

**RHODES UNIVERSITY  
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**

**THE PARTICIPATION OF TEACHERS IN THE MANAGEMENT AND  
DECISION-MAKING OF THREE SCHOOLS IN THE KAVANGO  
REGION OF NAMIBIA: A CASE STUDY**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the  
degree of

**MASTER OF EDUCATION**

**(Educational Leadership and Management)**

**By**

**MICHAEL M. MURONGA**

**December 2011**

## **Abstract**

The purpose of the research was to investigate stakeholders' perceptions and experiences of teachers' participation in school management and decision-making. Teachers' involvement is a contested issue in schools. The goal was to find out to what extent and in what way teachers participate in school issues, as well as gain insight and understanding on the effects of participation of teachers in schools and how principals enhance democratic practice for quality education.

The research was a case study conducted within the interpretive qualitative paradigm. I used document analysis, semi-structured interviews and observation to collect data for validity purposes and to counter subjectivity. The findings revealed at least a significant progress in terms of the Education Act, no 16 of 2001 requirement, of teachers' participation in management and decision-making in schools, which has been an issue in the past. The study revealed that decisions are taken after consultation through consensus. The study revealed that the participation approach promotes ownership and commitment of staff to higher performance and common goals. The findings emerged that participative management has advantages for achieving higher performance through collaboration, consultation, and broader participation. The foremost findings include school principals' roles in enhancing a collegial management approach by delegating, sharing leadership and responsibilities, and establishing organisation structures and committees involving teachers. Meetings serve as a platform for communication and sharing of information with stakeholders.

However, there were also signs of tensions amid school management teams (SMTs) and teachers on participation in school matters in all aspects. Furthermore, its time-consuming nature, authoritarianism and accountability emerged as major challenges affecting the implementation of the participative approach. In addition to that, the study revealed that lack of knowledge and skills, unwillingness to involve others and to participate affects the implementation of the theory. As a result, the study recommends to the policies makers and the Ministry of Education to organize training for all stakeholders on participative management to empower them. Moreover, the study recommends to regional managers, inspectors, and advisory teachers (AT) to provide information to institutions responsible for teacher training to accommodate the theory into their curriculum. School principals should undergo training programmes or in-service training for participative leadership purposes to enhance their leadership capacity and to carry out their responsibilities effectively.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the first place, I would like to thank our almighty God for his power and protection during the course of my study. Secondly, I would like to extend my warmest thanks to my supervisor professor Hennie van der Mescht for admitting me and giving me this opportunity to do this course, for his exceptional educational leadership management knowledge and skills he gave us during lessons, his guidance and supervision during the course of the thesis. At the stunning welcome party at their house, he and his wife Caroline, introduced us to the Grahamstown area and made us feel at home. The Education Management Association of South Africa 12<sup>th</sup> International Conference (2011) EMASA in Cape Town where we met various dignitaries because of his efforts.

I also extend my warmest gratitude to Prof. J. Baxen and Prof. J. McKenna for their quality presentations during research design course. Thank you very much Ms. Ngalo, a secretary at the Education Department for assisting me to fax my details to Namibia and helping me with printing copies. I thank my family, my girlfriend and daughter, Meslyn and Marianne respectively, for their patience in spending many months without seeing me. Furthermore, I would like to extend my gratitude to our Regional Education director and his deputy, and our circuit inspector, for giving me an opportunity to further my study in this field. The three school principals, where I conducted my study, for allowing me to do research at their schools and for participating in my study, and their staff members. The Regional TRC manager M. Mbambo for his dynamic motivation. My colleagues at work (school) for their patience and hard work. My class mates: Mr. Shitana, Mr. Rengura, Mr. Namukwambi, Ms. Naujoma and Mrs. Shikulo. Thank you very much for your cooperation, classmates.

## **Dedication**

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my late biological mother Anselma Nehova 'LyaNseu'. She passed away suddenly in September 2007. "Good discipline begins at home". My mother was my inspiration, a counsellor and guide in my life. She taught me how to live, laugh and care for others. She was the mother of the people and a breadwinner and helper for the whole family. May her soul rest in peace.

## **Declaration**

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

---

## ACRONYMS USED

DoE:	Department of Education
ELM:	Education leadership and management
ETSIP:	Education and Training Sector Improvement Programme
HOD:	Head of Department
LRC:	Learner Representative Councils
MBESC:	Ministry of Basic Education sport and Culture
MC:	Management Committee
MoE:	Ministry of Education
NANTU:	Namibia National Teachers` Union
PCECTR:	Presidential Commission on Education Culture and Training Report.
PM:	Participative Management
PMD:	Participative Management and Decision
PMDM:	Participative Management and Decision Making
SB:	School Boards
SM:	Self-Management
SMT:	School Management Team
ACE:	Advance Certificate in Education
CM:	Circuit Management
SBM:	Site-Based Management
SBM:	School-Based Management
EMASA:	Education Management Association of South Africa
NCSL:	English National College for School Leadership
CCEAM:	Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management

## Contents

Chapter One .....	1
Study overview.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Context of the study .....	1
1.3 The driving force of the study.....	5
1.4 The potential value of the study .....	5
1.5. Research objective (goal) and questions .....	6
1.6 Methodology .....	6
1.7 The structure of the study.....	8
Chapter Two.....	9
Literature review.....	9
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.1.1 Leadership and management concepts.....	9
2.1.2 The root of participative leadership/management in the world context.....	11
2.1.3 The root of participative management in Namibia and South African context.....	14
2.2.4 A description of participative leadership and management .....	16
2.2.5 Features of participative management school as an organization .....	18
2.2.6 The potential benefits of participative management .....	20
2.2.7. Participative management/leadership barriers .....	22
2.3 Participation of teachers in management and decision making .....	25
2.4 Empowerment/encouraging of participative theory.....	29
2.5 Concepts related with participative leadership and management .....	31
2.5.1 Teamwork .....	31
2.5.2 Decentralization and Delegation.....	33
2.5.3 Collegiality.....	35

2.6 Participative management studies of the Namibian perspective.....	37
2.7 Conclusion .....	38
Chapter Three .....	40
Research methodology .....	40
3.1 Introduction.....	40
3.2 Research design .....	40
3.2.1 Research paradigm.....	40
3.2.2 Sampling .....	41
3.2.3 Research procedures .....	41
3.3 Research methods and tools.....	42
3.3.1 Semi-structured interviews .....	43
3.3.2 Documents analysis .....	44
3.3.3 Observation .....	45
3.4 Data analysis .....	46
3.5 Ethical issues.....	47
3.6 Validity .....	47
3.7 Conclusion .....	48
Chapter Four .....	49
Data analysis .....	49
4.1 Introduction.....	49
4.2 School contexts .....	50
4.3 Data presentation .....	51
4.3.1 Perceptions of stakeholders on participative management and decision-making .....	51
4.4 Teachers' views/experiences on their involvement/participation in school decision-making ....	54
4.5 The qualities of participative management and decision-making.....	56

4.5.1 Promote a sense of ownership in school. ....	56
4.5.2 The preparation/development of teachers for leadership position .....	57
4.5.3 Foster teamwork.....	59
4.5.4 Encourage creativity and innovation.....	60
4.5.5 Foster quality decisions.....	62
4.6 Challenges of participative management (PM) in schools.....	63
4.6.1 Authoritarian leadership.....	63
4.6.2 Fear of responsibilities/unwillingness to accept responsibilities .....	64
4.6.3 Challenge of accountability .....	65
4.6.4 Time consuming method.....	66
4.7. The role of school leaders in Participative Management and Decisions (PMD) .....	67
4.7.1 Delegation and sharing of responsibilities .....	67
4.7.2 Decentralization of authorities to the teachers and empowerment .....	68
4.7.3 Involving subordinates in conflict resolution.....	69
4.7.4 Organising meetings and exchanging of information (communication).....	71
4.7.5. Establishing of school committees and Teamwork.....	72
4.9 Conclusion .....	75
Chapter Five.....	76
Data findings and presentations .....	76
5.1 Introduction.....	76
5.2 A review of the Ministry of Education agenda of the democratic principles .....	76
5.3 Broader participation of teachers .....	77
5.3.1 What are the stakeholder’s perceptions of participative management and decision making? .....	77
5.3.2 The relevance of Bush’s political and collegial models.....	79
5.3.3 The features of participative management in the schools .....	81

5.4 The responsibilities of school principals in promoting participative management in schools....	85
5.4.1 Delegation and empowerment .....	85
5.4.2 Decentralization .....	87
5.4.3 Establishment of school governance structure and committees.....	88
5.4.4 Motivation of teamwork.....	90
5.4.5 Involvement of teachers in conflict resolutions .....	91
5.4.6 Communication and open door policies.....	92
5.5 The effects of participative leadership .....	93
5.5.1 The advantages of participative management and decision making (PMDM) .....	94
5.5.2 The disadvantages of participative management in schools .....	99
5.6 The need for participative management/leadership training in education .....	103
5.7 Conclusion .....	104
Chapter Six .....	106
Conclusion.....	106
6.1 Introduction.....	106
6.2 Summary of main findings.....	106
6.3 The need for participative leadership training .....	109
6.4 Significance of the study.....	109
6.5 Recommendation for participative leadership development/training needs .....	110
6.6 Recommendations for future research .....	111
6.7 The limitations of the study .....	112
6.8 Conclusion.....	114
References .....	115
APPENDICES .....	123
Appendix 1: Interview Questions for school Principals .....	123

APPENDIX 2: Interview questions for HODs (SMT).....	124
Appendix 3: Interview questions for Teachers .....	125
Appendix 4: Requisition for interview permission and ethical issues details for participants.....	126
Appendix 5: Consent form for research participants .....	127
Appendix 6: Observation schedule .....	128
Appendix 7: Document analysis schedule .....	129
Appendix 8: A letter to request permission to conduct research in the region of Kavango.....	130
Appendix 9: A letter to request permission into schools in the circuit .....	131
Appendix 10: A letter for permission to conduct research in the region of Kavango.....	132
Appendix 11: A permission and confirmation letter for visiting schools from the inspector .....	133

# Chapter One

## Study overview

### 1.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I present the context of my study, the driving force for the research, my research goals and the potential value of the study in education, and a concise description of the methodology and the structured of the research.

### 1.2 Context of the study

This study aimed to investigate participation of teachers in the management and decision-making of three schools in the Kavango region of Namibia. It was mainly to find out the perceptions and experiences of the stakeholders, principals, HODs (head of departments) and teachers on the involvement of teachers and to what extent principals promote teachers' participation in the affairs of schools for quality education. In this study I used the terms participation, participative and democratic interchangeably and similarly the concepts management and leadership.

According to Botha (2006, p. 341) “during the past 20 to 30 years there has been a major shift towards greater self-management and self-governance in educational institutions throughout the world”. However, the concept of democratic participation in Namibia commenced when the country got its independence on 21 March 1990. After independence the new government introduced a democratic system of governance which made provision for fundamental human rights that include the right for education, freedom of association and academic freedom (Namibia. Constitution of the Republic of Namibia, 1990, pp. 12-13). Since then, democratic principles as a means of leading a nation have become major guidelines in the country, including running organisations such as schools.

Prior-independence, one of the consequences of apartheid education was the fact that key stakeholders such as parents, teachers, and learners were excluded from participating in decision-making in schools. The constitution of Namibia 1990 (especially article 20) provides for compulsory primary education for all children. Namibia's involvement in the world conference that took place in Thailand, in March 1990, led to its support of a world declaration for Education for All and a framework for Action (Namibia. Ministry of Basic Education Sport and Culture, 1993, pp. 9-10). In this way education was placed at the top of

the list of the country's national priorities. In order to achieve a successful restructuring of education, Namibia and South Africa adopted the principle of democratic participation by involving stakeholders in management and decision-making as a top priority in their education systems (*ibid.*).

To obtain these principles, the Namibian government introduced several programmes to redress the historic imbalances and implement transformation in education sectors. The introduction of the four major goals of education: Access, Quality, Democracy and Equity outlined in *Toward Education for All*, signalled the beginnings of a process of redress (Namibia. MBESC, 1993, p. 32). In an attempt to involve all stakeholders in education, and thus to promote quality education, the Education and Training Sector Improvement Programme (ETSIP) was introduced by the Ministry of Education in 2006. One of the main aims of ETSIP was to develop management skills and train newly appointed leaders for leadership roles (ETSIP, 2006, p. 25). This was partly in response to the fact that formal management training is not a condition for promoting teachers to become principals. ETSIP also calls for broader involvement of all stakeholders in the governance and management of education. However, similarly to the South African education system, literature suggests that an "imaginative set of policies is still being developed and implemented" and some of the policies "are still in the process of being implemented or refined" (Swanepoel, 2008, p. 40).

This expectation creates new responsibilities for school principals and underlines the complexity of school leadership which now has to accommodate different inputs from a range of stakeholders. The development is in accordance with theoretical moves towards establishing principles of democratic leadership. Democratic leadership and participation in education would mean that people have to be equally involved in management and the decision-making process of learning organizations where teaching and learning takes place. Increased organisational involvement also ideally resulted in "self-management" - a trend in many parts of the world (Bush, 2003, p. ix). This too has led to increased demands on principals in the country. Botha (2006) argues that "The culture of a democratic order displayed in SBM requires school principals to exercise leadership that fully promotes participation of all stakeholders" (p. 342). However, the serious concern was on the implementation of democratic leadership on education that could be strengthening to entrench the policy of 2001 (Mabuku, 2009: ii).

The drive towards self-management of schools led to the establishment of School Boards to govern schools. Self-management in the context of school means that those stakeholders who best understand the needs of students and the local community should make decisions. The School Board (SB) comprises of principals, elected parents, teachers, and members of Learners' Representative Councils (LRCs). Prospective SB members received training in developing a sense of ownership of local schools and their communities (Namibia. Presidential Commission on Education, Culture and Training, 1999, p. 83). In similar vein, Mungunda (2003, p. ii) disclosed that participative decision-making serves as a motivating factor for teachers to work for "common goals". He also argues that participation promotes a sense of ownership and commitment, which leads to positive relationships among stakeholders in a school. The emphasis for the training was to ensure that a School Board is aware of and able to manage everything that is happening in schools. The establishment of School Boards was also an attempt to promote decentralisation of responsibilities and authority. The Ministry of Education emphasised a transformation process in the education system in order to improve the teaching profession and put away an authoritative approach. Through these changes, leaders are expected to devolve some of their powers to stakeholders (Botha, 2006; Swanepoel, 2008).

The Ministry of Education believes that it is only through such a sense of ownership that parents, community members, teachers and students can really come to care about their schools, and value and 'own education' (Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana. 1997, p. 17). This thinking is in line with principles established in the 1940s in the work of Kurt Lewin, that "you cannot do things to people unless you do it with them" (Weisbord, 1991, p. 89). According to Bojowoye (in Bush, 2009, p. 275), stakeholders' engagement is regarded as a key factor in developing "culturally relevant teaching and learning pedagogies," in school management and decision-making. It is therefore the responsibility of educational leaders to construct locally meaningful activities to better connect with teachers and learners in school. This study focused on the participation of teachers as stakeholders in management/decision-making in schools.

Research conducted in South Africa in rural schools points to limited participation of stakeholders in decision-making (Msila in Niitembu, 2006, p. 3). In a similar vein studies conducted in Namibia reported various challenges to the implementation of participative management such as resistance to change, autocratic leadership, and self-centred decisions

(Kambonde, 2008, p. 74). Mabuku (2009, p. 87) argues that “shared decision-making, shared leadership and teamwork were being realised to a certain extent in schools and there is some shortfalls in the implementation of the policy on democratic ELM”. However, Mungunda (2003, pp. 67-68) reported that, “Participative management (or collegiality) does have a positive influence, with regard to creating a sense of commitment, ownership and teamwork” (p. 66). Harris & Muijs, in Bush, et al. (2009, p. 63) argues that a study conducted in England found a positive relationship between the degree of teacher involvement, and outcomes and self-efficacy. The findings show that teachers and students’ morale improves when they are involved in the practices of decision-making within schools. Furthermore, these studies point out the need to conduct research on participation of teachers in management and decision-making in schools for further exploration. I wanted to find out what is taking place in schools, especially in the Kavango region, since the implementation of article 16 of 2001 which requires equal involvement of stakeholders in management or decision-making.

Teachers’ participation in management is a hotly contested issue in Namibia, but I wasn’t aware of any research in this field, especially in the Kavango region, specifically on teachers’ involvement in management and decision-making. The study was not expected to illuminate challenges schools are facing, more especially teachers’ participation in school management and decision-making, but to find the progress made in education so far. Contemporary leadership theories, particularly democratic leadership concepts such as teamwork, delegation, distributed/decentralisation and collaborative leadership, as well as political and collegial approach (Bush 2003, p. 64-69 and Bush, 2009, p. 250) helped to provide a theoretical framework for the study.

