.40) further defines a case study as "the development of detailed knowledge about a single case". He points out that the case study research method is of particular interest to a researcher wishing to gain a rich understanding of the context of the subject being researched. In this study the context is of particular importance to me since, as I have argued, very little research seems to have been carried out on management in museums. This raises the question of whether the context of a museum places particular constraints on approaches to leadership and management which seem to have become dominant in other contexts, such as education.

Geertz (cited in Cohen *et al.*, 2000, p.182) stresses the value of a case study in portraying the reality that is researched as experienced by the research participants:

Case studies strive to portray 'what it is like' to be in a particular situation, to catch the close-up reality and thick description of participants' lived experience of thought about and feeling for a situation. Hence it is important for events and situations to speak for them rather than to be largely interpreted, evaluated, or judged by the researcher. In this respect a case study is like a television documentary.

The approach I have chosen – shaped by interpretivism – attempted to do just that. I did not come to the research with pre-conceived notions of what leaders and managers 'should' be doing. I am of course guided by literature, but I hope to approach the respondents' reality with an open mind, and hence allowing the 'events to speak for themselves' should be attainable.

In this study the particular context of the museum - a public institution serving a broad community - needs to be a key factor. This is because of the transformation that has happened in museums in South Africa as discussed earlier.

Yin (2009, p.18) argues that the boundary line between the phenomenon and its context is blurred, as a case study is a study of the case in a context and it is important to set the case within its context (i.e. rich descriptions and details are often a feature of a case study).

Verschuren (2003, p.124) reports on a range of authors who argue that a distinguishing feature of case study research is 'holism' rather than 'reductionism'. Whilst for Yin (2009) 'holism' refers to conducting the research at the single 'unit of analysis' chosen (discussed below) which may be an individual, a group or an organisation, for Verschuren the term 'holism' is ambiguous. It may not necessarily mean looking at a whole subject, person, and organisation but only at the relevant area of interest. Following this argument, the phenomenon of participative management could also be the case in question.

Basing the study at the Albany Museum is convenient for me: my participants are my colleagues and we work in the same building. According to Cohen and Manion (2000), this raises ethical issues which I discuss later.

3.4 Methodological implications

Interviews, observation and questionnaires are appropriate for capturing 'insider' knowledge of an organisation. This is a key feature of the interpretive approach which does not concern itself with the search for broadly applicable laws and rules but rather seeks to produce descriptive analysis that emphasise deep interpretation and understanding of social phenomena through the meaning that the people assign to them (Trauth, 2001, p.219). Qualitative methods specifically enabled me to gain an understanding of participants' understandings as well as their values, actions and concerns.

3.5 Sampling

3.5.1 The research site and the selection of the participants

This study was conducted at the Albany Museum in Grahamstown. Following Cohen, Manion and Morrison's advice, planning this research entailed sampling decisions which I need to share with the reader (2011, p. 143). My decision to work with Albany Museum was based on convenience because it is where I am employed as an education officer. Access to people and documents would therefore be relatively easy. Convenience sampling also results in saving on costs, and for someone with limited resources and time to carry out a study this was important

(Patton, 1990). In my case I needed a local museum. The choice was also partly purposive, since my interest was in museums as organisations (Cohen *et al.*, 2011).

I chose a sample of five HODs at the Albany Museum. I chose my participants because they were among the more experienced HODs and was thus likely to have a broader sense of management issues. Getting permission was done by way of writing letters to them (Appendix 3). The participants selected are described in Chapter Four.

3.6 Data gathering techniques

Data gathering techniques are the research instruments used to gather data which will form the basis of the study's findings. My data gathering tools constituted of questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and observation. These tools feature strongly in case studies because of their potential to gather rich data (Cohen *et al.*, 2011; Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). These are further explored in greater detail below.

3.6.1 Open-ended questionnaires

Questionnaires are among the most commonly used tools for gathering data in both quantitative and qualitative research (Patton, 2002; Berg, 2004). In this study I used questionnaires to gather data regarding the following topics:

- What is your understanding of participative management? Please explain.
- Have you ever been involved in taking the lead in an initiative in the Museum? If so, please give examples of your leadership.
- In your opinion what hinders the development of participative management in the context of your Museum? Please elaborate.
- In your opinion what are the benefits of participative management in the Museum?
- Are there any disadvantages or challenges?

3.6.2 Interviews

In addition to administering questionnaires and conducting field observation, I conducted interviews with the five HODs of Albany Museum. Maykut and Morehouse (1994, p.80) describe an interview as “a conversation with purpose and a form of discourse shaped and organised by asking and answering questions”. Interviews are broadly classified as either structured or semi-structured (Bloor & Wood, 2006; Euvrard, 2010). I used semi-structured interviews which enabled me to follow up and explore the implications of answers. Interview questions focused on HODs’ perspectives on the role they play in managing the Museum, examples of participation and team management. All interviews were recorded using an iPod video so that transcripts of the interaction could be later developed for data analysis.

Walford (2001, p. 90) advises that “interviewers and interviewees co-construct the interview as a social encounter not simply a site for information exchange and researchers would be well advised to keep this in the forefront of their minds when conducting an interview”. Gadd (2004, p. 397) reports the significance of how the interviewer responds to the interviewee, as an unsupportive or negative response could discourage a respondent from proceeding. Examples of the interview questions used appear in Appendix 2.

3.6.3 Observation

Observation concentrated on the practical aspects of participative management that is, i.e., how it works in practice. Observation can often be difficult and complex, but it is also one of the most versatile ways of gathering information. It can be organised to give quantitative or qualitative data, and can be used in a wide range of studies (Simpson & Tuson, 2003). Observation is more than just looking. It is looking systematically and recording systematically, the subjects usually being people, events, behaviors, settings, artifacts or routines (Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Simpson & Tuson, 2003, p.2). A strong feature of observation as a research strategy is that it offers an investigator the opportunity to gather ‘live’ data from naturally occurring social situations.

There are other advantages to observation. Robson (2002, p. 310) argues that what people do may differ from what they say they do, and observation provides a reality check. Observation also enables a researcher to look afresh at everyday behaviour that otherwise might be taken for granted or go unnoticed (Cooper & Schindler, 2001, p.374). Observation is a flexible form of data collection that can enable the researcher to have access to interactions in a social context that can yield systematic records to complement other kinds of data (Simpson & Tuson, 2003, p.12).

There is also a need to consider who the observer will be, as observation (particularly participant observation) can be affected by the sex, sexuality, ethnicity, class, appearance, attitude, interpersonal familiarity with the situation, involvement and concern of the observer (Kawulich, 2005, p.7). These factors may influence what the observer sees, or what those observed choose to reveal. In my case, being one of the HODs in the museum was an advantage as my presence would not have threatened any members.

During the HOD meeting I observed management in action, using an observation schedule as a guide. The schedule focused on the following issues:

- How participants participated in a meeting
- How meetings are chaired
- How tasks or roles are assigned
- How decisions are made.