Bush (2003, p. 76) argues that “the central focus of transformational leadership ought to be the commitment and capacity of organisational members.” The role of school principals to ensure professional development among their staff can be understood through contemporary leadership theory, particularly participative leadership. As a result, Bush (2003, p. 78) suggest that participative leadership is consistent with the collegial model in which leaders and staff have shared values and a common interest. Mbambo (2009, p. 3) argues that “no learning organisation can exist without the commitment of its leadership”. It is therefore the responsibility of the principal to encourage teachers’ participation in decision-making by creating opportunities and establishing various structures for equal participation. This study explored how and to what extent teachers are involved in school management and its effects.

### 1.3 The driving force of the study

My background in the teaching profession as a teacher and as a school principal put me in a better position to realise shortfalls existing in schools, the moment I entered the University of higher learning. The interest to conduct the research originated after the task and lesson presentation given to us by our supervisor about McGregor theory X and Y at the university. During this lesson I realised that there are misunderstandings with the way principals are taking decisions. Fortunately, after the lesson, my task was to present about current leadership theory. The advantages and disadvantages of participative leadership that were presented by my supervisor, when related to my own experience about the ways principals take decisions in schools, put me in better sight to opt for participative theory. I thought that since this topic is related to activities that are common in schools, by conducting an investigation of such nature to find out stakeholders' perceptions and experience, I would acquire more skills and knowledge on issues surrounding democratic participation operations in the education system. Put more simply, this research was motivated mainly by two factors, namely personal experience and professional interest, as well as a lack of sufficient study of this nature in the Kavango region of Namibia.

### 1.4 The potential value of the study

The significance of this study is that it will hopefully provide insights into the political and theoretical drives towards participative management in schools. The findings of the study will be useful for policy makers and authorities, including the Ministry of Education, to initiate effective programmes and guidelines towards effective implementation of the new approach, with the aim of enhancing the practice of democratic participation in management and decision-making in schools. The training needs of stakeholders' based on democratic intervention in school will be placed as the highest priority to achieve restructuring and transformation process in the education system. It will also serve as a framework and guidelines to other stakeholders who are entrusted with the responsibility of school governance. The main outcomes of the study would reveal the imperative of modern leadership theories for an organisation that wants to achieve development. The study may encourage more research to be conducted on this topic in other educational regions of Namibia on a "large- scale" (Mungunda, 2003, p. 79) that will involve all stakeholders.

## 1.5. Research objective (goal) and questions

The main aim of the study is to investigate participation of teachers in management/decision-making in selected schools in the Kavango region of Namibia. This study proposed to reach its objective by answering the following research questions:

1. To what extent – and how – are teachers involved in school management?
2. What are these stakeholders' perceptions of their level of participation in decision-making in their school?
3. What are the school leaders' (i.e. principals) perceptions of democratic participation in management?
4. What strategy do principals employ to promote participation?
5. What are the effects of democratic involvement?

## 1.6 Methodology

My research was located within the interpretive, qualitative paradigm. The interpretive was selected to enable me to gain new insights and knowledge about the phenomenon of participative management, its roles, and possibly to discover effects of the theory. Leedy & Ormrod (2005, p. 94) argue that “Qualitative research typically answers questions about complex natural phenomena, always with the purpose of describing and understanding the phenomena from the participants' point of view”. This method was therefore vital for my research since I wanted to understand the perceptions of stakeholders namely, school principals, HODs, and teachers about their understanding and experiences with regard to participative management in their schools. In addition to that, the aim of this interpretive research was to understand the phenomena under study, to achieve ‘thick description’ data and to interpret the information as it took place. The approach can reveal the events, “the nature of creation situations, settings, process, relations, and system” (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 134; Maxwell, 2005, p. 75). I thought that since the participants are not working in one organization, they might experience and practice the approach differently.

In this qualitative case study, I used three methods to collect data, namely document analysis, observation and semi-structured interviews. According to Patton (in Kapapero, 2006) “studies that use only one method are more vulnerable to errors than studies that use multiple methods in which different type of data provide cross-data validity checks” (p, 10). Triangulation and validity of data also plays better role in multiple sources. As a result, a case study was

possible for me to penetrate a 'small scale' population to understand situations and construct meanings from participants, the "concern for the individual and to understand their interpretations of the world around them and the subjective world of human experience" (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p. 22-23). The method focuses on few instances using more than one source to collect data for better understanding of issues. The use of case studies has become extremely common in educational research, especially with small scale research (Denscombe, 2007, p. 35).

A pilot study was conducted with two teachers from different schools before the whole exercise. This helped me to restructure my interview questions. The process of data collection started with observations of interactions/relationship between the school principals and staff members during morning meetings/briefing, and the extent of participation of teachers. Then I started analysing existing documents I found at each sites as planned, namely minutes of management, parents and staff meetings, allocations of duties, journal notes, organograms and trimester programmes. The observations and documents analysis activity continued and overlapped until the last day at each site. Observation was very important to fill the gap which the interviews could not disclose and provided objective data related to the research topic (Cohen, et al, 2000; Hancock & Algozzine, 2006). The documents, such as minutes of staff, parents and management meetings, were collected for verification and further analysis. In qualitative studies, "both verbal and nonverbal data may be collected" (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 96).

As a result of the situation I found at each school and in order not to disturb classes, the interviews at two schools commenced on the first day. Participants were interviewed as scheduled and according to times suitable for them, mostly when they had free periods. Before the events of the interview, a letter concerning detail of the topic and research ethics was handed to the selected participants to read for themselves and to decide whether to participate or not, since participation was voluntarily. Again, during interviews I explained the goal of the research and gave them informed consent forms to sign. School principal, one of their HODs, four teachers at senior secondary, and two teachers at combined and primary school were interviewed face to face using semi-structured interviewed.

## 1.7 The structure of the study

My research is presented in six sections, namely introduction, literature review, methodology, data analysis, data presentation and discussion of the findings, recommendations and conclusion. The study chapters are presented as follows:

**Chapter One** presents the introduction to the study. I give a brief account of the research context, motivation, research objectives and goal, methodology used and the structure of the thesis.

**Chapter Two** presents the literature review. Here I concentrated on the literature review that related to participative management from international and local perspectives.

**Chapter Three** discusses only the methodology used during this study. The methods and the research paradigm used are also outlined in more detail in terms of their effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses, etc.

**Chapter Four analyses** and triangulates the data collected during interviews, documents analysis and observations according to themes and categories that emerged.

**Chapter Five** discusses the findings in themes that emerged from the data presentation in chapter four, mixed with the literature review presented in chapter two and new literatures.

**Chapter Six** concludes with the research findings, recommendations and limitations.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Literature review**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter discusses the literature review underpinning the phenomenon of the study. My research aims to investigate the participation of teachers in management/decision-making in schools. In order to have a complete picture of the phenomenon, the first section of this chapter presents the definitions of management and leadership in the context of educational leadership and management (ELM), I then outline the historical context of participative management from a world perspective, and in particular Namibia and South Africa. I have chosen to combine the two countries because they share a similar history and Namibia was previously colonized by South Africa (Niitembu, 2006).

In the next section, I discuss the features of a participative management organization and outline the benefits and barriers that could be experienced. I also discuss the participation of teachers in school management/decision-making and the empowerment of teachers in participative management. Then, I discuss concepts that are related to participative management/leadership in educational leadership and management provision such as teamwork, delegation, decentralization and collegiality. I outline the findings of some recent studies about the phenomenon specifically those that were researched in ELM in Namibia.

##### **2.1.1 Leadership and management concepts**

In this section, I outline and distinguish between the concepts of management and leadership, arguing how they are related and used by many scholars around the world, giving clarity to my study. In the literature I reviewed how many theorists define leadership and management differently, but sometimes the terms are used inter-changeably or synonymously, and as a result we experience a problem of using both concepts as one because of their equivalent activities.

The “two concepts overlap and are similar”, and in terms of their connections need to be given equal prominence if schools are to operate effectively and achieve their objectives (Bush, 2003, p. 7). It is also argued that the two concepts are “essentially different activities,

and yet sufficiently similar to each other to defy attempts to capture the essence of each in a glib definition” (Van der Mescht, 1996, p. 12). Mungunda (2003, p. 6) points out that the two concepts of leadership and management:

Are used by many writers as either interchangeable or synonymous ... (they are) two different, yet complementary activities, existing side by side in a mutual, logical relationship.

Bush & Middlewood argue that, “Effective ‘management’ is just as important as visionary leadership if educational organisations are to be successful” (2005, p. 3). Therefore, for a person to become a leader or a manager he/she must possess all the skills and knowledge of leadership and management. Bennis & Covey assert that “good leadership is an integral part of the function of a manager” (as cited by Steyn, 2009, p. 121). Steyn maintains that, “A good manager ought to be both a good administrator and a good principal” (2009. p. 120).

Even though some people are managers and other people are leaders, many individuals currently practice both leadership and management skills in their lives. Bush maintains that because of disparities in education, it is vital to equip principals with a ‘tool kit’ of skills and the knowledge “to know which approaches should be applied in different situations” (2007, p. 402) which are obligatory to administration. The ‘tools’ in the ‘tool kit’ that Bush refers to, is that both leadership and management skills be provided in order to equip the principal to runs his/her school efficiently. Bush (2003, p. 1) also argues that:

Educational management is a field of study and practice concerned with the operation of educational organizations. There is no single general accepted definition of the subject, because its development has drawn heavily on several more firmly established disciplines including sociology, political science, economics and general management.

“Educational management has its roots in other fields such as business management, economics, sociology, psychology” (Kapapero, 2007, p. 10). This has added to the misunderstanding of the concepts, which indicates that people find it very difficult to manipulate, differentiate and even define the concepts accurately. Dimmock attempted to differentiate between the two concepts but acknowledges that “schools leaders [experience] tension between competing elements of leadership, management, and administration” (as cited in Bush, 2003, p. 7).

For greater clarity between these two concepts, breaking down any misconceptions and confusion, I would like to define them more accurately using current research views. On the one hand, Mabuku, (2009:19) defines leadership as:

The ability to inspire, provide direction for the vision and mission of an organisation, to give guidance, set an example, and maintain good working relationships with other members of the organisation.

Similarly, Van der Westhuizen conservatively defines leadership as “the ability of a person to convince, inspire, bind and direct followers to realise common goals” (in Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen, 1998, p. 78).

On the other hand, Van der Westhuizen (1991, p. 55) defines management as follows:

Management is a specific type of work in education which comprises those regulative tasks and actions executed by a person or body in a position of authority in a specific field or area of regulation, so as to allow formative education to take place.

A manager is referred to as a leader who is in charge of an organisation such as a school and who has managerial skills such as planning, controlling, supervising and guiding. A more holistic, multi-faceted perspective should be displayed. Schmuck (in Van der Mescht, 1996) argues that:

The administrator 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... (*ibid.*, p. 15).

Therefore, the key undertaking of both leadership and management is to know how to inspire and/or influence your subordinates to follow you so that the group can work together more effectively.

### **2.1.2 The root of participative leadership/management in the world context**

Historically the theory of participative management and leadership had an improbable origin. Some theorists suggest that it evolved during the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War from collaboration between Lewin and other colleagues (Reese, 2009, p. 161.). Lewin and colleagues did an experiment in 1938 to find out the best leadership style among democratic leadership, autocratic leadership, and laissez-faire leadership, in which they involved a group of children. The children were divided and given arts and design projects. The researchers then observed the behaviour of

children according to the three different leadership styles. After the experiment, they found that the best leadership style was democratic leadership (Kendra, 2005; Burns, 2004).

In another study in 1938, Lewin and anthropologist Margaret Mead conducted an investigation involving housewives to reduce civilian consumption of rationed foods. Two groups of women, one being the experimental and the other being the comparative group, were set up. The group that reached consensus through discussion, changed their food habit much more than those given expert advice. From this experiment, Lewin “found a core principle and concluded that people are likely to modify their own behaviour when they participate in the problem analysis and solution and are likely to carry out decisions they have helped to make” (Weisbord, 1991, p. 89; Reese, 2009, p. 161).

According to Weisbord “this finding was valued-based, a fact largely lost in debates about participate management” (*ibid.*, p. 89). Margaret Mead called it “Kurt’s special gift for understanding American ideals of democracy” (*ibid.*). Because of the statement, Lewin in his first research project “clearly recognised that you cannot do things to people but only with them” (*ibid.*). According to Weisbord Lewin’s major contribution to management was his “way of thinking that every change requires a new participative experiment” (*ibid.*). Therefore, in this context, as a leader you need to determine ways that would effectively involve subordinates in order for the organisation to survive. For every organisation to succeed, it is imperative that participative leadership theories are implemented whereby stakeholders are involved in decision-making.

Weisbord argued that “Lewin wed scientific thinking to democratic values and gave birth to participative management” (as cited by Smith, 2003, p. 24). In this context, Kurt Lewin today is hailed as the father of participative (democratic) leadership and participative action research and of organisational development.

Although it has a western origin, there are also some African management philosophies where managers in education have involved others in management with the expectations of the reality such as school performance and people’s needs (Van der Westhuizen, et al, 2008, pp. 61, 62). The Ubuntu philosophy is one of the frequently cited African models that “have much to offer in interpreting management practice and in understanding the behaviour of school

leaders and communities” (Bush, 2007, p. 402). According to Mbigi “Ubuntu means collective personhood and collective morality” (as cited by Bush, 2007, p. 403).

Nonetheless, Broodryk states that “Ubuntu” is a Zulu word meaning “humanness” (2006, p. 2). According to Broodryk this word refers to “traditional African views that are based on the values of intense humanness, caring, sharing, respect, compassion and associated values and that ensures a happy and qualitative human community life in the spirit of family” (*ibid.* p. 62). This is the model that is regarded by most African people as the way of working together with others. It can be likened to participative approach if one links it to modern theories that require people to work together through collective measures and processes.

Werner argues that Ubuntu reflects the principles of “participative management that involve transparency, accountability, legitimacy, the capability to facilitate collective decision making, and problem solving” (in Van der Westhuizen, et al, 2008, p. 63). As a result, the Advance Certificate in Education (ACE) School Leadership course which was established by the South African Ministry of Education in 2007 introduced the concept of the Lekgotha. The rationale for this was to train the leader, or *kgosi*, to adopt an approach that “inspires trust in the decision-making process” (*ibid.* p. 63).

Participative management originated in the 1930's in a business study conducted by Elton Mayo, who explored Frederick W. Taylor’s “scientific management principles” (Rivera, 2008, p. 1). According to Marchant (1976) his findings challenge Taylor’s views emphasising the importance of social norms, such as communication, participation, and leadership (*ibid.*). The “renewed interest in participative management hinged upon the desire for seeking better management practices, namely top-notch quality management systems, better employee relations, and integrated design and production teams” (Lawler, in Rivera, 2008, p. 1). The focus was to find managers who are able to work in democratic and participative ways to build relationship and ensure efficient and effective delivery on organizational sectors (DoE, 1996).

Consequently, back in 1973, Professor Vroom and Yetton contributed to Lewin’s theory in their study, “The Normative Model of Behaviour”, in which they investigated the effects of involving subordinates into decision-making of an organization (Shennu, 2010, p. 2). Their investigation led to what is known today as the participative/democratic leadership style.

(*ibid.*). Goleman (2000) also included participative leadership in his research as one of his six leadership styles: “coercive, authoritative, affiliative, democratic, pacesetter and coaching” (Fullan, 2001, p. 35). For this reason, the notion of participative management is not a new phenomenon, though in the context of this study, in education in Namibia and South Africa, the concept of participative management has particular political and social history links.

### **2.1.3 The root of participative management in Namibia and South African context**

Namibia and South Africa experienced similar ‘apartheid’ backgrounds. Apartheid in the two countries was applied in the sense that the education system was characterised by racial, regional, and gender inequality, as well as ideological distortions in teaching and learning (DoE, 1996, p. 18). So, it was similar in the sense that Namibia was colonised by South Africa, and so they shared everything in terms of policies, resources, and management style from 1920 to 1990. Namibia was colonised because South Africa wanted to proclaim it as its fifth province. As a result of colonisation, pupils in Namibia and SA were taught the same curriculum and subjects, “neglecting the quality of African education” (*ibid.*).

Participative leadership came into effect in Namibia and South Africa as a result of democratic government being introduced during the twentieth century after achieving victory over apartheid forces in 1990 and 1994 respectively (Nekhwevha, 1999, p. 496). A democratic government gave birth to a democratic education system which was organised around principles of broad participation in decision-making and the clear accountability of people in leadership positions and those involved in decision-making (MBESC, 1993, p. 41). Subsequently, educational transformation is rooted in the principles of democratic governance and policy alternatives that legally recognized the greatest possible participation of legitimate stakeholders, such as teachers, learners, and parents, in the affairs of schools.