I felt these observation points would indicate the nature and degree of participation in management thereby playing a confirming (or disconfirming) role when viewed in conjunction with other data. I also arranged to attend two staff meetings (one HOD and one staff meeting) to observe what was taking place *in situ* rather than rely on second-hand accounts (Patton, 1990, p. 203).

As evidenced by the research findings, the techniques used in this study complemented each other well.

3.7 Data Analysis

According to Huberman and Miles (1994, p.428), data management refers to “the operations a researcher needs to undertake to achieve a systematic and coherent process of data collection, storage and retrieval”. There are many ways of approaching data management within a research context. In this study I first started with the transcription of the data from both the questionnaires and interviews. These two data collecting techniques provided me with a larger amount of data, since interviews were used to supplement and probe issues rose in the questionnaires more deeply. I then started to immerse myself in the data more deeply, by listening to the video recordings of the interviews and comparing these with my transcripts several times. Marshall and Roman (cited in Creswell, 1994, p.114) describe data analysis as a technique of “reduction” and “interpretation”. This data analysis technique implies taking the ‘thick’ descriptions (voluminous amount of data) and reducing them to patterns, categories or themes and then interpreting these using the theoretical frameworks that had emerged in my literature review processes, in this case the principles of participative management.

With my research questions in mind I then developed themes which formed the basis of my discussion. Questionnaires were the primary data collecting technique, while the interviews were used to supplement and probe issues rose in the question more deeply. In light of the above, data from the interviews and questions were analysed and discussed simultaneously, while data from observation were included wherever they were relevant to the themes identified.

3.8 Validity

In this study, inductive analysis was applied as described by Danermark, Ekstrom, Jakobsen and Karlson (2002) showing that seeing similarities and differences across a number of sets of data is crucial. Patton (2002, p.41) describes inductive analysis as the investigation of data to discover patterns and themes leading to valid findings. During the process of analysing the data, I thus looked for trends, similarities and contradictions.

The transcripts were done and the participants were given their transcripts “to read to confirm whether they accurately reflected their responses” (Maxwell, 2008, p.244). I used three data

sources for triangulation. According to Golafshani (2003, p.603), triangulation is a “strategy for improving validity and reliability of research or evaluation of findings”.

3.9 Ethical consideration

For ethical considerations it is always important for the researcher to be mindful of the ethical dilemma that confronts researchers. Cohen and Manion (2000, p.56) describe ethics as follows:

A matter of principal sensitivity to the rights of others. Being ethical limits the choices we can make in the pursuit of truth... while truth is good, respect for human dignity is better, even if, in the extreme case, the respect of human nature leaves one ignorant of human nature.

In this way research findings could be limited or even incomplete since ethical demands may limit one’s freedom to gather data. This may happen when a key informant chooses to withdraw. Hence, certain rights need to be guaranteed, such as the right to privacy, anonymity and confidentiality of participants (Bassey, 1999). The purpose of the research was fully explained to the participants, and they were assured of the anonymity of the institution and confidentiality of data collected by way of an ethical statement, which was assigned by both the researcher and the respondents. The agreement included reference to the participants’ right to withdraw from the research at any time in the process of the research.

My own dual role as researcher / staff member was also an ethical challenge on several fronts. One is that respondents might tell me what they thought I wished to hear; this would have been unlikely though, given my rank as HOD being equivalent (or junior to) the rank of those interviewed. More threatening is the fact that I am a staff member, very familiar with the organisation, and may well have had pre-conceived ideas of what was actually happening as far as management was concerned. Naturally, there is no way of entirely ridding oneself of such bias; it is hoped that the range of data gathering tools I used would help to guard against skewed or slanted reporting. This argument is further pursued below.

3.10 Limitations of case study research

The case study method has to deal with the skills, limitations and / or bias on the part of the researcher. Case studies are dependent on the sensitivity and integrity of the investigator. The researcher is the primary data-gathering instrument, and all researchers are not equally skilled in observation and interviewing. There is limited standardisation in data analysis, and there may be confusion between data and interpretation of the data, resulting in selective presentation of evidence.

Shaughnessy *et al.* (2003) suggest that case studies often lack a high degree of control and treatment is rarely controlled systematically. However, Yin (2009) argues that the more specific the questions that the case study is trying to answer are, the stronger the likelihood of the case study staying on track and within limits.

3.11 Conclusion

In this Chapter, I have described the paradigm underpinning this study, the case study method as well as data gathering techniques that were used to respond to the questions in this study. I also drew attention to the limitations of case study research. The research process that was followed in this study was also discussed with reference to each technique used in this study: questionnaires, interviews and observation.

In the next Chapter I present and discuss the data.

Chapter 4: Data analysis and discussion

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this research was to investigate five HOD's participative management in the Albany Museum with a view to generating knowledge and insights that can be used to support senior management's engagement with participative management at a mid-management level. The data were acquired by employing three data collecting techniques, viz., questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and observation.

This Chapter presents the findings in categories, and discusses these in terms of relevant literature. Interview responses are coded as IRP 1, IRP 2, and so on, while questionnaire responses are coded as QRP 1, QRP 2 and so on.

Here follows a brief professional profile of the five respondents:

Table 1: Profile of the HODs involved in this study

HODs	Gender	Age	Qualifications	Working Experience
HOD 1	Female	±50	PhD	20 years
HOD 2	Male	40	BTech	10 years
HOD 3	Female	40	B.Sc. Hons in Archeology	5 years
HOD 4	Male	30	PhD	5 years

HOD 5	Male	43	Masters in Science	10 years
-------	------	----	--------------------	----------

4.2The picture of the participative management that emerges from the data

I begin this section by quoting my respondents' responses to the question of how they understood the concept of participative management.

According to QRP 1:

Participative management allows all employees in a company or institution to have their opinions heard. It does not necessarily mean that everyone has the power to make high level decisions, but allows the freedom and opportunity to express their ideas. This can result in the production of very good ideas, as sometimes staff sees things differently to management.

QRP2 describes it as “*The type of management style wherein subordinates are allowed to play a significant role in the decision-making process made by management in an institution*”. For QRP3, similarly, it allows for “*consultation with staff and inclusion of their issues and queries at a higher management decision-making platform*”. QRP4 introduces the notion of levels: “*Participative management is a management style that emphasises inclusivity and the importance at many levels in management*”. This is echoed in QRP5's description, which gives more detail:

Participative management is the type of management in which employees at all levels are encouraged to contribute ideas towards identifying and setting organisational goals, problem-solving and other decisions that may directly affect them.

In short, the HODs have a remarkably clear picture of participative management, in theory at least, which articulates well with much of the literature discussed in Chapter Two. In the literature, participative management has been noted for its ability to facilitate trust, self-confidence and active participation which increases the level of competence (Coleman, 2005;

Hargreaves, 2002). Moreover, others argue that working together as opposed to being in isolation to achieve common organisational goals provides a win-win solution for both the company or institution and the workers (Sagie & Koslowsky, 2000; Mungunda, 2003).

On this platform I now present a more detailed and ‘practical’ picture of how the participants in this study see participative management in the museum, looking firstly at the benefits and then at the challenges inherent in this approach.

4.2.1 The benefits of participative management

4.2.1.1 Participative management encourages staff participation

Respondents felt that participative management encourages all staff members to feel included in the management of the museum. Questionnaire responses revealed the following.

QRP1 said that participative management “*allows people to express their opinions*” and that it “*gives people freedom and opportunity to express their ideas*”. This is in line with what Bush (2003, p.64) says about collegial models where decisions are made “through a process of discussion leading to consensus. Power is shared among some or all members of the organization who are thought to have a shared understanding about the aims of the institution”. Furthermore, the concept of “collegiality” focuses on working to a consensus. It accommodates a vision of leadership that is shared among individuals or managers. Data from the interviews support this finding. For instance, IRP1 said that “*participative management is about sharing ideas*”. QRP2 responded that:

Participative management is type of management in which employees at all levels are encouraged to contribute ideas towards identifying and setting organisational goals, problem solving, and other decisions that may directly affect them.

This is supported by Lewin’s thinking as discussed in Chapter Two: “Lewin’s special gift for understanding American ideals of democracy ... lead him to include in these first research plans his clear recognition that you cannot do things to people but only with them” (Weisbord, 2004, p. 94). QRP4 also thought that participative management “*is a management style that emphasises*

inclusivity". Similarly, Hargreaves (2002) argues that "encouraging the use of participative management approaches in different learning contexts as the potential for securing trust and active participation among involved individual and social groups (employees)".

Furthermore, this actually draws away from the autocratic approach or dictatorship and rather encourages a subtle approach to get more out of one's workforce. QRP3 viewed participative management as "*a form of staff consultation*". She also perceived it to be a type of management style that emphasises inclusivity and inclusion of staff issues at higher management level. She also felt that "*if participative management were practiced at the Museum it would drive our ideology of team formation in a new direction that would unite upper level HODs and the middle management and also be a beacon of hope for the organisation as a whole*". This response suggests that, according to this respondent, participative management was not being practiced at the Museum. She sees the value of this kind of management though. Hence, a range of responses were recorded, from the suggestion that participative management was simply a form of consultation to the more visionary statement quoted above.

There were also reservations expressed. IRP4 said that "*Managers [should] make the final decision; that is the best for the institution where they work*". Although participants understood the meaning and the importance of participative management, it was highlighted that where necessary managers needed to make the final decision. This critical response also features in other studies. Mungunda (2003, p.23), for example, found that "the effectiveness of the use of a participative management has not matched its popularity". In short, it sounds like a good idea, but is not often acted upon.

These impressions were largely substantiated by my observations. During the HOD meeting that was held on the 5th of June 2013, I observed the proceedings closely. I found in that situation that participative management involved teamwork, a clear exchange of ideas, problem-solving and an open platform for communicating. This was evident when a staff member cited the shortage of staff as a problem - this was then fully discussed in the meeting, openly and constructively.

Another challenge was that some members felt sensitive about the high rate of absenteeism. Both matters were discussed and the meeting ultimately agreed to take forward letters to Head Office for advice and guidance. During the meeting the reports of the Departments were also tabled and fully discussed; several challenges were raised. I concluded that participative management was indeed being practiced at the meeting, but that the restriction referred to above was also manifest, namely that on important matters guidance was needed from higher authorities. Management had not necessarily devolved to the level of site-based controlled.

Nevertheless, participative management was present, and its quality of encouraging staff involvement was apparent.

4.2.1.2 Participative management encourages participation in decision-making

Respondents felt that participative management involves participation in decision-making in the management of the Museum. This was evident in the questionnaire responses.

QRP1 said that participative management “*is a tool for decision-making*”. QRP2 suggested that “*It gives room for subordinates to play a significant role in the decision-making process*” and QRP3 said that participative management is the “*platform for decision-making*”. The respondents felt that participative management involves participation in decision-making in the management of the Museum. This was evident in that all respondents, including the Manager, the HODs, Senior and Junior Administrative staff, general workers and also to some extent the Board of Trustees depend on their areas of jurisdiction. Decision-making is often seen as the central feature of management; Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (1999, p. 12), for example, argue that “Participative leadership assumes that the decision-making processes of the group ought to be the central focus of the group”. Hence, it is not surprising that shared decision-making arose strongly in my findings.

Research observation affirmed that the participants’ responses in departmental meetings encouraged participation. It was also observed that the HODs stay on agenda when discussing matters pertaining to participative management. The observation also indicated that members of the management participate in decision-making and reach a certain goal. This is supported by

Smith (2003, p. 24) who says that “when employees participate in management decisions they enhance their performance and become empowered”.

4.2.1.3 Participative management broadens HODs’ perceptions

Respondents felt that the participative management added a new dimension of leadership and management to the museum. QRP1 said that it “*helps HODs to see things differently*”. By this she meant that participative management, through the involvement of other staff members, is able to broaden and enrich HODs’ insights. This in turn leads to more effective performance, since a more holistic picture emerges. In similar vein, Mungunda (2003,p.42) argued that “most people desire increased involvement and participation, which has the ability to energize greater performance produce better solutions to problems and greatly enhance acceptance of decisions”. It was found that such group dynamics work to overcome resistance to change, increase commitment to the organisation, reduce stress levels and generally make people feel better about themselves and their world” (Bell, 1995, p. 94).

4.2.1.4 Participative management extends management to different levels

Another theme to emerge was that participative management approaches can devolve management activities to different levels within the organisation’s structure. QRP4 felt that participative management “*emphasises the importance of many levels in management*”. Data from interviews support this idea. IRP5 said that:

Participative management is the type of management in which employees at all levels are encouraged to contribute ideas towards identifying and setting organisational goals, problem-solving and other decisions that may directly affect them.

The notion of cutting across ‘levels’ within a traditionally hierarchical structure is a characteristic feature of contemporary leadership and management thinking. It coincides with Lewin’s ideals (discussed in Chapter Two) which set out to enhance the dignity of workers through meaningful involvement. This trend was supported in one of my observations. I observed a meeting which was conducted on the 5th of June 2013 where I was looking at how

participants demonstrated a high level of awareness of participation in management activities, regardless of their rank within the organisation.

The following features were evident:

- All members were actively participating.
- The atmosphere of the meeting was relaxed and very professional.
- All decisions and methods used to solve them were based on consensus, without going to a vote.
- The Director was openly involved without being autocratic or dictating the discussions. Instead he took part as a facilitator.

It became clear that the meetings were conducted in a relaxed manner but with an active team spirit where everyone – the Director, middle management and other subordinates - was working towards a common goal, shared vision and mission.