The apartheid government, both in Namibia (pre-1990) and South Africa (pre-1994), excluded the majority of citizens from legitimate and equal participation in education because of inequalities and authoritarian structures that existed. After independence, the South African democratic state published a White Paper on organisation and funding for schools with the aim of fostering democratic institutional management (Mncube, 2008). The democratic government of South Africa introduced school governance structures that attempted to involve all stakeholders in collective decision-making (South Africa, DoE, 1996, p. 16). The

Namibian government incorporated Act no. 16 of 2001, which was introduced after the *Presidential Commission on Education, Culture and Training Report (PCECTR)* of 1999, while South Africa introduced the South African school Act no. 84 of 1996, which emanated from the White Paper “as part of a broad programme of transformation and democratisation” of education (Taylor, 2004, p. 1).

In South Africa, a discourse about the democratic demands to increase and improve the level of participation from grass roots levels commenced as early as 1980 (Taylor, 2004, p. 3). Botha maintains that the main change “towards greater self-management and self-governance” (2006, p. 341), especially in the education sector in the world, took place during the past 20 to 30 years. The argument for a “need for greater democracy in education has been supported by a great deal of literature both nationally and internationally” (Mncube, 2008, p. 79). In this context of participative management, the origin of educational transformation in post-colonial Namibia and post-apartheid South Africa has in fact contributed to the changes of the political and social backgrounds in the countries (Nekhwevha, 1999).

The Ministry of Education considers that the teachers, learners, and parents are the ones who are contributing the most to make school organisations the way they are (Namibia, MBESC, 1993). According to Van Wyk decentralisation suggests that participation of stakeholders “originates from the belief that the state alone cannot control schools, but should share its power with other stakeholders, particularly those close to the school” (2007, p. 132). Donald, et al., as mentioned in Chapter one, assert that “through such a sense of ownership” (1997, p. 17) stakeholders will care about education development. The transformation becomes the heart of stakeholders’ involvement in education, specifically teachers.

The responsibility of the SB members included the involvement in participative decision-making concerning school issues where educators are expected to participate. Consequently, it is argued that “the participation in education has been improving in Namibia since independence” (Niitembu, 2006, p. 24). However, the fact is that participation in school management according to the Ministry of Education still has not reached its goal, because there are still arrays of problems in many Namibian schools. Similarly, Prew (2006) suggests that many principals of South African schools still pursue an authoritarian style of leadership, with a top-down approach.

Participative leadership gained prominence towards the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century because of increasing criticism that bureaucracy was being used as a form of management (Niitembu, 2006). Bureaucracy is defined as a form of authoritarian leadership that is associated to the abuse of power, lack of democratic decision-making and over centralisation of authority by government officials and leaders (Rogers & McIntire, 1983, as cited in Niitembu, 2006, p. 28). Max Weber called this management approach the “bureaucratic model” (in Van der Westhuizen, 1991, p. 71).

According to history, the South African and Namibian Education Ministries continued to engage in bureaucratic processes as the apartheid rules continued to have an inhibiting effect, and as a result, this style continues to receive support, where it has been allowed to be nurtured (Niitembu, 2006, p. 28). Unfortunately, the system did not contribute to the development and transformation of inhabitants, hence, it was seriously criticised for its inability to bring about change. As a result, the participative management approach was established for quality leadership purposes.

#### **2.2.4 A description of participative leadership and management**

According to McLagan & Nel (1995), participative leadership developed before the twenty-first century and when autocratic governments came to an end (Niitembu, 2006)). According to Kambonde (2008) the rationale for this was to eradicate the legacy of the past whereby stakeholders such as teachers were inhibited to participate in the affairs (governance) of the school. Participative management means the involvement of some or all staff members in decision-making or resolutions of conflicts in a working environment. Similarly, Macmillan argues that “Participative or participatory management encourages the involvement of employees in decision-making or otherwise promotes the involvement of stakeholders at all levels the analysis of problems, development of strategies, and implementation of solutions in a school” (2007, p. 1). This contemporary paradigm in leadership style in the world requires that stakeholders must also play a role in decision-making, as well as in the management of an organisation. In another way, the method is known as transformational leadership (Bush, 2003). According to Kaufman (2001) and Kim (2002), “participative management involves employees in making organizational decisions” (Chen and Tjosvold, 2006, p. 1728).

Another way of describing participative management is considering it as a way of letting stakeholders jointly make decisions concerning their work in schools. I call it joint decision-making because all the members of an organisation are involved in making the decisions and

they have to share the responsibilities together. In a similar vein, Koopman & Wierdsma define participative leadership as “joint decision making or at least shared influence in decision making” where the decision-making is done by a “superior and his or her employees offer a variety of ideas and inputs to solve a problem for potential benefits of an institution [such as a school]” (in Somech, 2005, p. 778). However, Sato et al. warn “that teacher involvement in the decision making process can generate job-related stress and role ambiguity and can create tension and conflict among teachers, principals, and administrators”(in Somech, et. al, 2009, p. 285).

Shields contends that since democratic management is more participative in nature, it may be defined as a management style that “offers all legitimate stakeholders opportunities to participate” (in Mabuku, 2009, p. 16). Participative leadership approach in a practical sense means that all members of an organisation get involved in decision-making as required by decentralisation policies of the Ministry of Education, as shown in *Towards Education for all: A development brief for education culture and training, 1993*, as well as Namibia, Act, no. 16 of 2001. Consequently, the policy of decentralisation expects school leaders to encourage staff members to engage in group decision-making by participating in dialogue and decision-making without them necessarily influencing it. Similarly, Schaufeli (as cited in Somech, et al, 2009, p. 285) maintains that although there are some contradictions between some staff members, principals are required to show greater concern for their “workers’ health, and the consensus belief that healthier-happier employees are power” is becoming common.

The reason for this kind of leadership whereby stakeholders are involved is to promote participative leadership (which could be described as democratic leadership, participatory leadership, or distributed leadership and shared-decision making) in school-based management (SBM) or self-management (SM) of schools (Botha, 2006, p. 341; Mabuku, 2009, p. 61). Steyn et al., (2009, p, 115) denote that participative management means that all interested parties will have a say in decisions affecting them. In the same way, Sarason claims that the “political principle justifying stakeholders’ involvement is that when decisions are made affecting you or your possessions, you should have a role and a voice in the process of decision making” (as cited in Stofile, 2005, p. 10). Furthermore, the South African Department of Education also concludes that “decisions should be made by those who best understand the needs of students and the local community” (DoE, 1996, p. 29).

This means that the aim of such political requirements of the Namibian policies document *Towards Education for all* and South African Department of Education is to promote good governance and to transform education so that it relies on equal participation. It is therefore vital that any decision-made affecting either the teachers or learners, should be solved by themselves. The bargaining policy through collegiality plays a role in participative approach. Kambonde maintains that it is not like the “apartheid system of the previous era where rules were laid down by a few people in formal leadership positions” (2008, p. 8). He further reiterates that the “new policy encourages and promotes participatory leadership in which all stakeholders play an active role in making decisions about education” (*Ibid.*).

Therefore, participative leadership and management can be described as an excellent model for democratic management, whereby school principals submit to working together with every team member, involving them in the decision-making process and to promote self-management with his staff members. Through this approach, a democratic principal will share most decisions with his stakeholders, whether it is confidential or not. This is also a feature of a participative school.

#### **2.2.5 Features of participative management school as an organization**

In this section, I present some of the features of participative management/leadership that are traceable in schools as an organisation or environment. As a former teacher and principal this is based on my own observation, as well as on what other researchers in the world have observed in their studies.

In terms of ELM, a participative school is referred to that organization where everyone is treated equally in participation, sharing ideas and in-put, when it comes to decision-making. The structure and management of the school is ‘flat’. A flat school does not reflect the presence of pre-determined channels of communication. Instead, staff members communicate directly with each other openly and freely. Literature points out that a participative organization could be identified by its shared culture of a ‘flattened’ network and sharing knowledge in management and decision-making (Bush, et al., 2005, p. 66).

In addition, teamwork, group projects and active participation in that school, are all signs of participative management, because they point to increased involvement of all members and members being more committed to the idea of working together to achieve school goals.

According to Stofile teamwork in such a school “creates synergy because the sum of the effort of team members is far greater than the sum of individual efforts of people working alone” (2005, p. 15). A similar stance is held by Edmondson who states that a participative school “promotes teamwork, cooperation in solving problems and teachers [who] discover new opportunities and challenges and enables them to learn by acquiring, sharing, and combining knowledge” (in Somech, et al, 2009, p. 289).

In a participative school, most of the responsibilities of the principal are allocated to the staff and at the lowest possible level, and not according to any hierarchical structure. Copland maintains that “participative leadership has the potential to ease the burden on the principal” because power and responsibilities are shared among the working group (in Bush, 2003, p. 79). Similarly, Barron suggests that an organization of such nature creates “an open form of management where employees have a strong decision-making role (in Brown, 2009, p. 1)”. In this theory, employees are inspired to contribute by the manager who actively seeks a strong cooperative relationship with his/her employees.

A school which practices participative management increases productivity, improves collaboration and discipline, and reduces costs, because of the good atmosphere that exists among the staff. According to Branch (2002, p. 6), participative management “increases service and product quality as well as stimulating “higher productivity and output”. However, many researches dispute these findings as there is no current explored research which reveals such outcomes of increased output (Somech, 2002). One thing I observed about such a school is that the teachers are very agreeable, active in listening, trustful, and are more committed in carrying out their responsibilities without trepidation, even in the absence of the principal. The elements of participative management are active participation and collegial interaction by all members, including teamwork and mutual agreement. Such a school consists of a decentralized management structure, whereby responsibilities are distributed fairly, and growth, development, creativity and risk-taking are encouraged among teachers (Sodhi, 2009).

A school where staff meetings are held regularly to discuss issues concerning the school, through consultative management style, is an example of a participative organization. Van der Westhuizen, et al. contend that “regular formal contact between the management team and other members of the organisation” (2008, p. 149) increases the level of workers’

satisfaction. In such an organisation every person is equal and has the democratic right of expressing opinion freely. Participative management provides an environment that makes employees' needs known and creates a means of expressing it openly in all areas of the organisation (Sodhi, 2009). Furthermore, Wagner states that “participative management has the potential to balance the involvement of managers and their subordinates in information-processing, decision making, or problem-solving endeavours” (in Somech, 2009, p. 288). Therefore there are many potential benefits that an organisation practicing participative management could use to its advantage in achieving its goals.

### **2.2.6 The potential benefits of participative management**

A participative management style offers various benefits at all levels of a school organization. One of the reasons why this approach is favoured by many managers is because the application of the theory, whereby staff is involved in participative decision-making by their managers, improves the understanding of the issues involved by those who carry out the decisions. According to Tannenbaum & Allport (in Yohe 2003, p. 2):

Participative decision making has been found to increase organizational effectiveness, improve relationships between managers and subordinates, increase creativity and productivity, increase organization loyalty, and reduce absenteeism and turnover.

This approach has the quality of encouraging people to be more committed to actions when they are involved in the relevant decision-making of organisation. Once it is used properly people become less competitive, more collaborative and less resistant to new ideas. In particular, when staff members are working on joint goals, this approach can ‘bear fruit’. Stofile argues that “participation has the effect of overcoming resistance to change and reduced stress on the part of the management” (2005, p. 11). Once the approach is manipulated effectively, it can result in fewer labour disputes, antagonism, and resistance to change, and better understanding of the problems and interests of a school principal. However, job responsibilities can create additional stress for some teachers, more specifically, those who are “low in agreeableness” (Somech, et al., 2009, p. 285).

Consequently, when several people make decisions together, the social commitment to one another is greater, and hence increases their commitment to making better decisions. People say, “Two heads are better than one”. This means that when two or more people sit and try

solving a problem together, they are able to make better decisions than one person. In a similar vein, Oduro maintains that “problem-solving through consultation is impossible with a single person’s wisdom” (2004, p. 3). However, Parnell & Crandall dispute that “participative works in some cases, but in most cases the manager should make the decision based on his or her expertise and information” (2010, p. 2325). In fact, participative management motivates employees by considering their suggestions which certainly can have a positive impact on teamwork and employees performance, but not in every situation.

The participative model encourages active participation by everybody involved, increases creativity and commitment, and develops talents and skills of team members. Wall & Rinehart concur that teachers’ involvement in school activities empower them and therefore it is “perceived as a crucial factor that affects the school’s effectiveness” (as cited by Somech, 2010, p. 277), increasing their commitment. Employees who play a part in deciding what to do feel a much greater sense of ownership over making it happen and “this creates a feeling of ownership regarding the school” (Steyn, 2009, p. 128). In reality, employees feel more important when their manager allows them to participate in decisions, because for them it is a new experience and they tend to feel proud about their involvement so it boosts them to work harder in order to achieve organizational effectiveness.

When a group of employees comes together and is afforded the opportunities to get involved in the management of an organisation or contribute to decision-making, their morale and job satisfaction rise, resulting in more effort being put into achieving positive results. Somech states that, “teachers in participative environments can increase the pool of ideas, materials, and methods, which will lead to a higher quality of instruction” (2005, p. 781). However, Heckshers indicates that, “employees’ involvement efforts may not produce positive results and can even result in negative outcomes” (in Parnell, 2010, p. 2324). Arnold reiterates this thought, saying that “with the positive effects of this type of management, there is also the possibility of negative effects, if not implemented properly” (1999, p. 2). The issue now is that if teachers are more committed to their work and they are satisfied with the leadership style and the working environment then I do not see any obstacle that can prevent them from improving school outcomes. Therefore, I side with Somech because this practise can contribute to higher outcomes in schools.

In this vein, Stofile argues that, “Participation leads to empowerment. The more people that are given a chance to participate in the activities of an organization, the more they become empowered and their capacity to perform better increases” (2006, p. 12). According to my experience, employees’ participation in decision-making or management can increase productivity, work quality, job satisfaction, employment security, and organizational flexibility. Day et al. & Gebert et al (in Benoliel & Somech 2010) reveal that participative management practices are commonly perceived as offering “a variety of potential benefits to the overall school organization and to its employees” (p. 285). The likely benefits of this approach could persuade most managers to employ it in their schools because of its qualities such as empowering teachers to work hard and be active organisation members. In education, participative model is a tool to support the organization’s vision and teachers objectives.

Another main benefit of the participative leadership style is that this technique promotes the determination and development of potential leaders who are already in the team. During participation for common purpose, the school management can determine which employees can be future leaders in the same school. Literatures suggests that the process allows for the development of additional leaders who can serve the organization later (Shennu, 2010), because the leadership style can lead to the identification of potential future leaders through exchanging of ideas. Through such practices the strengths and weakness of teachers’ that would have gone unobserved can be successfully identified through debating issues.

#### **2.2.7. Participative management/leadership barriers**

The participative management research illuminates a number of barriers and extreme factors that can lead to the failures of participative management (Yohe, 2003). So in this section, I present some of the barriers of participative approach in ELM.

As mentioned in 2.2.3, ‘participative management is not without its negatives’. I think that along with the positive effects to this type of management, there is also the opportunity of negative effects if not implemented properly. Khoza maintains that “participation is open to abuse and if applied irresponsibly it may end up yielding negative results” (2004, p. 24). There are many obstacles a school would have to overcome in order to install an environment that can succeed in using participative management. One of the major challenges is that some teachers do not want the responsibility of decision-making or involvement in management; teachers are especially concerned about the workload if they become part of the school

management. According to Blase and Blase this approach “may actually be harmful for some, as it generates additional pressure and it is perceived as increased stress due to the added challenges, responsibility and accountability” (as cited in Somech, 2009, p. 287) that teachers will have to face when included in the decision-making process. Furthermore, some teachers realised that their influence in participation has “little or no difference” in school decisions (Khoza, 2004, p. 25).

However, Steyn et al. point out that “in school, each teacher is a manager and as such a leader in education” (2009, p. 120). This indicates that in order to be a leader it is not only the responsibility of a school principal, but also the responsibility of teachers and other stakeholders. It is therefore the principal’s responsibility “to convince, inspire, bind and direct followers to realise common ideals” of school-based management (Van der Westhuizen, as cited in Botha, 2006, p. 342). Unfortunately, because of misconception and peer pressure, literatures reveals that some teachers may keep their opinions to themselves and refuse to tell a school principal if they feel that an idea or suggestion would not work (MacMillan, 2007). In these cases, it appears that teachers do not feel that “site-based school management promotes an inclusive approach and values all the stakeholders” and as a result, it must be acknowledged as “a co-production of all three elements” namely principals, teachers and parents (Kamonde, 2008, p. 11).