4.2.1.5 Participative management enhances staff commitment and sense of responsibility

Enhanced commitment to their work emerged as a further striking feature of participative management. Respondents felt that commitment was one of the positive spin-offs of this approach. QRP4 said: *“I have proposed and begun implementation of the display upgrades. I have initiated my own research programme”*. QRP3 viewed *“sharing ideas with other HODs in the museum meetings”* as being an example of commitment and a new found energy.

A key feature of my observation of a meeting held on 22nd of August 2013 was the fact the staff members readily accepted new responsibilities. There was a general spirit of cooperation and willingness to be involved, which to me suggests high levels of commitment to work. Bhatnager (2007) refers to this as a strong feature of participative management, where members’ sense of ownership is raised. By ownership he means readiness to take responsibility, clearly a sign of commitment. I return to this point below.

Some respondents singled out responsibility and creativity as added benefits of participative management. QRP1 said this management approach “*allows experienced staff to learn to take responsibility*” and “*results in the introduction of new and innovative ideas*”. QRP1 added: “*Participative management allows experienced staff to learn to take responsibility, it allows them to have their own opinions heard, and can build up their own self-esteem. It can result in the introduction of new innovative ideas*”.

These notions find strong support in literature. For instance Somech (2002, p.437) believes that staff members ‘involvement in and subsequent influence on decision-making processes promote commitment to the decisions that are made and increases willingness to carry them out in their work with the staff. This rationale is referred to as “pragmatic “or a “human relations” approach (Koopman Wierdsma in Somech, 2002, p.346) and assumes that participative management is an instrumental way to achieve productivity, efficiency, or other valued organisational results. For QRP5 this resulted in a “*strong feeling of association and taking responsibility*”. IRP1 said that participation “*is about sharing responsibilities*”.

4.2.1.6 Participative management leads to co-construction of knowledge

Respondents felt that broadening and enriching one’s knowledge was a key positive consequence of participative management. QRP1 said that this approach “*allows us to have our opinion heard and builds self-esteem*”. QRP2 thought that “*a greater pool of thought and knowledge*” was always a strong advantage, and this could be achieved through sharing. Obviously this assumes a level of trust and willingness to share on the part of senior management. The principle of being informed proved over and over again by Lewin’s experiments, such as the war-time decision to discourage housewives from buying expensive cuts of meat because these were very scarce. Once Lewin involved the housewives to make their own decision – after making available all the information – they made good decisions which they acted upon. In this sense knowledge is power bearing out and this resonates with Davidoff and Lazarus’ (2000, p. 28) observation that “*empowerment is about sharing, control and responsibility*”.

4.2.1.8 Participative management ensures a greater sense of ownership

As mentioned above, respondents felt that a sense of ownership among staff members was very important, and that participative management practices could enable this. QRP2 said that there was “*a greater sense of ownership among all staff members*”. QRP3 said that “*everyone will feel that they are making a difference because they are included in the day to day running of the Museum*”.

QRP5 gave a complex answer which is worth quoting in full:

Participative management increases productivity and job satisfaction cannot exist unless there is a high level of motivation in the employee. The vice versa also holds true! Decentralized decision-making means that everyone has a say and everyone is important. Since the input or feedback comes from the people who are part of the processes at the lowest levels of execution even the smallest details are taken care of and reported. No flaw or loophole goes unreported. Quality control thus begins and it is ensured at the lowest level. There is a lesser need for supervision and more emphasis is laid on widening of skills and self-management. This and quality control means that the costs are controlled automatically.

This rich response moves beyond the notion of ownership, embracing practices of feedback loops and quality control. It all stems from “*a high level of motivation in the employee*” though, which is clearly a feature of ownership. What QRP6 envisages here is a system in which feedback loops are secure so that everyone is fully informed of what may be going wrong at any level of the organisation, leading to ‘self-management’ because every staff member feels important in the chain of production.

In both meetings I attended, staff members’ enthusiastic participation in discussion and decision-making suggested high levels of ownership.

4.5.1 Leadership and participative management

A few respondents referred to leadership roles they had assumed, or initiatives they had undertaken that revealed leadership tendencies. QRP1 said:

I have led several initiatives within the museum, though mostly within my own Department. I have rose considerable funding for research projects, and led expeditions. This work has resulted in the discovery of species new to science, thus increasing the knowledge of the biodiversity of unique South African freshwater organisms.

This kind of academic leadership is what one may expect from a Museum which has a strong academic research thrust. While interesting, it would be presumptuous to attribute this kind of behaviour to any particular management approach. QRP2 similarly reported:

I am constantly [driven] to do so as my job designation resources as much. All aspects that involve exhibitions and coming from the institution. I have to oversee the recent proposed upgrade of the front foyer has been an initiative of his individual. I have supervised the exhibition department and have upgraded the gallery.

It is more likely that academic leadership emanates from the kind of collegiality and professional mutual respect that exists in academic departments. Whether this could really be linked to a participatory management approach is debatable.

I now turn to the challenges, factors that inhibit participatory management practices, or are considered to be inherent weaknesses in the system.

4.3 Factors that hinder the development of participative management in the context of the museum

Under this broad heading the data suggested several categories. The data from all three sources – interviews, questionnaires and observation – will be reported under these categories.

4.3.1 Lack of communication between HODs and other staff members

Respondents felt that communication needed to be improved in the Museum. In the context of the Museum, management's lack of communication can lead to confusion because some of the HODs do not report what was discussed with their teams. IRP2 stated that a very significant challenge was that middle managers work in "silos; where little awareness of other sections or portfolios is evident and they often do not involve themselves in 'administration matters'". IRP3 similarly felt very strongly about the "lack of communication between people in management

and their subordinates". Some respondents blamed a lack of training. IRP4 thought that "*people need to be trained because they don't know what is valuable... a lack of communication, and failing to communicate announcements*" all lead to poor team work. Communication is obviously a very important factor in the consultative process, where sharing of ideas can take place. IRP4 thought that "*managers should consult and listen to one's ideas*". It is also a lack of understanding of their roles, as Owens (2001, p. 95) points out.

In a meeting on 22nd of August 2013 I noted complaints from the subordinates who said that they were not kept in the picture, and hardly ever involved in decision-making. Bush's collegial model (2010, p. 54) draws attention to the kind of communication that characterises systems where participatory management practices are prevalent. He describes these as 'horizontal', to distinguish them from the vertical communication flow that occurs in hierarchically organised organisational structures. If it is indeed the case that HODs do not as a rule communicate decisions to their teams, one may deduce that the Museum still has traces of the traditional, hierarchical management structure.

4.3.2 Lack of management competence

The generally low level of management readiness among museum staff members was also highlighted as an issue. Respondents felt that some members of the management team hindered the development of participative management since they lacked an understanding of how such a system might function, and the capacity to enact it. QRP4 argued that "*Participative management requires multiple levels of competent staff*". Low numbers of staff meant that participative management development was difficult to achieve as many Departments were one person Departments. Staff apathy also limited implementation.

As is often the case, members also laid the blame elsewhere, typically with higher authorities. QRP5 said that the Albany Museum belonged to the Government, and that they (the staff) could not simply "*do what we wish ... we cannot hire or fire any employee. We take instructions from Government, we are guided by policies and this limits our creativity and hinders the development of participation*". While there is clearly truth in this, the argument also distracts one

from what may be a more likely explanation for lack of initiative and acting competently. After all, there are countless cases of schools that do well in spite of being strongly controlled from central government bodies.

In a meeting on the 5th of June 2013 I observed that policies were regarded as very important and their implementation was regarded as the key to the success of the institution. My findings in the meeting prove that policy implementation could play a role in reducing what Sergioivanni (2001, p.166) referred as the “ability-authority gap that exists in departments”. Although a Museum HOD may be in charge as a leader, most HODs are aware that often the middle management they supervise know more about what needs to be done and how to do things. Being prepared to learn from them would be a step in the right direction. Furthermore, regarding policy as all-important once again points to a lack of initiative and willingness to take responsibility. It is easier to blame policy.

Another problem was described as “*younger staff thinking they know it all but not having the wisdom built on experience*” (QRP 1). This is also clearly a capacity issue, but it is more than that since the staff in question believes they do have the necessary skills and experience whereas senior staff disagree. Conversely, one respondent identified “*arrogance*” on the part of senior staff as a stumbling block. QRP 1 argued that senior staff could feel “*insecure and they may feel threatened by less qualified and less experienced staff who nevertheless have good ideas*”. The same point was put differently by QRP 4 who felt that “*participative management devalues the contribution of leaders by implying that all staff takes part in these processes*”. This is an interesting comment, seeming to suggest that the ‘real’ (formal) leaders need to take and receive the credit for what is achieved, but participative management suggests that **everyone** has taken part. This is revealing of a mindset not yet ready for true participatory practice and teamwork. With reference to more traditional theories, this kind of thinking suggests a clinging to outdated heroic paradigms of leadership. The respondent concluded: “*Hard decisions are required to be made, and this is the job of the manager/HOD*”.

Not that this view is entirely without merit or value. The same respondent –QRP4 – felt that “*Not all staff have the best plans for the museum at heart, making complete participative management*

unbearable ... staff apathy” was also mentioned as a barrier. He thought the organisation’s effectiveness was threatened by apathetic staff members; he mentioned a particular programme that had become dysfunctional because of reliance on participation.

4.3.3 Lack of overall vision among museum departments

The Albany Museum has different Departments and each Department is represented by a Head of Department (HOD). The institution has its own vision which reads *To become a museum that is an integral part of our community, contributing to the process of nation building through nurturing a society that is aware of the value of its past and is constructively engaged in the present in order to create a better future*. One of the challenges arising from this research was an acknowledgement of the fact that the various Departments do not form a whole. As QRP1 put it,

Each Department has its own competencies and expectations; each Department is very specialised with staff of varying professional qualifications. One Department cannot manage another; in terms of overall management, any institution has a hierarchy necessary for proper functionality and final decision and responsibility rests with HODs.

IRP1 elaborated by referring to a scientific Department within the museum, where collaboration and participation was a hallmark of their work. As she put it “*We all have opinions and discuss them regularly*”. These discussions were not about management though, and she went on to make this important point:

They are more about science than about management... scientists think very differently from managers. As scientist we like to share ideas and have other people, criticise them, as it helps to improve the ideas. Many non-scientists would find this sort of environment threatening, but constructive criticism is very useful when used in a right way.

This observation points to one of the main issues of conflict in the organisation, where teams of people with essentially different aims and goals often do not collaborate or cooperate across divisions. This ‘fractured’ nature of the organisation was discussed earlier, and this is an example of where participative management on an organisational level seems hard to achieve. IRP 1

explained that in their own Department they worked together well, sharing responsibilities. However:

Within the context of the museum as a whole, I like to think that I am open minded and prepared to listen to other people's feelings and points of view. We discuss projects and tasks that need to be done, and which need to be prioritised, but unfortunately we are very understaffed, so there is always a backlog of tasks to complete and now requests for our participation come in almost daily.

In a nutshell, she sees her chief function – as scientist leading a team of scientists – threatened by organisational demands. IRP5 – the Acting Manager of the museum – by contrast, is involved in the implementation and monitoring of legislation policies and strategies, specifically those that have to do with museums and heritage. His role is to provide accurate information and advice on museum supervision, administration and human resource management. He needs to ensure effective supervision and effective implementation of policy decisions.

The 'distance' between different teams or groups is perceived by some – IRP3 as a “*lack of communication between people in management and their subordinates*”. IRP 4 similarly thought that managers should consult more and listen harder. These responses above find resonance in Owens (2001, p.95) who states that one of the persistently under-recognised problems in implementing participative methods is that not all members understand how to manipulate their roles to the best of their ability.

This does not sound either unusual or necessarily problematic. The Albany Museum is indeed a vast complex with many diverse interests; hence one would expect pockets of expertise. What does become problematic is when these become 'silos' as noted earlier. As QRP2 put it, “*Individuals are myopically concerned with issues within their Department “by focusing on short-term goals rather than long-term objectives. Hence, there seems to be an absence of an overall, holistic picture of the Museum and what it stands for. This is partly because of a lack of knowledge. Yet, Harris (2000, as cited by Coleman, 2005, p.20) in the museum context, argues that “in every management style it is important to have a common vision which places emphasis on distributed leadership or collective leadership among museum staff”.* Furthermore

Harris identifies distributed leadership with the collective leadership of museum staff working together to improve museum practice and therefore people outcomes.

On the 5th of June 2013 I observed that there was collaboration where Departments were working together on a project where there were common goals, so synergy of this kind is possible, but clearly not prevalent. This is probably a leadership challenge, and may point to either a less inspiring, visionary leadership approach, or the absence of a programme where the organisation as a whole is assessed and monitored. What may be needed are what Roueche *al.* (Cited in Leithwood, 2000, p.55) refer to as “powerful leaders of the past and present ... dreamers and visionaries. They were people who looked beyond the confines of space and time to transcend the traditional boundaries of either their positions or their organizations”. Complete, meaningful collaboration rests on truly shared vision, and this seems not be in place.

4.3.4 Shortage of staff

On a more mundane level, respondents felt that the shortage of staff hindered the development of participative management in the Museum. QRP4 felt “*promoting participative management development is difficult*” with such low staff numbers. He said “*among Departments there is only one male or female staff and apathy also limits implementation*”. These sentiments were supported by QRP1.

In both meetings on the 5th of June and the 22nd of August 2013 the shortage of staff was repeatedly mentioned as one of the main barriers to effectiveness in the Museum. Many important and potentially valuable projects had to be abandoned or postponed because of being short-staffed. Clearly, being short-staffed increases the burden of day-to-day administration on staff who are present, limiting their management and leadership potential.