Another dilemma faced in participative management is that it is a time-consuming approach. The more people involved in the decision-making process, the longer it can take to make decisions, because it requires that the participants understand the ideas and afforded opportunities in order to argue or raise their opinions. A related barrier is that participation is associated with meetings and it is, therefore, a time-consuming process. Shennu resonates that time is one of the major weaknesses of participative leadership approach (2010, p. 3). The challenge is that on occasions when there is an immediate deadline, this approach prevents leaders from taking quick decisions, even in crisis situations.

According to Wildy & Loudon, although being time consuming, the challenge experienced by the principals is to apply both efficient and collaborative decision-making strategies to avoid this problem (2000, p. 181). However, Hersey argues that there is “no proof that democratic decision making, is more effective than decisions that are made by one individual only” (as cited in Van Westhuizen, 1991, p. 157). This means, sometimes, even solitary decision-

making can contribute to positive outcomes in an organisation, it just depends on what kind of decisions are being taken. Even autocratic decision is believed to produce best results than participation approach (Somech, 2002).

The participative leadership approach can create problems for leaders, especially when people are used to deciding together and always depend on group decisions. Mabuku argues that “group participation in decision making has the weakness of depending on collective decision-making” (2009, p. 29). This may be a problem because as Jones contends, in, “crises, there is no time to hold meetings” (2005, p. *ibid.*). This indicates that in some case it is not good to become too accustomed to one system as the panacea for decision-making, because once people get used to one system, they can prevent leaders from taking solitary decisions (Rivera, 2008). I align with Mabuku, that situational leadership, where the leader does not depend on only one technique could be better than the participative approach.

Another challenge is that some employees are not educated or experienced enough to help make effective decisions. Therefore these employees would need to be trained in order to be in position to contribute in making effective decisions, because “Everyone needs the skills and abilities to do their job and to participate effectively”. (Branch, 2002, p. 10). However, training also requires financial support. Participative management can be effective if you are dealing with highly educated and understanding people, but when these skills are limited, decision-making can be less effective e.g. with unskilled labourers (Shennu, 2010).

Furthermore, Jones shares a similar view that in a situation where “staff lack competence, [or] crucial information, they will need close supervision” (as cited in Mabuku, 2009, p. 29). The leaders practising this approach are expected to monitor and provide constant guidance and support to the group in order to accomplish their task. This is why participative leadership may not be quite effective in some situations, and employees who lack groups skills may not benefit from participative management, because they are not vocal. Current research suggests that most subordinates prefer participative decision-making regardless of their levels of understanding or influence on the organisations (Parnell, 2010, p. 2324). While funding for training is lacking, this will remain a dilemma.

A further challenge that participative management would be exposed to would be the potential dangers of sharing sensitive information with unskilled workers. However, in participative leadership theory, vital information must be shared regardless of its sensitive nature (Shennu, 2010). The danger is that the sensitivity issue can lead to a possible information leak resulting

in conflict among workers. Nevertheless, Steyn et al. (2009, p. 115) disputes this by referring to transparency principles arguing that:

In terms of school, management requires decision-making by the person in charge to be made public to those affected. In this way, for example, members of staff at a school, pupils and parents should be fully informed of all relevant decisions taken. There should be no hidden motives that are kept from them. They should not suffer under so-called “hidden agendas” that keeps them in the dark on matters that may be important to them.

In fact, consultation has its own challenges, in that it delays decision-making and there is the potential of confusing issues and losing one’s control on issues. Jones (as cited in Mabuku, 2009, p. 27), cautions that:

First, there is the issue of time. The more you consult, the longer the decision-making process will take ... the more people you consult with, the higher your chances of being confused by the mass of views some no doubt contradictory you will receive. Secondly, if too many people become involved you may well lose your grip over the whole process.

Some leaders feel that consultation may put them in a position whereby a principal has to negotiate for support of his emotion, not being able to decide on his own, making decision-making a burdensome practice (*Ibid.*, p. 24). In a practical sense, the people involved at certain stages may influence decision-making in order for it to go in their favour. In light of these challenges some leaders tend not to consult other members of the organisation and, subsequently, are perceived by their followers as being authoritarian or incompetent (*Ibid.*).

A final challenge that principals will be faced with would be, who is actually accountable? Even though the principal may share responsibility and decision-making with others in school, the challenge is that the principal is ultimately accountable for the outcomes of the collaborative decisions made, not staff members. According to Elmore (in Wildy & Loudon, 2000, p. 181), school restructuring gives decision-making authority to stakeholders, but not accountability for the decisions, and as a result, it is a challenge to the principal to get people to do things that they are not customarily doing Nevertheless, it is vitally important that teachers are encouraged by management to be part of school management and the decision-making process.

### **2.3 Participation of teachers in management and decision making**

The teachers’ participation in management and decision-making plays an important role in the field of ELM. Participation of teachers in school management and decisions according to

the past in comparison to the present situation is very different, and the past was very unbearable. According to Heystek & Paquette “Neither educators nor parents have had much experience of participatory decision making since in the past, principals were generally considered as the only people with the knowledge and authority to make decisions” (in Swanepoel, 2008, p. 41). This was very similar in Namibia where teachers and others stakeholders were not part of the school management and did not have any authority to decide on any matters concerning the school (Niitembu, 2006; Kambonde, 2008).

After independence, politicians introduced various educational policies such as the school board policy. The rationale of the Ministry of Education was to decentralize management and delegate some responsibilities to stakeholders. Since school boards consist of teachers, parents and learners, some authority was given to them to promote school base-management (SBM) and alteration. According to Mosoge and Van der Westhuizen “Participative management requires of SBM structures that authority is delegated from higher to lower levels” (in Botha, 2006, p. 341). The ministry basically devolved some power to the stakeholders starting from the parents to the principal. At the same time the principal was requested to delegate some of his responsibilities to a school management team, HODs, teachers, parents and learners. Their function was to oversee the activities of school and to assist school principals with regards to management and policy formulation. The school principal’s power was reduced by the educational policy Act no 16 of 2001 and given to the stakeholders (Namibia, 2001, p. 2).

Literatures show that “teachers’ participation is a system of involving teachers in work that has traditionally been done by principals” (Mosoge & Van der Westhuizen 1997, p. 196). Therefore, the democratic participation of the stakeholders in school management and decision-making is seen as the heart of the ELM transformation process, since the approach promotes collaboration between a school principal and teachers. According to Walker & Vogt, failure to involve others who are affected by changes could cause resistance (in Van der Westhuizen, et al, 2008, p. 197).

According to Marishane “the concept of decentralisation originates from the belief that the state alone cannot control schools, but should share its power with other stakeholders, particularly those close to the school, on a partnership basis” (as cited in Van Wyk, 2004, p. 49; Van Wyk, 2007, p. 132). Therefore, this was the responsibility of the principal or school

management team (SMT) to ensure that opportunities are given to the teachers and also to contribute to decision-making. Hargreaves (in Somech, 2010, p. 175), maintains that:

Scholars embraced the notion that flatters management and decentralized authority structures carry the potential for achieving outcomes unattainable under schools' traditional top-down bureaucratic structure.

However, it is believed that participation increases school effectiveness and is justified by democratic principles that once it is implemented, it can become visible (Bush, 2003). In Namibia, the necessity of involving teachers in shared decision-making during the initiating, planning and management tasks is reported in numerous government documents such as Presidential Commission on Education Culture and Training Report of 1999, policy documents *Towards Education for all* of 1993 and the education Act no. 16 of 2001. This indicates that the government was committed to the transformation of education from the grass roots level by involving all the stakeholders and by developing democratic systems policies that would encourage equal participation in school governance. However, Mendelsohn disputes that although the new Namibian government decided to promote teachers' "participation through democratic School Boards... there is no structure or evidence of what they had done to improve schools" (in Niitembu, 2006, p. 12).

The involvement of teachers in participative decision-making (PDM) is defined as an organisational process by which managers share influence on decision-making with his/her subordinates such as the head of departments (HODs) and teachers, in terms of authority. PDM is an organisational activity or 'organisation-centred process,' whereby employees are directly involved in debating issues that affect the organisation or themselves (Mungunda, 2003, p. 22). The rationale for the involvement of the stakeholders is that the expected educational change cannot be achieved and/or sustained successfully without teachers who facilitate the change program and the actual change in the classroom.

As a result, in the last few years, the drive of reform initiatives towards the realisation of these shared responsibilities in education has grown immensely. Educational reform in ELM has been based in the language of teacher participation and empowerment, because researchers reveal that "most teachers expressed a relatively strong desire to participate" (Somech, 2010, p. 183). During the apartheid era teachers were not included in decision-making in the school as mentioned above. A teacher's role in "participation is not only about

taking part in [the] decision making processes but it is also about being valued” (Lilyquist, 1998, in Khoza, 2004).

The reason for this is that teachers are the ones who spend most of the time in the classroom with learners, and this suggests that they are the ones who should be making decisions that affect them and their learners. Therefore, principals as key players must also play their role to implement change and introduce instructional improvement in their schools. According to Swanepoel “the necessity of involving teachers not only as implementers but also as shared decision-makers during the initiating, planning and management phases is reported in numerous research publications such as Hargreaves, Lieberman, Fullan and Hopkins (1998); Kirk & Macdonald (2001); Singh & Lokotsch (2005); and Frederics, Blumenfeld & Paris (2004)” (2008, p. 2).

The involvement of teachers in decision-making is one of the panaceas to fulfil the needs of the Ministry of Education that requires that teachers as stakeholders must be involved in the governance of school. According to Chapman (as cited in Dimmock, 1993, p. 59):

School-based management demands greater participation by staff and parents in the policy and decision making processes of the school. Relevant stakeholders make decisions in school-based management collectively and collegially, not individually through the principal and/or deputy principal of the school. Principals liaise and interact with the consultative groups and attend to the interpersonal dynamics of the collaborative process.

In a similar vein, Erickson & Gwelch (in Mungunda, 2003, p. 25) point out that the “overall benefits of adopting a group management approach to school governance include improving the quality of communication and decision making practices, staff motivation”, and boost the coordination of responsibilities and ideas. The principal as an organisational leader is expected to establish teamwork, school committees and to share responsibilities of decision-making with those involved in the change. In this sense, the manager’s responsibilities are to follow and support the efforts of the teachers and learners in order to increase learning and teaching. In order to help schools become more effective as educational institutions, school principals should attempt to empower and encourage the participative approach in their schools.

## 2.4 Empowerment/encouraging of participative theory

Many theorists define empowerment in different ways due to different perceptions of this single concept. Empowerment, in simple terms, means giving individuals the authority to participate, to make decisions, to contribute their ideas, to influence and to be responsible and accountable for decisions they can make. Put another way, empowerment means developing your employees by offering them power or training in order to be more capable of facing the challenges of an organization. According to Short, et al. empowerment is “a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems” (1994, as cited in Somech, 2004, p. 278). Similarly, Frost et al. (in Khoza, 2004, p. 18), define teacher empowerment as an endeavour to:

Develop teachers’ capacity for curriculum debate, develop self-awareness and a sense of professional growth, increase teacher ability and motivation to engage in curriculum decision making, increase their capacity for honest self-evaluation, develop a critique of educational policies at both local and national levels, and increase their ability to build and test theories about teaching and learning.

Therefore, participative managers/leaders are expected to empower their staff in order to enable them to be effective in the decision-making process at any level within the institution which could have an influence on the school as a whole, for example, in school goals, school policy, admission policy, school budget, and curriculum. Smyth & Shacklock argue that “in education, policies are made by school governing bodies, administrators and politicians, but teachers are rarely part of the processes and their voices are missing” (as cited in Khoza, 2004, p. 3). However, at present, every organisation motivation, empowerment, and development plays significant roles for staff to get involved in the affairs.

This is the only opportunity for the employees to show that they are capable or that they have the skills and knowledge to do the job on their own and face whatever comes their way. Therefore, a democratic leader is expected to possess a strong personality in order to inspire and empower his subordinates, moving with them in a certain direction for the sake of school development, and achievement of goals. Mabuku emphasises that “contemporary education trends have incorporated empowerment strategies as a means of improving school effectiveness” (2009, p. 24). In this framework, the way forward for education effectiveness is through empowering teachers who are the agents and the parts of an engine of schools.

It therefore becomes necessary for a leader to be strong and to have empowerment skills, and, at the same time, be willing to share power effectively with his/her followers (Steyn et al,

2009, p. 126). Botha argues that the “current position of the principalship [sic] is to provide not only authority, but also leadership” (2006, p. 341). Bezzina defines teacher empowerment as “the transfer of the decision making authority of key school issues to people who in the past had looked to an authority figure to make decisions” (as cited in Khoza, 2004, p. 18). Therefore, empowerment is the process in which teachers gain access to decision-making, achieve status, become valued and trusted, and increase their skills and knowledge in site based-management. In addition, Margulies and Kleiner argue that, “Empowerment is a key feature of post-bureaucratic organisations” (as cited in Jamali, et al, 2006, p. 339).

It is against this background, that participative management calls for teachers to undertake leadership roles in schools and it requires that principals encourage such leadership in schools. Russell suggests that empowerment “involves entrusting workers with authority and responsibility” (as cited in Mabuku, 2009, p. 5). If people are consulted about school issues, and permitted to be involved in the decision-making process, they may feel empowered and consequently become committed to and accountable for the institutional goals. Therefore, in order to grow the approach of leadership, schools have to embark upon career path development. Future leaders should be grown from teachers, middle teachers, and head of departments/assistant principals to school principals (Bush, et al, 2009, p. 115).

Bush, et al. argue that in England, “the English National College for school leadership (NCSL) has introduced a programme designed to ‘fast track’ leaders into senior positions, and to encourage schools and local authorities to ‘grow their own’ leaders” (2009, p. 114). This approach will support and strengthen schools to find effective leaders for the future. Capable teaching staff can be inspired or empowered by school managers to take part in leadership roles and decision-making. Gasparski (cited in Boleslaw, 2009, p. 1), points out that:

Inappropriate behaviour in organisations is not caused by the fact that people working there are less ethical than other people but by the fact that not enough attention is given to developing ethical behaviours inside organizations, to enhance a strong ethics foundation of a leadership pattern.

This means that leaders are not doing enough to develop their leaders in their schools, and therefore, it becomes the responsibility of managers and government to uplift and transform the behaviour of the members of organisation for effective management of schools. Spreitzer (in Boleslaw, 2009) argues that the approach can be encouraged and grown only if we take the

participative context into account, that is, the involvement of all stakeholders in decision-making. Currently it is argued that all-important subordinates should take decisions and implement it, because everyone is a leader (Steyn, 2009). Staff members can grow effectively if they realise that they also have some managerial roles to play in an organisation.

Actually, there is no ‘magic bullet’ to encourage people to be proactive in participation, because they can see the real benefits of participatory practices in their organisations themselves (Boleslaw, 2009, p. 46). Employees’ participation in certain work issues is desirable for individuals to gain experience and skills and to have an interest to participate in the more difficult areas that will take place for example in conflicts resolutions and decision-making. According to Branch “Participative management’s emphases on teambuilding and teamwork, and on autonomy in the conduct of the work itself are consistent with the way science is conducted, particularly in the public sector” (2002, p. 19).

## **2.5 Concepts related with participative leadership and management**

In the last section, I discussed ways of how to motivate teachers to participate in school decision matters. However in this section also I present some concepts that are related to participative management and leadership namely, teamwork, delegation and decentralization and collegiality concepts.

### **2.5.1 Teamwork**

*"It's possible to achieve almost anything as long as you are not worried about who gets the credit"* (Harry S. Truman).

The concept ‘teamwork’ means when a group of people with different portfolios of an organisation work together as team, discussing and sharing ideas and responsibilities, with the aim of achieving a goal. In a similar vein, Middlewood defines teamwork as “a principle that embodies people working together as a group and sharing the same values in the same organization” (in Kambonde, 2008, p. 19). According to Stofile (2005, p. 15):

Teamwork in an organisation creates synergy because the sum of the effort of team members is far greater than the sum of people working alone. In a team situation each member contributes to the success of others and this collaboration of different members to bring about an integrated achievement is the secret that lies behind the success and effectiveness of high performing organisations.

From this context, there is an indication that teamwork has the same function as the participative approach, because they both require that a group of people work together to achieve a common goal. Similarly, Monyatsi maintains that “teamwork is a crucial pointer of democratic ELM as it involves consultation and collaboration among stakeholders in schools” (in Mabuku, (2009, p. 24). Through the process of teamwork or collaboration, shared goals and shared vision can be achieved in school organisation. Mabuku contends that “if you put together those empowered individuals to become a team, the performance and outcome would be extra-ordinary. Natural effective teamwork can produce incredible results if everyone is playing a full and equal part” (*ibid.* p. 14.). However, in a learning organisation such as a school, working successfully as a team is not as easy as it may seem. Effective teamwork certainly does not just happen spontaneously; it takes a great deal of hard work, effort and compromise to succeed. Hoy & Miskel (as cited in Aipinge, 2007, p. 28) assert that:

By supervising organisations with subsystems, school administrators’ deal with a “wide array of problems, situations and people”; therefore they must have a range of abilities and skills to lead effectively.