4.3.5 Participative management is time consuming

Several respondents pointed to how cumbersome and time-consuming participative management practices can be. This sentiment is supported in literature (e.g. Bush, 2003, p.81).

QRP5 argued:

Participative management stands for increased participation and when there are many people involved in decision-making, the process definitely slows down. Input and feedback start pouring in from each side. It takes time to verify the accuracy of measurements which means that decision-making will be slowed down.

In both meetings –5th June 2013 and 22nd August 2013 - I observed that participative management was indeed time-consuming since it was important to listen to each and every staff member. Often, though, in meetings of the Manager and the HODs decisions were taken and simply forwarded to the rest of the staff for their input. This is clearly more efficient, but it is unlikely to result in true participation. Staff members who were not present at the meetings are unlikely to have strong enough views to challenge what may have been decided, and may be happy simply to be informed.

4.4 Concluding thoughts

Given the benefits and challenges discussed above, I felt the need to describe the extent to which management in the museum context can be termed ‘participative’. I also discuss the contextual elements that either enhance or inhibit attempts to implement more participatory approaches to management and leadership.

Generally there certainly is evidence of a degree of participative management in the Museum. Respondents reported on how they have been consulted, and how they themselves have consulted in the course of their duties, especially when it came to decision-making. The structure of the Museum (see organogram attached as Appendix 8) also lends itself to participation through Committees which is essentially how the museum is run. One of the respondents- RP1 – also interestingly remarked on how participative approaches to management were needed in a situation which had experienced high degrees of change. This is a reference not only to the change discussed in Chapter One, but also the fact that the Museum has had three Managers since December 2012:

The museum management style keeps changing as we have different Managers coming into place; since December 2012 we have had three Managers. Our Manager that time moved to a new job, a few months later our Acting Manager moved as well and now we have one of our botanists bravely standing in for this position. This has resulted in high degrees of participative management as we are all trying to support our Acting Manager, and we frequently discuss issues that we are not sure how to deal with.

I have also personally witnessed participative management in action in the meetings I have attended. In the meeting of the 5th of June 2013, for example, I found that issues were extensively discussed before any decision was taken and all decisions were based on consensus. This is a healthy situation, generally supported and promoted in literature. Smith (2003, p.24), for example, claims that “participation enhances empowerment which in turn enhances performance and individual wellbeing. Participation therefore leads to capacity building”. The more people participate the more meaningfully they will be able to contribute to the success of an organisation.

The organisation is well disposed to participative management, which in itself augurs well for transformation of the system. It is not blind to the challenges though, as discussed above, and awareness of these no doubt lies behind the fact that no-one is quite prepared to commit entirely to this management approach. These are explored more fully in the final Chapter of this thesis.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

The overarching aim of this study was to investigate participative management in the context of a museum. The purpose was to explore a relatively under-researched field with insights drawn from contemporary leadership and management theory, with the potential value of providing guidance in the field. In this Chapter I present the conclusion of the study. I start with an overview of the main findings identified in the previous chapter and then proceed to make recommendations for both managerial practices as well as for further research in the field. Finally, I discuss the limitations of my research. I begin by providing answers to the research questions which drove this study, which were:

- What is management's understanding of participative management?
- What are the benefits of participative management?
- What challenges do HODs face in using participative management approaches?

5.2 Findings

As reported in Section 4.2, the concept of participative management appears to be clearly understood by members of the management team of the Albany Museum I worked with in this project. This was evident from their comments and generally positive attitude towards it. Hence, it was not surprising that they saw many of the benefits of this approach to management, and could speak confidently about these. They saw that participative management leads to a greater sense of ownership among staff members since they are involved in decisions that affect them. They also recognised the fact that shared or joint decisions were often better ones, because often staff members not in formal leadership positions are able to make valuable contributions to discussions, especially in cases where they are centrally involved. They also mentioned that participative management encourages leadership development: involvement encourages initiative. This, in turn, leads to knowledge growth, which is then not confined to the senior (management) personnel, but occurs at all levels of the organisation.

However, participants were equally conscious of the challenges of participative management and the obstacles imposed by the basic organisational structure of the Museum. One sharp point of criticism expressed was the view that not all staff members have the necessary experience or expertise to take part meaningfully in decision-making. Another criticism was with regards to time, and the fact that consultation and trying to find a consensus was time consuming. The most significant challenge, though, was based on an acknowledgement of the special and unusual nature of the Museum as an organisation. Museums are characterised by groups or teams of staff members, with very different aims and objectives. For example, while senior management may be concerned about salaries and service contracts, scientists are focused on gaining and extending knowledge. As one respondent put it, scientists do not think like managers. This makes it very difficult to shape a coherent vision and mission for the organisation, hence the sense - in this study – that the Museum lacked a strong vision.

It is of course not unusual in itself to have an organisation that has strong tendencies and interests that do not seem to speak to each other – a university for example – but it is nevertheless the challenge of management to bring about some form of coherence and joint purpose. In the case of the Museum, these efforts are hampered by the fact that the organisation is seriously understaffed. Negative experiences and ‘blinkered’ views of the organisation lead some to suggest that participative management may not be the ideal form of management for a museum, though consultation remains essential.

In summary: participative management is both understood and generally accepted as a good way to manage an organisation, and even members who are critical of it can see its benefits. However, the fractured and diversified structure of the organisation calls for a particularly skillful application of this management approach, one which would also demand leadership and a greater sense of working towards what are called collegial models of management. Whether this is in fact desirable for a museum is debatable.

5.3 Suggestions for future research

- My research investigated participative management from the point of view of five HODs. To develop a more holistic understanding of the concept, more research is needed to bring together the views of directors, managers and staff members. While this is likely to bring to light even more challenges it may also lead to identifying solutions to some of the problems raised in this study.
- Future research on participative management from the perspective of other museums is needed, since my study focused on only one. It seems likely that other museums may perceive and practise participative management differently and much may be learned from comparative studies. As this study has revealed, very little work has been done in this area.
- Finally, studies which focus on museums as unusual organisations are needed. Museums are at least as unusual or unique as schools, yet studies of schools are common and have done much to contribute towards our understanding. If museums are to survive the transformation process which seeks to make them more relevant, socially, politically and economically, we need to develop our understanding of what they are as organisations.

5.4 Recommendations for practice

My findings highlight the readiness of the HODs to employ a participative mode of decision-making to achieve valued organisational outcomes. It was also clear from responses that the potential positive effects that collegiality can have on commitment are enormous, thus collegial processes and strategies need to be sustained and effectively managed through ongoing transformational leadership and collegial management processes and strategies. This requires skillful management and leadership, especially in light of what I have identified as unusual features of museums as organisations. It is likely that museums could learn from other similar institutions, such as universities, who similarly have to balance administrative needs with academic ones, as well as deal increasingly with community engagement.

References

- Abraham, S. & Koslowsky, M. (2000). *Participation and empowerment in organisations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bassey, M. (1995). *Creating education through research: A global perspective of educational research for the 21st century*. Newark Kirklington: Moor Press.
- Berg, B.L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (3rd Ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bush, T. (1993). *Exploring collegiality: Theory and practice. Managing schools: Challenge and Response*. London: The Open University, Milton Keynes.
- Bush, T. (1995). *Theories of educational management*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (3rd edition). Sage London.
- Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management* (4th edition). California: Thousand Oaks.
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5thed). London: Routledge.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K.(2007) *Research methods in education* (6thEd.).London: Routledge.
- Coleman, M. (2005). Theories and Practice of leadership an introduction. In M. Coleman and P. Earley (Eds) *Leadership and management in Education cultures, change and context*, pp.6-25. Oxford: University Press.
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: Sage Publications.
- Day, C., Hopkins, D., Hadfield, M., Hargreaves, A. & Chapman, C. (2000). *Effective leadership and school improvement*, pp 9-25. London: Routledge, Falmer.
- Edumuseum, (2010). *Education at Albany Museum*. Rhodes University: Grahamstown.
- Fullen. (2001). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Gore, M. (2005). *Annals of Eastern Cape Museums*, Vol (4)1-26.
- Grace, G. (1995). *School leadership: Beyond Education Management*. London, Falmer Press.

- Griffin, D. & Abraham, M. (2000). The effective management of museums: cohesive leadership and visitor-focused public programming. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 18: 335-368.
- Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed Properties: A new Architecture for Leadership. *Educational Management & Administration*, 28: 317–338.
- Harris, A. (2003). The changing context of leadership: research, theory and practice. In Harris, A. and Lambert, L. (eds.) *Building leadership capacity for school improvement*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hyman, W. & Mason, B. (1995). *Managing Employee Involvement and Participation*. Sage Publications: London.
- Johnson, M. & Ledbetter, L. (1993). *The role of the principal in a shared decision making school. A critical perspective*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Atlanta.
- Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership redefined: an evocative context for teacher leadership*. Vol.23, (4), 421-430.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinbach, R. (1998). *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinback, R. (2000). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Management Study Guide. Accessed July 2014 at <http://www.managementstudyguide.com/limitations-of-participative-management.htm>).
- Mills, M. B & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book* (2nd Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moloi, K. (2007). An overview of education management in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 27: 463 – 476.
- Mungunda, C. (2003). *An investigation into school principal's experience and perception of participative management*. Unpublished M Ed thesis. Rhodes University: Grahamstown.
- Owens, R. (2001). *Organisational behaviour in education: Instructional leadership and school reform*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Publishers.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Paulsson, A. (2008). *Towards good and effective management in a museum: the importance to understand understanding*. Bachelor Thesis: Lund University.

- Pitman, M. A & Maxwell, J. A. (1992). Qualitative approaches to evaluation. Patterson, M.G West, M.A, Lawthorn, R and Nickell, S (1997). *Impact of People Management practices on Business Performance*. London: Institute of Personal and Development.
- Poo, B & E. Hoyle. (1995). Teacher Involvement in Decision-making. In Johnson, D., (ed.) *Educational Management and Policy: Research, Theory and practice in South Africa*. Bristol: University of Bristol Centre for International Studies in Education.
- Rennie, L.J. (2011). Blurring the boundary between the classroom and the community: Challenges for teachers' professional knowledge. In D. Corrigan, J. Dillon & G. Gunstone (Eds.). *The professional knowledge base of science teaching*. New York: Springer.
- Sagie, A. (1977). Leader direction and employee participation in decision-making: Contradictory or compatible practices? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 387-416.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1984). Leadership as cultural Expression. In Sergiovanni, T. and J. Corbally, eds. *Leadership and organisational Culture*. Urban and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The life world of leadership: Creating culture, community and personal meaning in our schools*. San Francisco: JosseyBass.
- Somech, A. (2002). Explicating the complexity of participative management: An investigation of multiple dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38 (3):371.
- Stake, R.E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Stake, R.E. (2000). Case studies. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 435-455). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Stake, R.E. (2005). *Qualitative case studies. The Sage handbook qualitative research* (3rd Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Suchy, S. (1999). *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 18, (1):57-71.
- Torgler, B., García-Valiñas, M. & Macintyre, A. (2010). *Participation in environmental organisation*. Sirling: Routledge.
- Van der Mescht, H. (2008). Educational leadership and management- some thoughts from the field. *Journal of Education*, 44: 7-24
- Watson, S. (2007). *Museums and their communities*. London: New York
- Weisbord, M. R. (2004). *Productive workplaces revisited: Dignity, Meaning, and Community in the 21st Century*.

- Wilkinson, D. (2000). *The researcher's toolkit: The complete guide research*. London: Routledge.
- William, K. R & John, F.G. (2006). *Partnership at work*. London: Routledge.
- Winegardner, K.E. The case study method of scholarly research
<http://w.w.w.thsa.edu/online/cybrary/case/.html>.
- Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and Methods* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks: CA.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Letter to manager of the museum

Enq: N.Madinda
Cell: +2734494043
Email:n.madinda@am.org.za

51 Ext 4
Grahamstown
South Africa
14 March 2013

To: The Manager
Albany Museum
Grahamstown
Eastern Cape
South Africa

Dear MrCimi

Request for permission to carry out a research study

I am a part-time Masters of Education student in the field of Educational Leadership and Management at Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa. I am presently engaged in a research project which aims to explore the enactment of “participative management” in museums in the Eastern Cape. In this regard I have, for the purpose of convenience, selected your institution for my research study which I plan to do from 08th April to 28th June 2013. I would like to work with you as the manager and 5 HOD’s in your institution.

I also need to address the staff once to put them into picture and also give them some short questionnaires. As part of this research I also need to observe at least two staff meetings as well. Further to that I will need them to keep a journal as part of data collection. I would also like to peruse any documents that you may have related to the enactment of participative management.

Please note that this is not an evaluation of performance or competence of your HOD’s. I undertake to uphold the autonomy of all participants and they will be free to withdraw from the research at any time without negative or undesirable consequences to themselves. In this regard, participants will be asked to complete a consent form.

It is against this background that I am requesting your permission to conduct a research study at your school. Please feel free to contact me at any time should you have any queries or questions you would like answered. Attached please find a copy of the confirmation letter from my supervisors, Prof. Hennie van der Mescht and Dr. Callie Grant who can be contacted as follow: Hennie Tel: 046 6038384 email: h.vandermescht@ru.ac.za and CallieTel: 046 6037508 email: c.grant@ru.ac.za

Yours sincerely

.....

MrsN.Madinda

Appendix 2: Individual interviews

1. How do you deal with people's ideas and views?
2. Do you invite people to express their ideas?
3. Do you have departmental meetings?
4. How do you involve others in your management?
5. Is it challenging or difficult?
6. Is the management style of the museum participative and how does this work in the museum?:

Appendix 3: Invitation to research participants

Enq: N.Madinda
Cell: +2734494043
Email: n.madinda@am.org.za

51 Ext.4
Grahamstown
South Africa
14 March 2013

Dear Mr/Ms.....