Similarly, Fink (2006) cautions that teachers to whom leadership is distributed need to be up to the required task if progress in teamwork is to be achieved (Bush, et al. 2009). The fact is that teamwork is one of the fundamental principles of participative management and is completely different from the way organisations were led. Teamwork is the new organisational model, because in the past, schools were run based on the assumptions of hierarchy, where school principals were thought to know all the answers and they were generally in charge of the whole school alone. Currently, school operations are constructed on the assumptions that knowledge, insight, and answers should come from all organisational team members, not from a single individual. Everard, Morris, & Wilson suggest that, “teamwork depends on effective meetings, effective decision taking, effective communication, the identification of team roles, and effective delegation” (cited in Niitembu, 2007, p. 30).

Currently it is argued that it is only teamwork that can enhance the participation and the collegiality among the staff of an organisation. According to Peters, and many others, teamwork is substituting the “hierarchical structure as the dominant method” (in Stoner, et al,

1995, p. 516), of leading an organisation such as a school. At the same time, teamwork helps people to achieve their personal and team goals, improve communication, develop a sense of common vision, achieve the organisational goals, and strive for success. Peters (*ibid.*, p. 499) further defines teamwork as when “two or more people... interact and influence each other towards a common purpose” of an organization.

From group work efforts, good teamwork is motivated in school by good leadership and effective communication which are vital factors of interpersonal interaction of group members, enabling them to share ideas, opinions and common goals without feeling threatened. Jamali, et al., emphasise that “communication thus facilitates the flow of data, information and knowledge through teams and communities” (2006, p. 345) and effective teamwork can facilitate conflict resolution in schools. Similarly, the establishment of sharing tasks is one of the characteristics of team members who understand their responsibilities. So, by clearly distinguishing and distributing responsibilities, the school will be able to motivate effective teamwork, encouraging decentralization and delegation of authority and responsibility.

### **2.5.2 Decentralization and Delegation**

People compare delegation with the decentralization of authority. The two concepts almost mean the same thing even though they are different. Delegation is also known as the distribution of responsibilities to subordinates in an organization. So when you are delegating responsibilities, you are also decentralizing, distributing and devolving power to your colleagues. Stoner, et al., define delegation as “the assignment to another person of formal authority (legitimate power) and accountability for carrying out specific activities” (1995, p. 355). In schools, delegation is one of the key motivating factors for improvement if authorities are distributed throughout the organisational structure and the rest of staff members.

In reality, delegation of authority by the school manager to teachers is necessary for the effective functioning of a school. However, contrary to this, a leader must also realise that he cannot supervise and at the same time do everything else in the organisation, by himself. In the context of education, delegation offers many advantages such as:

1. Creating more opportunities for individual growth;
2. Opportunities for the employees to engage in the functioning of the institution;
3. Empowering employees with responsibilities at a higher level
4. Enhancing confidence, self-esteem, communication and organisational skills.

For Van der Westhuizen delegation serves as “a basis for in-service training as staff are guided to assume greater responsibility” (1991, p. 173) and to work on their own and to train them to become future school leaders. Delegation enables all members of an organisation to learn the routine of thought and to initiate decision in schools. According to Stoner et al. (1995, p 355), “[D]elegation causes employees to accept accountability and exercise judgment” and at the same time improves employees “self -confidence and willingness to take initiative” (*ibid.*) in schools.

In education, principals are expected to delegate some of their authority and responsibilities to their subordinates with the aim of developing efficient functioning schools. Stevenson argues that teachers “practise management through processes of delegation and distribution” (in Kambonde, 2008, p. 13), which is regarded as in-service training. So, it is vital that principals train their teachers, aiming to delegate responsibilities such as “represent[ing] the school in various activities outside or within the school, while the principal gets on with other management tasks in the school” (*ibid.*). Stoner further stresses that through the process of participative management, “delegating might maximize the effectiveness of employees, speeding up decision-making” (Stoner, 1995., p. 356). This can help principals to contain the expansion of conflict of interests and resistance for change within the school environment.

However, this approach has some barriers. On most occasions, the main reason why principals do not delegate responsibilities is that some principals are “too disorganized or inflexible to delegate work effectively” (Stoner et al., 1995, p. 356) to their entire staff or management structure. Another issue that arises is that not every employee is capable enough to complete delegated responsibilities effectively. These are a few of the common negative aspects of delegation and democratic management, and, if they are not properly addressed, the problem could deteriorate into chaos, negatively impacting on the development outcomes in the schools.

Decentralization is the way in which leaders are able to devolve power to staff members, while delegation is the measure to which formal authority is given to all staff members in an organization, or extensive authority and accountability are passed down according to organizational hierarchy. Karstanje emphasizes that, “Decentralization involves the assignment of decision making tasks to lower levels” (as cited in Niitembu, 2007, p. 29). In the case of schools, the lower levels referred to here are head of departments or deputy principals, teachers, and cleaners. But in order for the decentralization to be effective, committees should be present in schools where collegiality is being practised.

### 2.5.3 Collegiality

“Let’s do these together colleagues!” Collegiality is organisational approach that is related to collaboration, teamwork, participative management and leadership. It is stressed that, “an alternative to hierarchy is collegial structure” (Bush & Middlewood, 2005, p. 66). Therefore the opposite of bureaucratic management is collegiality and consultative approaches. In this model, schools are expected to be run by teams through equal involvement of some or all the member of an organisation, not through individual responsibility. Bush (2003, p. 64) refers to collegial models as those theories that:

Assume that organizations determine policy and make decisions 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.

This implies that for an organisation to be successful in decision-making, that are acceptable by all the stakeholders, it should always attempt to get input from its members, through a collegial approach and not through an autocratic decision that does not involve all members. However, teachers in this model should indicate that they are ready to collaborate and willing to share responsibility in the schools. Brundrett fittingly defines collegiality as “teachers conferring and collaborating with other teachers” (in Bush, 2003, p. 64) which means that the leader presents problems and allows teachers to debate together with the leader in sharing ideas about solutions. Little (as cited in Bush, *ibid.*) stresses that:

The reason to pursue the study and practice of collegiality is that, presumably, something is gained when teachers work together and something is lost when they do not.

In fact, when people work with colleagues, they don't lose anything such as respect, cooperation, quality management and good decision making. So, collegiality assists the group gain some of the goals that an organisation deserves such as taking proper decisions together instead of an individual. Thus, Bush argues that "collegial models believe that professionals have a right to share in the wider decision making process" (2003, p. 66) in a school. However, in the educational context, it is not only professional teachers who want to be involved in the decision-making process of the school, but every individual; even unskilled employees think of being involved for the sake of making proper decisions. As a result, Bush arguing that "collegial models assume structures to be lateral or horizontal with participants having an equal right to determine policy and influence decisions" (2003, p. 74).

In the collegiality leadership model, there is no hierarchical structure of communication because structures take on a more flattened shape in order to involve everyone in the institution in decision-making and to promote ownership of the outcomes of discussions. Frost, et al. maintains that "it is against this backdrop that greater collegiality and more active involvement of a wide-range of individuals are called for to improve schools" (as cited by Khoza, 2004, p. 3). Furthermore, Bush demonstrates that the "collegial model assumes a common set of values [are] held by members of the organization" (2003, p. 66) such as school staff, not only the manager. Similarly, Steyn, et al. claim that "in a true democratic society there are no unimportant people, because of their humanity, all people as human beings have equal human dignity" (2009, p. 56). In fact, this indicates that in every democratic organisation or society, every person, whether they are poor or rich, educated or uneducated, is part of a collegial management structure, and they need to be involved in issues that affect them.

Collegiality is part of participative management and it is described as being a very time-consuming approach as many people are involved in discussion. Bush maintains that the main opportunity to apply the collegiality approach is through daily meetings with the whole staff that operate in small schools, but "may be suitable only for information exchange in larger institutions" (2003, p. 66). In order to save time, leaders should be skilful enough to condense discussions, otherwise the approach becomes worthless. Hargreaves argues that the approach is unpredictable, voluntary, and an informal practice (in Bush, 2003, p. 84). Theorists argue that the common value of the collegial model is to reach agreement about goals and policies through a consultative means. Brundrett stresses that, "shared vision" and shared management

is a “basis for collegial decision-making” (as cited in Bush, 2003, p. 66), because every member in an organisation is involved in the implementation of policies.

Furthermore, Bush argues that “common values and shared objectives lead to the view that it is both desirable and possible to resolve problems by agreement” (*ibid.*). Baldrige et al. (in Bush, 2003, p. 75) state that participative management is based on collegiality not a leader alone. Therefore, school principals are expected to adopt participative leadership strategies in which the burdens of decision-making are shared through the means of democratic dialogue. In this context, Sergiovanni suggests that “the burdens of leadership will be less if leadership functions and roles are shared and if the concept of leadership density were to emerge as a viable replacement for principal leadership” (as cited by Bush, 2003, pp. 78-79). A similar suggestion was reported in some of the studies conducted in other regions of Namibia of the particular approach that shared leadership responsibilities can lead to less resistance, turn-over and absenteeism of employees (Kambonde, p. 2008; Mabuku, 2009).

## **2.6 Participative management studies of the Namibian perspective**

Various studies of this nature have been conducted in Namibia related to this theory. Most of them highlighted the effects that the colonial legacy had on Namibian education. In general, most of the current school principals that are running schools in Namibia were proponents of the previous colonial government. So, since they were trained during the apartheid era, they are still practicing a similar style of management and leadership. Mattson & Harley (as cited in Moloi, 2007, p. 463) maintain that “most of today’s black teachers and school leaders began their teaching careers under the *apartheid* regime where they were required to practise in racially prescribed settings”. Bush, et al., maintains that “the imminent retirement of the ‘baby boom’ generation principals, born in the years after the second world war, threatens a leadership crisis in many nations” (2009, p. 114).

According to Mungunda there is “overwhelming support for the notion that participative management (collegiality) does have a positive influence with regard to creating a sense of common goals, shared vision, a sense of ownership, commitment and improved human relations” (2003, p. ii). Similarly, Kambonde (2008) revealed that there is a strong sense of commitment among the respondents to participative management and its accompanying practices, such as shared decision-making and broad stakeholder involvement. The scholars

indicate that participative management has a positive influence towards commitment and teachers' ownership of an organisation.

However, both studies highlight some challenges facing participative management. For example, Kambonde stresses that the challenges such as the “persistence of autocratic leadership, conflicts of interest in decision making, and selfish decisions are still being carried out in schools” (2008, p. 74). Therefore, for the Namibian school principal to understand and implement the full participation of the stakeholders in management will take time to achieve. Nonetheless, literature reveals that participative decision-making appears to be the current practice of schools (*ibid.*).

In addition to this, Mungunda observed that within the notion of collegiality the “time-consuming nature of participative management and the misuse of democracy by certain members in the organizations” (2003, p. 68) impinged on the authority of the principal. Mabuku (2009) on the other hand noted that the practices of communication and teamwork are not well expressed, since in most cases, either teachers or learners are not involved in decision-making. Mabuku (*ibid.*) concluded that the implementation is far from satisfactory in line with both the Education Act 16 of 2001 and the policy on Education for all”. Both these studies demonstrate that participative management is being applied through consulting staff, delegating responsibilities and establishing various committees at school to represent others.

This might happen in some schools, but unfortunately there is not enough evidence for me to have more concrete view on these aspects, as the previous research was not conducted in the Kavango region. What I know is that in some schools these activities are being practiced, but in some cases it appears to be just ‘window dressing’, because there is no real collegial participation within the schools. In most cases, although participative methods are applied, principals overrule subordinates even though they are the majority (Kambonde, 2008).

## **2.7 Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have discussed the literature review that advocates the use of participative management and decision-making in schools. Related literatures revealed that the involvement of teachers in management and decisions can contribute to organisational commitment and higher productivities, improve teamwork and teambuilding, and enhance teachers' creativity and innovative ideas. All Principles are believed to be characteristics of

democracy. The approach can develop future school leaders, as potential candidates are identified through meetings and the “fast track” approach (Bush, et al, 2009). Teachers’ involvement in decision-making appear as the cause of ownership of school, opportunities to gain skills, and experience of doing management tasks. The chapter revealed that leaders should share leadership responsibilities through committees where decisions and responsibilities should be shared among the teachers and the leaders. However, participative management also has negative aspects and group decision-making depends on the contingency of the situation. The chapter reveals that participative approach cannot always lead to higher school achievements, but can sometimes even be negative. The chapter made clear that Bush’s participative leadership is related to the collegial model that focuses on consultation and consensus on decisions. In addition, it was discovered that despite the accountability involved, the principal should devolve power to the teachers and delegate some managerial responsibilities for them to perform.

## Chapter Three

### Research methodology

#### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology and methods used in my research, in an attempt to get appropriate responses/data to my research questions on teachers' participation in school management and decision-making for quality governance in three rural schools in Namibia. In the following sections I explain the paradigm in which this study is situated and the methods I used to gather and interpret data. I also concentrate on the issues of ethics and validity.

#### 3.2 Research design

##### 3.2.1 Research paradigm

This study was located in the interpretive, qualitative paradigm. Case studies focus on providing an in-depth account of events, relationships, experiences or processes occurring in that particular case (Denscombe, 2007, p. 35). Qualitative methods focus on context that may shape the understanding of a trend under investigation, within the context of three schools in Namibia. This method encourages a multi-method approach in which I was a primary instrument in collecting data. Using multiple methods helped me to ensure that the data gathered was of essential depth and range (Burton & Jones, 2008, pp. 66-67).

In this study, it was not possible to conduct a large number of case studies since the scope of the half-thesis is quite limited. Merriam (2002, p. 38) argues that “an interpretive qualitative study would be interested in how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds and what meaning they attribute to their experiences”. For this reason the sample was quite small as it was possible for me to delve deeply into people's experiences and perceptions by using multiple methods and data sources in order to obtain a rich image of the phenomena that I did not get from other sources.

Leedy & Ormrod (2005, p. 94) argue that:

Qualitative research typically answers questions about complex natural phenomena, always with the purpose of describing and understanding the phenomena from the participants' point of view.

This approach was therefore appropriate for the research since I wanted to understand perceptions and experiences of school principals, head of departments and teachers. The approach helped me to enter the setting with an open mind, prepared to get involved in the complexity of the situation and interact with participants through interviews. To strengthen my sense of what was happening, I chose to use observation and document analysis discussed under the research methodology and tools section (3.3).

### **3.2.2 Sampling**

In order to get the kind of data I wanted for my research I selected three schools in the Kavango region of Namibia based on my prior knowledge of them and their accessibility. I have conducted my study at one senior secondary school, one combined school and one primary school. I opted for the various phases because I assumed that participation might be slightly different depending on the kind and level of school. Cohen, Manion & Morrison maintain that in a case range, a researcher selects the cases to be incorporated in the sample “according to typicality or possession of particular characteristics being sought.” (2007, p. 114), I believed that this move also added value to my research data.

In the study, a sample of three principals, three heads of department (HODs) and eight teachers were drawn from the defined population. Two school principals were male and one was female. I included one female principal to hear her perceptions on participation of teachers in management and decision-making at her school as suggested by Mungunda (2003, p. 70). At each school I interviewed two SMTs, a Principal and one HOD. I planned to interview four teachers at senior secondary because such schools have numerous staff members with even higher qualifications such as degrees and higher diplomas and have more knowledge and skills about the participation approach. I interviewed two teachers at the other two schools. I had the idea that the more teachers, learners, stages and grades a school has the more complexity the school’s decision-making processes are likely to be. This was one of the reasons why I interviewed four teachers at a senior secondary school. It was vital for me to employ all three phases to obtain their views. I think that this move also added value to my research data.

### **3.2.3 Research procedures**

At the start of the research, I first made an appointment with the Regional Director of education of Kavango region to give him/her more details of the study. I also sent a letter from the university requesting authorization for access to schools for my research purpose.

Secondly, I went to the selected school sites for appointments with school principals and to submit a letter requesting entrance to the schools. I submitted a letter asking for permission from the director to the schools to have access to school documents, and to interview staff members. I then explained to the interviewees again the purpose and potential value of the research. After the discussion with the principal, I set dates for the visit to the sites. And then I scheduled interviews with the principals and staff members. All the selected schools participants involved in the research signed a consent form. The following issues were experienced:

1. Instead of spending at least two days getting to know the staff well, I was forced to start with the interview because the selected participants had only one or two periods free a week.
2. Since I was told by the director not to disturb classes, the only opportunities available were to interview the staff when they were off or in the afternoon. This was especially the case with hostel resident staff.
3. I planned to interview the rest of teachers and HODs before interviewing principals; however at one school I had to interview the principal on Monday because he/she had to leave the same day to attend to some commitment for two weeks.
4. The transcription went well and transcripts were delivered to the participants for 'member check'.

### **3.3 Research methods and tools**

This study was a qualitative case study approach with multiple data sources, namely document analysis, observations, and semi-structured interviews. In similar vein, Denscombe maintains that “The case study approach allows the use of a variety of research methods. More than this, it more or less encourages the use of multiple methods in order to capture the complex reality under scrutiny”. (2007, p. 45) The sources were used in collecting data with the hope that they would all meet to support or add to an interpretation of the particular phenomenon under investigation through triangulation (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 101). According to Cohen, et al. a case study has the strength to “penetrate situations in ways that are not always susceptible to numerical analysis”. (2007, p. 253) This method assisted me because I intended to look in-depth at the phenomenon within its real-life context in order to use the data as a basis for my conclusion, interpretation and prediction (*ibid.*).

During data collections, I spent one week at each research site. I started with observations of interactions between principals and staff members during morning meetings/briefings, as well as analysing existing documents I found at each site as planned to help inform the framework I have to work in. I planned for interaction with the participants in the first days at each research site, but it was different because of the problems mentioned in 3.2.3. At each research site I conducted interviews as scheduled with the participants according to time suitable for them. During interviews I handed them a letter containing ethical information to read before the interview.

An informed consent form was signed by each participant and a copy of the letter from the regional director was given to the principals. Diener and Crandall (in Cohen, et al. 2000) defines informed consent as “the procedures in which individuals choose whether to participate in an investigation after being informed of facts that would be likely to influence their decisions” (p. 51). The goal and value of the research was also highlighted and this increased their interest, trust and acceptance. I interviewed the managers last with the exception of one who left the same day; I visited the school as mentioned in 3.2.3.

In the next section I discuss the three research tools/sources used to collect data. “[A] research tool is a specific mechanism or strategy the researcher uses to collect, manipulate, or interpret data” (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 12)

### **3.3.1 Semi-structured interviews**

Semi- structured interviews were conducted with the purposefully selected participants (as explained earlier). I selected these participants because data were “used to establish particular comparisons to illuminate the reasons for differences between settings or individuals, a common strategy in multi case qualitative studies” (Maxwell, 1998, p. 235). Interviews were the main source used during the research for data collection. I relied on interviews because they are “flexible and adaptable; responses can be probed, followed up, clarified, and elaborated on to achieve specific, accurate responses” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001, p. 267). A number of open-ended questions were prepared based on literature review, research questions, goal or objectives (Burton & Jones, 2008, p. 86).

Each participant group was asked different but similar questions because of the phenomena that was to be investigated. For example, I interviewed principals and HODs to find out whether they apply participative management or not and to what extent and what strategy or role do they play to encourage the approach. Teachers were asked to confirm or deny whether

they are involved or not, as well as their perceptions and experiences of all the participants when it comes to participative management and decision-making at their schools, etc. The purpose here was to guarantee that the conclusions satisfactorily represented the entire population or “range of variation rather than only the typical members or some subset of this range” (Maxwell, 1998, p. 235). I experienced that semi-structured interviews are a time-consuming method, but I used it because of the following advantages:

1. Interviews can motivate respondents to give more accurate and complete information.
2. The interviewer is afforded an opportunity to explain questions that respondents may not otherwise understand.
3. The researcher can ask people about their belief and perspectives about facts, feelings and conscious reasons for actions, and motives (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 146)
4. Interviewing is a more flexible form of data collection than questionnaires.

According to Monette, Sullivan, & de Jong, (1998: 181) interviewing is the technique in which an interviewer reads questions to respondents and records their verbal responses. However during this study, interviews were recorded with a cell phone video recorder and audio voice recorder, as well as note-taking for the purpose of delving into responses.

### **3.3.2 Documents analysis**

Document analysis was used to provide base line data in the form of useful insights into past events (Burton & Jones, 2008, p. 75). I selected this tool because analysis of documents is used commonly in case study research of this nature. With the “gatekeeper’s” (Weisbord, 1991, p. 88) permission, I was allowed to analyse documents such as minutes of management, staff, and SB meetings, school rules (policies), the organogram, allocation of duties and other relevant documents. I think this helped to guide me through restructuring and rephrasing my interview questions, because some of the activities I detected at the school sites directed me to change my questions and what to explore. According to McEwan & McEwan “document analysis can fill in some missing data pieces or can raise a host of new questions regarding the accuracy of observations and interpretations.” (2003, p. 82). The information from the documents’ analysis was used in this research to confirm or refute with what the participants divulged in interviews.

The evidence from multiple data sources were summarised or interpreted in order to address the research goal/questions under investigation and to make it meaningful in a narrative way.

I have reviewed a number of documents in order to answer the question under investigation. Similarly Hancock & Algozzine maintain that “the advantages of this instrument can be designed by the researcher to address the specific research questions in need of investigation” (2006, p. 53). So this is what I did with the document schedule trying to capture only what is vital about the phenomenon. However, it has been argued that “a potential advantage is that these instruments are primarily self-report measures research reveals that people do not portray themselves truthfully when they are asked to respond to surveys, questionnaires, and examinations” (Cresswell, 1998; Glesne & Peskin, 1992; Hatch, 2002) (*ibid.*).

### 3.3.3 Observation

In this research, I used observation as a tool to observe the interaction of staff during morning briefings or meetings to see, for example, if the school principal allowed democratic participation and the teachers’ level of participation, caring, and attention, and the general atmosphere (Gillham, 2000, p. 45). All the events that took place that related to my topic were recorded on my observations forms and used in this study as part of the ‘rich insight’ and respectable data (Denscombe, 2007, p. 224). However, because of school arrangements, observation went better in a secondary school where morning meetings was held every day than at the other two schools, where staff meet only on a Monday each week.

Observation is believed to provide concrete information about the phenomenon under investigation and some hidden information the interviews may not disclose (Cohen, et al, 2000, p. 305). According to Cohen et al. (2007) observation is the “distinct feature of research process that offers an investigator the opportunity to collect life data from naturally occurring situations” (p. 396). This tool was vital to me since I was able to collect first hand, rather than second hand information by looking at what is taking place in the real situation.

According to Morrison (1993, in Cohen et al, 2000. p. 305) observations enable the researcher to gather data on:

1. The physical setting e.g. the physical environment and its organization
2. The human setting e.g. the organization of the people, the characteristics and makeup of the groups or individuals being observed
3. The interactional setting e.g. the interactions that are taking places, formal, informal, planned, unplanned, verbal, non-verbal etc.
4. The programme setting e.g. the resources and their organization, etc.

Observation enabled me to “enter and understand the situation” and observe these settings (Morrison in Patton, 1990, p. 202, *ibid.*). In this research I used semi-structured observation as a ‘non participant observer’. However, Adler and Adler, (1994) in Cohen et al., argue that “all research is some form of participant observation since we cannot study the world without being part of it”. (2000: p. 305)

### **3.4 Data analysis**

Analysis involves the separation of things into their component parts (Denscombe, 2007, p. 97). The data analysis started the first day I had commenced gathering information by reading data collected (Flick, von Kardorff, & Steinke, 2004). In the same day I commenced coding and sorting the raw data by getting a general sense of patterns - a sense of what the data meant, completing the observation notes and documents schedules (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). The comparison of categories and themes started with documents and observations schedules and then interviews. The data gathered mostly through in-depth interviews, their experiences and their reasoning have been described and explained in a way I have heard things from the participants’ point of view (Denscombe, 1983 in Denscombe, 2007). According to Cohen et al (2007, p. 141) “triangulation attempts to work out, or explain fully the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one stand point”. Triangulation in this context means that data from observation, interviews and document analysis were compared to look for common themes or patterns that might appear in the data collected from all methods.

I did my data presentation by integrating and summarizing the data and identifying general categories or themes that developed from all the research tools by describing and developing positive ideas about categories and relationships among the categories (Creswell, 1998 in Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 150). Coding as a way of “assessing and classifying data” according to investigation categories were used in this research by not mentioning the names of the participants and schools, instead I used pseudonyms (Flick, et al. 2004, p. 156). Coded data were then arranged in themes and sub themes and then discussed in light of my research questions and in light of a literature review that related to stakeholders’ participation in management and decision-making in an organization.

### 3.5 Ethical issues

I submitted a letter explaining the details of the research to the regional director, inspector and principals and asked for permission, since the main aim of this study was to understand the “subjective world of human beings” (Cohen, et al., 2000, p. 22). I was very careful in the research to ensure ethics by following the four categories of the most important ethical issues: protection from harm, informed consent, right to privacy and honesty (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 101). I informed all the research participants that I would not expose them to unnecessary or psychological harm.

A memorandum of agreement was reached between me and participants whereby participants signed an informed consent form. Participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity even in letters I gave to them (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001, p. 421). The anonymity of the participants and of their schools was protected in this research by using pseudonyms and by coding their names as follows: School Principals P1-P3, Heads of department HOD1-3, Teachers as T1-8. However, the coding enabled me to identify the participants during data presentations and analysis. I undertook to report the research findings in a rigorous, complete and honest fashion without misrepresenting information (Leedy & Ormrod, *ibid.*, p. 102).

### 3.6 Validity

The validity in this research has been ensured through a triangulation process. According to Maxwell triangulation plays role in “collecting information from a diverse range of individuals and settings, using a variety of methods” (2007, p. 245) as was discussed previously in section 3.4. The data from various participants were integrated in order to find common themes and sub themes using all the tools that described the phenomena under investigation. I believed that the application of the approach has minimised the risk of systematic biases in this research. Maxwell argues that “triangulation reduces the risk that conclusions reflect only the systematic biases or limitation of specific sources and allows for broader and more secure understanding of the issue you are investigating”. (2005, p. 93) Furthermore, as Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Cuba 1988 (as cited in Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 100) have suggested about validity issues, I assume that the data of this research is credible, transferable, dependable, conformable, and can be verified. This is because, during the research process, I collected some of the documents such as minutes of staff and management meetings, journal notes, allocation of duties, organograms, and the interviews of all the participants were recorded with cell phone video and audio-voice recorder and some notes.

Participants verified the data by listening to their voice and some checked the data transcription or raw data which was taken from them and are safely kept. The audit trail will be kept with my supervisor if possible. All the letters of permission from both sides and informed consent forms which were signed by all the participants are also available (Leedy and Ormrod, pp. 100-101).

### **3.7 Conclusion**

In this chapter I outlined the research methodology I followed to collect the data of the study of teachers' participation in school management and decision-making. This included the research paradigm, methods and research tools used, and procedures as well as the research validity and ethical issues the study involved. The data collection was exciting to me and I learnt that a well thought out process may influence the situation on the ground. The use of instruments depends on situations and the phenomena under investigation. A good example of this was my expectation that I would get more information from school journal notes, but such a thing does not exist at some schools, and the only information I obtained was from the school management's own diary. In the methods used, I learned that the "case study approach can fit in well with the needs of small-scale research through concentrating effort on one research site or just a few sites" (Denscombe, 2007, p. 45). The use of three research tools was useful for me in collecting data as presented in the next section.

## Chapter Four

### Data analysis

#### 4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I present the data produced from semi-structured or one-on-one interviews, document analysis and observation. A total number of fourteen participants were interviewed: Three school principals, three heads of departments (HODs) and eight teachers as indicated in my research methodology. In general I concentrated mostly on the interviews as the major source of information, with the aim of obtaining a clear picture or record from the participants' personal experiences and perceptions of participation in ELM in their school as an organization. The document analysis and observation in this research were used to gather supporting evidence for the interviews' outcomes, because I believe that the reality from the interviews can combine well with the outcomes from document analysis and observation, because both the research instruments focused on the open-ended guiding research questions:

1. Is participative management being practised here at the school? The HODs were asked whether or not the school practised participative management.
1. What is the extent of teachers' participation in school management/decision-making?
2. What are the effects of the democratic style in ELM in school?
3. What is the role of supervisor/the Ministry of Education in terms of teachers' leadership development in participative management?

I managed to get assistance from school managers and HODs. They supplied me with some documents such as the minutes of Management members and Staff meetings, the allocation of duties, school rules, the trimester programmes and also parts of dairies/journal notes quoted from the managers' or HODs' own note book. I used this to complement the participants' interview accounts. I spent almost five days at each school and conducted some observation activities in the school ranging from observation of morning briefing/staff meeting, to observation of some formal and informal principal-teacher interactions. My primary interest during this observation period was to find indicators of democratic ELM such as broader participation, communication, delegation, and empowerment, shared decision-making, shared leadership and teamwork. This was mainly carried out for triangulation purposes of the three

research tools (interviews, document analysis and observation) and consideration of the sub themes or categories that emerged from the data presentations.

## 4.2 School contexts

Since my research method is an interpretative case study, my research concentrated only on three schools in one circuit. The schools are situated between approximately 20 and 90 km to the west of the Kavango region in the North of Namibia, alongside the Kavango River that serves as the perimeter between Namibia and Angola. The three schools consist of a senior secondary, a combined school and a primary school. The schools are all instituted in the rural areas.

The Hakana senior secondary school (pseudonym) is constructed about 200 metres from the tarred road that gives it straightforward access to Rundu town. There is no clinic nearby and it is surrounded by many small shops and shebeens [sic]. The school consists of about 670 learners from grade 8 to 12. The school has 24 teachers, three Heads of Department, and one Principal, both members of school management (SMTs) teach promotional subjects. The school has electricity, two photocopiers, and an administration block that consists of management offices, secretary's office, staff room, store rooms and toilets. There is also a library, a hall, a laboratory and a computer room. The school was fenced a long time ago, but now the fence is getting old. The school has enough teaching staff and all of them have average teaching periods and are highly educated. Learners always use a library and computers despite the lack of materials.

The Nziya combined school (pseudonym) is a cluster centre consisting of six schools. It is also situated about 150 meters away from the tarred road. There are about ten teachers, two additional members of management, one HOD and a principal and 394 learners from grade 1 to 10. There is electricity and a pit latrine (toilets) available for learners and teachers at the school. The school has very small offices, which can only accommodate a principal and the HOD, and very small working space which serves as a staff room or working room for the teachers. There are about 10 classrooms and some temporary structure classes and there are no photocopier machines, no computers at the moment. The school has not been renovated for many years and in one classroom block, wind has damaged the roof and during the rainy season it is impossible for lessons to take place in one of the classrooms. The school environment is very clean. The principal is also teaching promotional subjects. The school

has enough human resources (teachers) and all of them have fewer teaching periods, except the lower primary teachers.

Kazana primary school (pseudonym) is also situated about 150 meters away from the tarred road. There are about seven classrooms and about 260 learners; and there are eight teachers and two store rooms which serve as offices for the principal and HOD. Pit latrines (toilets), electricity and water are available. There is a small photocopier machine which is not being used. The school principal is also teaching and is also a class teacher.

## **4.3 Data presentation**

### **4.3.1 Perceptions of stakeholders on participative management and decision-making**

This section discusses the data of participants' perceptions of participative management in schools. It begins with school management and then the views of teachers and how they experience their participation in school management and decision-making.

#### **4.3.1.1 Principal's perceptions of participative management**

The principals believe that participative management means the involvement of stakeholders and agreed that it is vital that there should be consultation with everyone in decision-making. According to P1 every member of the school should participate because participative management is believed to promote a sense of ownership because by letting them to participate "they also can feel that things belong to them".

For P2, when everyone is involved it leads to commitment in school, while P3 believed that participation in decision-making is everyone's right. He argued that "participative management means everybody in the management should participate that is a sort of democratic participation and everybody has a right to say what he wants to bring in like concerns like proposals and so on". P1 believes that participative management leads to team building and the achievement of common goals.

The principals believed that participative management involved agreement, consultation and the sharing of ideas before taking decisions in schools. P3 believes that "in participative decision-making we tend to agree with the management members, after we have discussed

something” and they cannot make the final decision until everybody has been informed of the decision. He also stressed that it is vital that this is introduced in schools: to involve all the stakeholders “so that we can hear more from their side.”

During my observations, I noticed that school managers understand and are attempting to implement what the articles Act no. 16 of 2001 requires them to do: that parents, teachers and learners should be able to participate in the administration of the school and its activities, since meetings are held at schools to discuss and share data about school issues involving teachers. This was confirmed during school observations and in the minutes of staff meetings that I consulted while visiting the schools. The next section is about the views of the HODs on participative Management and leadership in schools.