Invitation to take part in a research study on participative management

I am sending this invitation to you as Head of Department who might be interested in participating in a research study. I am a part-time Masters of Education student in the field of Educational Leadership and Management at Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa. I am presently engaged in a research project which aims to explore the enactment of “participative management” in museums in the Eastern Cape. In this regard I have, for the purpose of convenience, selected **Albany Museum** for my research study which I plan to do from 08th April to 24th June 2013. I would like to work with you to conduct a research to explore this enactment of “participative management” and work closely with you to extend the boundaries of our knowledge.

I will request you to allow me to make some observations in your department and any other areas where participative management is enacted.

Please note that this is not an evaluation of your performance or competence. I undertake to uphold your autonomy and will be free to withdraw from the research at any time without negative or undesirable consequences to yourself. In this regard, you will be asked to complete a consent form.

It is against this background that I am humbly inviting you to participate in the research study at your institution. Please feel free to contact me at any time should you have any queries or questions you would like answered.

Yours sincerely

.....

N.Madinda (Researcher)

Appendix 4: Declaration of participants

I (full names of participant) hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of this research project. I am willing to participate in this research project.

I understand that I reserve the right to withdraw from this project at any time.

Signature of HOD

Date

.....

Appendix 5: Observation schedule

HOD MEETING DATE:

FIVE POINT SCALE

N/A	Not applicable
1	I strongly disagree with the statement
2	I disagree with the statement
3	I agree with the statement
4	I strongly agree with the statement

TEAM PROCESSES

All members are present	NO	YES	1	2	3	4
All members are active participants	NO	YES	1	2	3	4
The meeting setting encourages participation and intersections	NO	YES	1	2	3	4
The meeting starts on time	NO	YES	1	2	3	4
The team stays on the agenda	NO	YES	1	2	3	4
An agreed upon decision making on problem solving methods is used	NO	YES	1	2	3	4

Members understand and use team roles and tools currently	NO	YES	1	2	3	4
The groups checks for consensus before making decisions	NO	YES	1	2	3	4
The meeting ends on time	NO	YES	1	2	3	4

COMMUNICATION

Communication is directed to the whole team, not to one or selected members.	NA	1	2	3	4
Team members are open and say what they think.	NA	1	2	3	4
The team addresses conflict rather than ignores it.	NA	1	2	3	4
Team members refrain from interrupting each other.	NA	1	2	3	4
Team members encourage and support each other.	NA	1	2	3	4
Team members	NA	1	2	3	4

listen to each other.					
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--

LEADERSHIP

Team members take on different roles and responsibilities in the meeting.	NA	1	2	3	4
The team leader ensures that task assignments are evenly distributed.	NA	1	2	3	4
Team members give recognition and feedback to each other.	NA	1	2	3	4

RESULTS

The team is updated on results of actions taken on problems previously discussed.	NA	1	2	3 :	4
The team is focused on improving the business. (strategic initiative)	NA	1	2	3	4
The objectives of	NA	1	2	3	4

the meeting are accomplished.					
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

OWNERSHIP/MORALE

Team members are willing to take on assignments for the team.	NA	1	2	3	4
Team members have followed up on action items from previous meetings.	NA	1	2	3	4
Team members actively support team decisions	NA	1	2	3	4

Appendix 6: Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Use a BLACK or BLUE ink pen. Please do not use a pencil.

In the interests of confidentiality, you are not required to supply your name on the questionnaire.

Please respond to each of the following items by placing a CROSS, which correctly reflects your opinion and experiences on the role of teacher leadership in your school.

This questionnaire is to be answered by an HOD.

A. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

1. Gender

Male		Female	
------	--	--------	--

2. Age

21-30		31-40		41-50		51+	
-------	--	-------	--	-------	--	-----	--

3. Your formal qualification is:

Below M+3		M+3		M+4		M+5 and above	
-----------	--	-----	--	-----	--	---------------	--

4. Nature of employment

Permanent		Temporary		Contract	
-----------	--	-----------	--	----------	--

6. Years of experience

0-5yrs		6-10yrs		11-15yrs		16+yrs	
--------	--	---------	--	----------	--	--------	--

B. PARTICIPATIVE MANAGEMENT SURVEY

Instruction: Place a CROSS in the column that most closely describes your opinion on the role of teacher leadership in your school.

Scale: 4= Strongly Agree 3=Agree 2= Disagree 1= Strongly disagree

B. 1

I believe: - theme is probing respondents' understanding of PM	4	3	2	1
7. Only the Management should make decisions in the museums				
8. All employees can take a leadership role in the museum				
9. That only people in positions of authority should lead.				
10. That men are better able to lead than women				

B. 2

Which of the following tasks are you involved with? – theme is involvement in management of museum	4	3	2	1
11. I take initiative without being delegated duties.				
12. I reflect critically on my own department.				

13. I organise and lead reviews of the museum year plan.				
14. I participate in the museum decision-making.				
15. I give in-service training to my colleagues.				
18. I participate in the performance evaluation of my subordinates				
23. I design staff development programmes for my institution				
26. I set the duty roster for my colleagues.				

Instruction: Please respond with a CROSS either Yes/ No/ Not applicable, to your involvement in each committee.

If YES, respond with a CROSS by selecting ONE option between: Nominated by colleagues, Delegated by SMT or Volunteered.

B.3

				How I got onto this committee:		
I play a leadership role in the following committee/s:				Nominated by colleagues	Delegated by SMT	Volunteered

27. Wellness committee						
28. Skills Development						
29. Disability						
30. Safety and security committee.						
31. Assessment committee						
32.Unions						

Instruction: Place a CROSS in the column that most closely describes your opinion on what factors support or hinder teacher leadership.

Scale: 4= Strongly Agree 3= Agree 2= Disagree 1= Strongly Disagree

B.4

D.Participative Management: Open-ended questions

1. What is your understanding of participative management? Please explain.

2. Have you ever been involved in taking the lead in an initiative in the museum? If so, please give examples of your leadership.

3. In your opinion what hinders the development of participative management in the context of your museum? Please discuss.

4. In your opinion what are the benefits of participative management in the museum?

5. Are there any disadvantages?

Thank you for your time and effort!

Appendix 7: Letter from supervisors

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Tel: +27 (0) 46 603 8384

Fax: +27 (0) 46 622 8028

14 March 2013

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Request for permission to carry out a research study

We have a group of 9 part-time Master of Education students in the field of Educational Leadership and Management at Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa who are presently engaged in a research project which aims to explore the enactment of “participative management” in museums in the Eastern Cape. In this regard we request that you allow the students access to their selected schools in order to carry out their research.

Please feel free to contact us at any time should you have any questions you would like answered. Our details are as follows:

Yours sincerely

Dr. Callie Grant
Tel: 046 6037508

Prof. Hennie van der Mescht
Tel: 046 6038384



Appendix 8: Organogram of the museum