#### **4.3.1.2 Heads of department’s perceptions on participative management**

The general feeling of the three HODs was that it is always good if all the members are involved in the management of the school, rather than an individual making decisions and managing a school. They agreed that it is good to involve and to inform everybody so that they are aware of what is going on and what is going to happen. It is necessary for the teachers to raise and share their concerns to the management members if they cannot understand the decision. HOD1 believes that it is good for all the members to share and have information “rather than all the information is coming from one person”.

According to the participants, teachers do take part, but they said that there are also shortcomings involved in participative decision-making. There is some “discrepancy or difference” when you are handling some cases in school because all the stakeholders, including teachers who are school board members and NANTU school committee representatives, have to be involved. HOD1 argued that “In some cases ordinary teachers don’t always agree with some of the issues we want to initiate at the school”

This correlated with the observation recorded on 12/07/11 when teachers opposed the ideas of the principals when they were informed that the school hall was to be a rendezvous place to meet parents. Then the principal asked them to decide themselves where they could meet the parents. One teacher proposed that it would be good for him if he meet them in a class as he needed to talk to the parents and the learners. This is also a sign that teachers sometimes make decisions themselves in schools.

The HODs felt that teachers in their school were partaking in almost every decision through various committees, by contributing their ideas and influencing the decisions of the management, to achieve better decision or solutions. HOD1 argued that “teachers are participating in our decision making and also they are supporting the management members,” while HOD3 also, believed that teachers are more involved in decision-making since there are collective decisions that involve all teachers and management at the school and they all look into school matters horizontal deeply. The document analysis, (documents such as the minutes of staff meetings) confirmed that teachers are also supporting the management, for instance when it comes to the improvement of teacher-parent relationships, which was discussed in a staff meeting on 25/03/11.

The general feelings of the HODs were that sometimes is not good to involve teachers in every decision that is taking place at school, especially when it comes to school performance or policies. HOD3 echoed that sometimes management must take a stand especially when applying policies to avoid confusion, while HOD2 argued that “normally to some extent not always”. Document analysis of 01/02/11 and 17/05/11 also confirmed that the principal of Hakana School involved stakeholders, such as management members and teachers, in debating matters like school results. Similarly, this was observed in other schools documents’, where teachers were involved in decision-making related to school results.

Moreover, HOD3 contended that “participation at the school is going well because everybody is involved, the teachers are being involved, they have to bring in their views to the management and when they come together they come to a conclusion to make a decision for the whole staff”. Teachers take initiatives and make decisions in their committees before informing management of what they think. The minutes of a staff meeting analysed on 13/07/11 confirm that the extra-mural activities committee in Hakana was approved by the management team, and allowed to go ahead with their ideas for the learners to have sport activities on Wednesday every week (24/05/11). HOD1 & HOD2 maintain that when the management believes that the motion is good for the school, management decision can change. The HODs argue that teachers are involved in participative decision-making and they have some power over some school issues since the management cannot not make a final decision if there is resistance or if they did not meet or consult all the members. HOD1 stressed that, they always convene meetings to agree on something but “if certain majority

did not agree, then that decision cannot take place/materialise”. In a similar vein HOD 3 echoed that: “When the group does not support it, sometimes you leave it out; we don’t take action, because the other groups are not taking part”.

I observed on the 13th July 2011: When the teachers were failing to come up with the decision of whether to have grade 12 holiday classes, the principal did not decide on that day, but he gave them until the next day to think about it and express their views.

#### **4.4 Teachers’ views/experiences on their involvement/participation in school decision-making**

There is tension between the views of teachers and the SMT since they differ on the way they experience their involvement in management/decision-making in their schools. However, there seems to be a fifty-fifty result, since some teachers agreed that they are involved in decision-making by contributing, sharing ideas or giving their opinions on whatever problem or decision that was going to be taken according to democratic principles, while some believed that they were not involved in most cases and some said “we are partly involved” (T6). T8 argued that “there is no participative decision-making at the school, there is only one man’s decision”. Similarly, T3 argued that “sometimes you find like in both direction, because you find that sometimes there are decision made with the consideration of the teachers been involved and sometimes there are decision being made without involving teachers”. T5 stressed that:

Sometimes the management sits to decide and then tell us that this is what they are planning to do for us to contribute some information. Sometimes you don’t know what is going on, we just leave it the way they are dealing with issues you don’t understand it, it is the management mostly involve.

However, except at Hakana secondary school, teachers express lack of involvement in school finance. Some believe that they are being involved in participative management and decision-making in schools. T1 says that:

Yes, the reason why I am saying so is because every member of the management (HODs) is issued with responsibilities and even teachers are involved

In a similar vein, T4 echoed that:

Yes, actually democracy exists at the school, when the management decides or when they come up with something they bring it to the staff and then the staff members also have to take and be part and parcel of the decision

However, T4 argued that they all play a role but in some cases the management can decide when they think this is good for the school, and teachers just receive information.

In a similar vein, T2 maintained that:

Most of the time since I have been here, we have to agree upon something, the principal will put something in the staffroom and the teachers have to vote or something, there has to be a majority count before we can agree on something, such as a rule that will be applied or something, we have to agree on it before it will be implemented.

Participants believe that “our involvement has to do with democracy, if the principal make decisions or something without notifying us, then we won’t be able to take part, since we have the right to do so” (T2). T2 & T6 argued that “that whatever decision to be made, we have to agree upon it, before we will be able to take part” (T2). T6 believed that:

Participative management is being applied in the sense that we are consulted as regards any change that the school wants to attempt to make. This means we participate partly in decision-making of the school management.

Furthermore, T7 asserted that they are always involved when it comes to management things, “if one teacher is to be involved, the teacher will be called and explains on what must be done”. However, T7 argued that, in most cases “most of the things are being dealt with by the principal, he first explained to you that now teacher A has to do a, b, c and teacher B has to do a, b, c d”.

The Hakana document analysis of 27/01/10 indicated that the teachers are involved in management of the school by suggesting for instance the school comes up with some policies to reduce the movement of learners since the teachers believed that the movement contributed to poor results. My observation of decisions taken at the school on the 15/07/11 revealed the management’s decision alone of informing staff about when they have to be at school for parents’ meetings. The teachers were not asked to debate on the time when they needed to report. However the effort of trying to involve teachers in the discussion was observed when they were asked “do you have anything to raise?”

On the issue of the learners not doing homework, I observed that the principals gave an order to the teachers to take it up with the learners’ parents. On the issues of school budget the Hakana School reports to the stakeholders and teachers are involved in prioritizing the needs for the school. However T5, T6, and normally T8, disclosed their concerns about their lack of involvement in participative decision-making concerning school finances. At the same time

T7 stressed that he is not receiving money from the learners, but the school bought a photocopier which everyone has contributed to. The qualities of the approach are discussed in the next section.

#### **4.5 The qualities of participative management and decision-making**

Participation in ELM is believed to promote a sense of ownership, empowerment, commitment, achievement, teamwork and proper decision-making in a school as an organization. This section focuses on some of these factors, beginning with ownership as indicated by participants.

##### **4.5.1 Promote a sense of ownership in school.**

Participants, especially school principals, believed that one of the important factors of participation in ELM is to promote a sense of ownership, since it is believed that it motivates and unites staff members. HOD1 argued that “once all stakeholders are involved in decision-making, results in unification of the group which is better than isolating members”. He further argued that “it is important to be involved so that, at the end of the day, the decision that we are taking have to be ours not for a certain members or certain group”. In a similar vein, HOD3 contributed:

If you involve them you are motivating them even they themselves can do it. They have also to feel part of decision-making so that they can be able to do it even by themselves, and because you are motivating them they develop also that ownership.

The principal of Hakana senior secondary stressed that the advantage of participation is for the stakeholders “to have an ownership of what is to be done and when to be done and where can it be carried out as one”. In a similar vein, P2, contended that it is very good to apply participative management because, “first of all a person have to feel free, they have to feel that ownership, that we are also the owner of the school, they have to feel it and when they feel it you will see everything is running smoothly”.

Furthermore, P3 believed that participative management could “encourage ownership to the teachers, so they feel their school is theirs so they have also the right to participate democratically and they have got the platforms to say what they want to say and they must feel also ownership of the school”. Teachers also divulged that it is very important to get involved in participative management so that they could develop that ownership, and that they could also do or say whatever they wanted to say concerning the school as long as it

benefitted all the stakeholders, not only satisfied an individual. T6 stressed that once everybody participated actively, it would let him/her “feel to be the owner of that specific place and the person feels welcome, but if the person is giving a brilliant idea and that idea is concluded wrongly, that creates an environment not conducive to learning”. Teachers stressed that once people were not included in management and decision-making it affect them because their ideas/opinions are not recognised. T3 concluded that:

The more teachers are allowed to participate in the decision-making the more they will feel proud of a certain organisation, for example a school, if they can say this is my school, they will feel more inclined to work harder.

My observation noted that once teachers are being involved in management they can develop this ownership, since teachers had already started developing caring attitudes demonstrated by their cleaning of and fencing of the school environment. This was noted on 25/07/11 at Kazana Primary during morning briefing and I observed that the approach can nurture teachers for leadership roles.

#### **4.5.2 The preparation/development of teachers for leadership position**

The research participants indicated that participative management is important since it serves as a means of preparing and developing teachers for leadership positions, because through their involvement in school activities they will gain more “knowledge and skills how to do things on their own”. As a result T1 & T2 stated that “sometimes the school principal reads and distributes some handouts” to the teachers to develop their knowledge and skills in school management. P1 echoed that sometimes he used to spend time with the staff reading the principal manual from the first page and discuss it with them, like “this one today and tomorrow morning we will discuss this one” with the rationale of “building those people so that they also become leaders one day”.

P2 stressed that:

Teachers’ involvement in management is very important because they are also leaders on their own and if they have to run the office without you moulding them to become leaders then you totally neglect their capability and skills at the same time.

Furthermore P3 argued that he “equip[s] everybody with the work around the school, so that everybody supposed to be aware what is supposed to be done even in the absence of the principal”, he believed that this serves also as “professional development” for their own future. Furthermore HOD1 echoed that they involved teachers “so that they have to learn” and know how they “can run a school smoothly”, since everybody is a member of the

organisation they need such staff development exercise. He believed participative management is good encouragement for the running of schools (HOD1).

HOD3 echoed that, especially during parent and staff meetings, the management delegates' teachers to lead meetings as a way of empowering them and sharing tasks for leadership development purposes. According to P2, "managers must know that they will not live forever". She further said that they should remember that "Those people will also become leaders so now if they don't take part what leaders do you expect who are the future leaders then".

However, some teachers believed that there was no identification of future leaders taking place in their school. T4 argued that she "won't say we are being supported or that kind of activities take place at this school whereby potential candidates are identified and developed to become leaders, no". According to HOD1, teachers were afraid of failure because they tried several times to include some teachers to develop their skills in doing some management tasks, "for example even summary register" one term but they were inactive. T1 & T3 maintained that teachers are "afraid of responsibilities and afraid of failures," that is why they don't want to participate. They thought that participative management that served as in-service training helped develop teachers for leadership responsibilities (T2).

At Nziya combined school, on 18/07/11, I observed that the school principal was sharing responsibilities and sharing leadership roles during morning briefing with some teachers. In the document analysis of Kahana, it was revealed that the principal delegated a member of management to lead a fundraising function on his behalf. Furthermore there are various committees established at the school for the purpose of participation of staff such as in school finance, disciplinary committees, extra-mural activities, debate clubs, as noted on the allocation of duties and document analyses (13/02/11 and 12/07/09).

In addition to that the participants indicated that there were various committees in place that assist with the administration and leadership of various activities in schools. P1 asserted that "teachers are involved in various committees, you will find there are various committees that we have at the school just to mention a few, we have tour committee, we have farewell committee ... and there are many committees these teachers are distributed" amongst to perform those activities. This is also a sign that teachers are playing at least a role in the management of the school and that sometimes they are being prepared for leadership

purposes, because those teachers will at least know, for example, how to budget, plan, and doing things in teams.

#### 4.5.3 Foster teamwork

Participative management was perceived to encourage teamwork in schools. The participants, especially the HODs, believed that teamwork involve good cooperation, collaboration, trust and understanding among organisation members who work together to solve problems or make decisions that they face in their school. HOD3 argued that “When there is teamwork, it does not matter how much power you have, you have to decide together”. All the HODs believed that there was teamwork and that it was working effectively. HOD1 argued that “especially at our school it is working”. HOD3 echoed the same sentiment, saying that:

Normally I can say that there is teamwork here, when it comes to decision-making, there is teamwork, because even though the management has power we still have to listen to them for us to make decisions.

In a similar vein, HOD2 also believed that there is teamwork at their school, because teachers normally work as a team, they meet and they discuss problems related to their phases or subject matter. HOD3 stated that:

Teachers and management are working together when it comes to decision-making, whenever problems arise or any issues pertaining to the school, we are collaborating, because it is collective from the management to the ordinary teachers. It is very effective.

Furthermore, all three principals indicated that there was teamwork as well as teambuilding at their schools, while P2 emphasised that teamwork/team building at her school was very strong because there were more female teachers than males. However, P1 was of the opinion that, “we have always been trying to build teamwork, but it has only started to work this year because of the new teachers who have joined us”. T3 echoed that: “since I started at the school we always talked about teamwork, but it was only last year that we could see an improvement. For almost four or five years we couldn’t see that people are willing to work together as a team and this year there has been some development.” Document analyses for school management and staff meetings held during 28/05/2009 and 2010, revealed that there was a problem at Hakana School in terms of teamwork. According to P3:

If participation is not going to materialise, the outcomes will be no team spirit, there will be no team building and the decisions will be taken by one individual in the organisation, which will affect the whole organisation.

Furthermore, P3 said that if participation is low, then it is very hard to create teamwork and it is very hard to reach a common goal. P2 stated that teamwork created healthy relationships amongst workers. According to P1, he encouraged teachers to participate and to “work together as a team since there is no organisation that will succeed if there is no teamwork and everyone has to participate”. T8 claimed that “we are few at this school but there is no teamwork” because there are people who exclude themselves from doing something at school. In a similar vein, participants believed that teamwork does not materialise, that they are not involved in decision-making, and that favouritism is practised at their school. Some teachers argued that in terms of teamwork, “we only work together when it comes to teaching aspects, however at taking decisions, we are not taken care of only certain people whom the manager favours are considered,” (T6). According to T6, “this means people will not participate actively in the management decisions”. The teacher believed that “ethically there was a problem, tribally there was a problem, and trust is also a problem”, and this affected their creativity and innovation.

#### **4.5.4 Encourage creativity and innovation**

In general, participative management is believed to be a motivating reason for staff to be creative in their organisations. According to the participants, especially from the teachers’ perspective, the approach was actually good because it encouraged all members to participate in decision-making openly and to say whatever things they wanted to say or to express how they felt. T6 stressed that the “importance of participative management is to lobby for creative ideas”. Participants believed that if teachers were “allowed or empowered to participate they could do a lot and come up with good solutions”, as well as various ideas on how the school could be run more smoothly for the benefit of learners and the school as a whole.

T2 stressed that if all teachers participated, “they will be willing to abide by the rules and be willing to do whatever is needed”. Teachers believed that by doing that, new ideas would arise, since “people are different and talents are different”. Hence “I will come up with something new that will lead to development” (T2). In a similar vein, P2 remarked that “once they realise that you don’t trust them, those people will not build self-confidence”, and “anything that will go wrong at the school, they will still wait for you to respond”. P1 corroborated that teachers “should also provide their own views on how things need to be done so instead for them just waiting and waiting to be fed”. However, teachers argued that there was no transparency when it comes to decision-making. T6 held that:

Some ideas are taken, some are being implemented but some are not being implemented, you keep on waiting for these things to be implemented but the implementation process does not transpire.

As a result, teachers believed that this contributes to them just keeping quiet or not participating further, because whatever they said would not manifest as suggested. Hence, T6 argued that whenever they had a meeting or morning briefing, “I just keep quiet, because whatever I say will not be taken into consideration”. My observation on the 18/07/11 revealed that after a member of the management finished addressing the staff, he asked them whether they had anything to say. But all of them were quiet, just as T5 disclosed during an interview. There was no real encouragement such as “let’s talk” and so on. T8 also argued that “at this school there is no motivation, I am not promoted honestly I am not being promoted.

However, managers responded saying “it is important that views of others need to be taken into account, in that gives you an advantage of progressing”, and when one allows them to bring in their “views also everyone will do that task according to his or her understanding” (P1). I observed during my stay at Hakana School that the principal was really attempting to let those teachers be creative and innovative, by involving them in discussion, but the teachers did not give their positive side of participation.

On the question of principal’s qualities, I probed the teachers. T4 argued that her principal is a “person who is open and he give opportunities to say what you feel or what you have or what you want to bring under the attention of the others”. Participants believed that creativity or innovation “can only be encouraged by opening up sharing everything with your teachers”. P1 maintain that by applying an “open door policy whereby any teacher can come into your office and ask whatever he might needs” could motivate the generation of new ideas in schools. P2 argued that she involved teachers since the “younger ones they are so flexible of movement” when it comes to new ideas ...The principal will not always run around because everyone is participating, everyone is collecting and we bring the collections together”.

She likened participation to a working body, claiming “the body does not have only a head ...it should have all the parts then it is a body”. In a similar vein, SMTs argued that equal participation “plays a very big role, whenever you are introducing participative management in the school, it can make your work easier, because many participants can bring their concerns, can bring their likes and they can bring their plans and techniques to reach a solution (P3 & HOD2). In contrast, principals stressed that there are “certain things teachers

have to do on their own especially when it comes in the class room” and it was confirmed that teachers have limited rights to take decisions on their own (P1 &T7).

#### **4.5.5 Foster quality decisions**

The research participants indicated that democratic decisions always result in better decisions than ones made by one person alone. Participants believed that participative decisions, shared decisions and joint decisions could result in better decisions, and an organisation with higher achievements, better cooperation and better relationships in schools. According to P2 “when everyone is not involved it might cause contradiction, misunderstanding and misinterpretation.” For this reason T8, T7, and P1 believed that it was good if all members were involved, and that there was “compromise” rather than “rushing to a conclusion”, for decisions to be made in a mature manner. HOD1 held that through a participative method, a leader could be directed better on “how to handle or how to decide on certain things”. In a similar vein, T4 stressed that “teachers and each and every one can participate in making a right decision which is to the benefit of the learners”. Furthermore, T8 maintained that:

There are always better results when people are involved in decision-making: you always give good ideas and avoid the bad ones. Because when you decide alone you would not know what others are thinking, you would not become more effective at what you are doing.

Moreover, some participants thought that participative management and decision-making in ELM could mean the avoidance of pointing of fingers, blaming one another and antagonism among the staff, and it could also result in better performance. T3 argued that “when bad things happen people could not come to point fingers at one another” while T4 also shared the same sentiment: that whenever a decision that involved participation is taken, “I should also be accountable for whatever...decision that is taken, I cannot point a finger at someone if a problem arises”. However, T2, T3, T5 & T6 argued that their school lacks transparency as regards decisions because most of the decisions that are taken do not transpire or are not implemented. As a result, they thought that the best way for them to resolve the matter was perhaps by being quiet and not contributing during meetings (T6 & T2). T2 believed that if the management become serious about doing something about the challenges of participative management “I am sure that we will improve the performance of the school.”

## 4.6 Challenges of participative management (PM) in schools

### 4.6.1 Authoritarian leadership

Apart from the members of management teams, the majority of teachers believed that autocratic domination still prevails in the way in which managers make decisions. Further evidence of autocratic leadership of certain management activities in the schools is documented in the minutes of the MC and staff meetings where decisions were taken only by managements. T2 & T3 claimed that “sometimes there are decisions being made without involving teachers and sometimes it will be like autocratic” whereby the manager will just decide that one has to do something, and “if you don’t do it, come and see me in my office”. T5, T6 & T8 revealed that autocratic leadership still prevailed. Management members stressed that “sometimes you have to be autocratic although democratic is most important, but autocratic sometime have to apply especially in decision making” and there should be a “limit of participation”. (HOD1, HOD2, P3).

In a similar vein, T8 revealed that at their school the “major challenges is only one man’s decision not for everyone, part of the staff are excluded” and “there is nothing like democratic here it is just autocratic”. T6 echoed that “I think authoritarian leadership still exists or partly exists at the school”. According to T7 “I am not part and parcel of problem solving” or the “management” and there is nothing that he could do in terms of decision-making, he could only wait and see what would be decided and then do what he is told. He doesn’t do anything in terms of finance either, nor receiving or expenditure, it is only the principal who has the power to buy things, “us we receive only report that we bought a fax machine, computer, etc.

The participants thought that those were some of the problems that were causing them to abstain from participating in school management and decision-making in school. My observation detected that the teachers did not share responsibilities with the management at one school; even the HOD did not play his role as a second in command. Since every managerial responsibility was with the principal, the teachers are given only extra-mural activities. T7 claimed that “everything here is done by the principal”.

#### 4.6.2 Fear of responsibilities/unwillingness to accept responsibilities

One of the challenges of participative management as identified by the participants is the unwillingness of some staff to accept responsibility, and fear of failure. Participants revealed that the management was always trying to invite them to participate in decision-making but teachers were not willing to participate. Some participants believed that the reason why managers sometimes take solitary decisions is because teachers don't want to participate in decision-making. T1 argued that "the main reason is that some teachers don't want responsibilities, they are afraid of responsibilities and at the same time, they are afraid of a heavy workload". T3 argued that:

Sometimes, some principals are forced to do that due to the fact that you find that some teachers are misbehaving, they don't like to participate in school activities.

HOD2 contended that when "teachers hesitate, that is when the management will come in and try to decide on their behalf," while HOD1 believed that sometimes teachers are unwilling to accept responsibility "due to the fact that maybe he is afraid to go where the other people are going or sometimes he might be afraid of failure." In contrast, the teachers in this study indicated that they are willing to participate and perform responsibilities at their school, and argued that the problem was that they were not really involved by the school managers. T5, T6, T7, and T8 share a similar sentiment of lack of involvement in decision-making. According T8, when you are involved in the administration work or decision-making you "will learn a lot, you will learn from them and it is good when you learn the first time, because then the second time won't be so hard".

The unwillingness to participate in school issues was observed during my stay at the three research sites, and HOD1 also confirmed that "teachers' participation in decision-making, it is not 100% I may say like that, let me say maybe 70 to 80%". Furthermore, HOD2 share a similar view that teachers are not "proactive, because the decision they are trying to make might affect them later ... they will be reluctant and unwilling to do it". HOD3 stressed that "teachers are sometimes defensive" they argue because they don't want to take part in the responsibilities. In contrast, T3 & T5 argued that principals don't ask for ideas from people "like what we can do about this given situation?" The teachers believed that the principals are not willing to involve them and don't encouraging people to participate. As a result "people will start distancing themselves from the decision" thinking that they were not accountable for decisions. Teachers may then start to behave as though they were only to receive information, and not play a role in its generation.

### 4.6.3 Challenge of accountability

Participants believed that accountability is the root cause of managers making solitary decisions, instead of involving other stakeholders or applying participative decision making. T1 & T4 argued that participative management is good but sometimes if things did not go well in school the person who would be accountable would not be teachers, but the school principals. T1 believed that:

Teachers are also accountable but who is on top, it is the manager. So the manager is accountable. Because he is the head of the school, he is responsible to answer all the questions.

In a similar vein, T4 stressed that the principal is accountable, for example, when it comes to grade 10 outcomes, “but he is not the one accountable for teaching that grade,” and “it will be also the teachers, such as me, as the one teaching the grade, who is accountable for that result”. However, T4 argues that whatever goes wrong in school “he is the one to be attacked and not me and he is the one to answer on my behalf also”. HOD3 maintained that sometimes you have to take “a stand ... applies like the policies and all those stuffs”. However, document analysis indicates that the principal of Hakana requested that the HODs to be responsible for their departments, which means they have to be accountable for everything that is going on in their subjects. As a result of accountability some teachers and members of the management believed that there should be a limitation on the amount of involvement of teachers in decision-making. HOD3 & P1 argued that:

Sometimes you can listen, but you should only take on some of what they say. The problem is if you involve them too much they can mislead you, so sometimes you have to take a stand together and make a decision to avoid confusion.

In a similar vein, P3 & P1 believed that “too much participation in the management or decision-making can also affect the organization, for example, if you listen to both sides, and you would like to accommodate all the ideas or points of view, at the end of the day it will be hard for you to reach the solution” ...and “different views might lead to failure because you give them too much room”. P1 argues that “people like democratic participation ...but as a leader you should limit the amount of participation in decision-making”. Both managers felt that participative management sometimes “leads to failure, and it is not always successful”, because in participative management everyone would like to offer his own views, “different views can lead to failure.”

My observation also indicated that whatever happens at schools the principal was accountable. P1 argued that “when thing comes back the accountable person will be the principal”. On the 11/07/11 I observed as P1 indicated that when learners boycotted classes, the media goes first to the principal to find out why, and even the regional office was staring at the principal. Therefore, the participants believed that the person accountable is the principal, because he is the “one to be seen everywhere, teachers nowhere to be seen” (P1). As a result, principals thought the involvement of teachers in decision-making consumed time in schools.

#### **4.6.4 Time consuming method**

Time consumption is believed by the participants to be a stumbling block since the method demands that everyone shares the same view and has a clear understanding of the situation before a final decision can be made. HOD1 contended that the “democratic principle is time consuming, because you have to involve all the stakeholders at all levels; you have to convince them to agree before anything can be decided”. According to HOD1 “Some of the participatory members who are involved might just argue for the sake of arguing, or they may argue just to make sure that something is not decided on”.

P2 maintained that “sometimes teachers look at their own advantages and forget the advantages of the school” like in case of starting time during winter time. As a result P1 stressed that there must be a limitation “because at the end of the day you want things to be done at a given time”. He also believed that “the moment you give them too much power they might overrule some of the things”. However some teachers believed that making a decision on the basis of time was not a good idea.

T2 argued that “it is very risky” to decide alone. She believed that this happen, where principals make decisions without consulting others, while T3 stressed that “if there is not enough time for consultation, then decisions just have to be made”. T2 claimed that “when I have ample time then I consult others before I make a final decision”, because otherwise “others will not abide by it” because they would not be happy because they were not the one who made the decision and so things would not work out as it planned. P1 maintained that “there are certain things that we can carry out immediately and there are certain things that can be postponed to a certain time and there are certain things that must be done immediately because of the situation on the ground”. Teachers have a role to play, but not always.

## 4.7. The role of school leaders in Participative Management and Decisions (PMD)

### 4.7.1 Delegation and sharing of responsibilities

Delegation and sharing of responsibilities is believed by participants to be one of the main responsibilities of the leaders in promoting teacher participation in school management and decision-making, as it involves in-service training for development purpose, whereby teachers are supposed to learn management routines and skills. HOD2 argued that sharing of responsibilities with teachers was a “very good experience because every teacher or every management member will know the role of the principal or the role of the HOD since they go through experience and gain skills on how they can do certain things”. In a similar vein, school principals believed that they are sharing responsibilities with their teachers with the aim of letting them know the responsibilities of management. P1 stressed that:

The aim is to equip everybody with the work around the school, so that everybody is aware of what they are supposed to be doing even in the absence of the principal, so that they should take note that this one is their responsibility and this is what they are supposed to be doing.

Furthermore, P1 argued that “when I delegate responsibilities I have to make clear what is expected from every individual”. He said “I have to explain this and this and this to teacher A, B, C and D, this is what we have to do and teacher B this and this is what you have to do”.

This sounds like an autocracy, but principals maintain that they delegated tasks to staff members. T8 asserted that there was “no sharing of responsibilities” at their school. As I said previously in this chapter, my observation at one school noted that the only responsibilities given to teachers were of extramural activities, whereby the teachers who served as members of management were responsible for collecting money from parents or learners as articulated by T7, while the rest of the responsibilities were for the HOD and principal (T8).

However, P3 argued that before the meetings took place, “we allocate duties to the staff members so that everybody would get the chance to say something during the meetings”. P3 emphasised that “especially when it comes to parent meetings” the management gives everybody a task or responsibility to share their knowledge with the parents. P3 believed that teachers could also participate, because “they can also lead since they are leaders also”.

HOD2 held that he asked the colleagues, when they are in the group, to share responsibilities by getting them to do different managerial activities together, while HOD3 echoed that “we

used to share responsibilities with teachers, by delegating them tasks such as sport, choir, culture”... and also ... “we delegate the work of the management to them, even administrative work”. HOD2 believed that “through that delegation, we are playing a role; we are exchanging activities and encouraging teachers so that they can know what to do, and then together we decide as a group”.

Furthermore the principals argued that not everyone around the school was prepared to be a leader or to accept managerial responsibilities. P2 argued that “not everyone is interested in managing, not everyone is interested”, while P3 shared a similar view: “do not expect everyone here to like the management style, leadership is meant for some people only, not for everyone”. However, the principals believed that their role, when they delegated responsibilities to the teachers, was to ensure that the responsibility was completed. P1 & P3 claimed that “when I delegate something to the teachers, my role there is for me to monitor whether these things are being carried out or not” so when you delegate you have to monitor and evaluate. HOD1 argued that empowerment by showing people what he has to do is also important in participative leadership.

#### **4.7.2 Decentralization of authorities to the teachers and empowerment**

There was feeling among the participants of the study that the principals were playing their role by decentralizing power to staff members. However, principals claim that teachers have no power to go beyond their given authority. T2 asserted that “there is a rule that says that if a class teacher has a problem, try to solve it on your own”. However, teachers believed that they had no power or authority to decide on something on their own, because the final decision lay with the principal. According P1:

There are certain things the teachers have to do on their own or they can control on their own, especially when it comes to the classroom, if a learner makes noise that learner doesn't need my attention; it is the teacher that needs to take care of that.

Teachers thought that they had authority to decide or to take action especially in their classrooms (T4, T5 & T3). The SMTs maintained that teachers “are not allowed to go beyond the given power, if they go further then there is a problem.” (P1 & HOD3). Hence, P1 maintained that when teachers “make a decision they should consult me”. According to T1 sometimes the management “makes suggestions, then they will bring it to the staff,” and what the staff can do is “look at it, we decide what we want, we start elaborating and contributing, to shape decisions until we find the final one.” Participants believed that through this process, if your suggestion is supported by the majority, then it can be taken. However, participants

believed that learner problems were referred to the disciplinary committee, and that they are the ones to make a final decision and inform the principal. In contrast, T4 argues that:

It depends, because the teacher is always in direct contact with the learners in a class, if something happens in the class, and the teacher feels that there is no solution, unless the parents need to be brought in, the teacher can decide to suspend a learner, but he has to inform the principal, because a teacher himself cannot decide to suspend a learner without informing the principal.

The respondents revealed that the role of the managers in terms of the decentralization of authority, management functions and diffusion of power, is believed to be a challenge in some schools. T5 believed that “if we can be given rights I think we can get involved and make decisions”. In a similar vein, T3 argued that they are not empowered as such, as “we do not have the mandate to decide on many school issues, but sometimes we are able to offer information before the decision is made”.

Furthermore, T8 argued that “there is no empowerment at the school”. My observation found that all managerial work such as summary registers, teachers’ attendance, budget and expenditure is all done by the principal. T7 confirmed that everything is done by the principal; teachers have no authority over finance. However, T4 believed that their principal sometimes shared power with his subordinates, “because power sometimes is limited you cannot give everything” but normally when he is away “he will let someone to take over, and whatever matters come up, that person should be in his footsteps then he can apply or solve problems in his absence. He is decentralizing power to the management member it does not mean that when he is not there then the school cannot be run, so the school is going normal” (T4). Document analyses done on 27/07 and 18/07/11 revealed delegation of power to staff members by P2 to do what they can in their departments except in solving conflicts.

#### **4.7.3 Involving subordinates in conflict resolution.**

One of the roles of the principals or school managers is to involve teachers in conflict resolution. The principals believed that they are involving teachers in participative management when it comes to conflict resolutions, but it depends on what kind of issue needs to be solved. P1 & P2 stressed that when problems arise that “need everyone then everyone should be involved but when it is confidential, you don’t need everyone.” Some school conflicts require only the management. P3 reiterated that some information “is very sensitive, you have to handle it at management level”, T3 also echoed the same sentiment that some

information is confidential and as a result, “staff members are just informed of the latest development of what is going on”. P1 believed that:

We involve the SB members from the beginning if the problem goes on, we can also involve the teachers and if we cannot reach a solution we can also ask the inspector to come and join us.

HOD1 & T1 stressed that at school level during conflict resolution, “ teachers those who are SB members and also teachers who are NANTU members have to be involved”, while HOD2 echoed that teachers, learners and the SB had to be involved in conflict solution. With an eyewitness problem “you have to call them into your office, and then you discuss it”. HODs believed that teachers are more involved in conflict solutions. HOD2 argued that normally if we have a meeting, “we ask the teachers to bring in their views, their problems then we look at those views or points, and then we ask them what they suggest” and “then we decide as a group”. Similarly, HOD3 argued that when a problem arises, both the SMTs and teachers “need to tackle it whereby we have to look at the matter and then we stand on one point”.

Participants believed that teachers needed to be involved so as to get ideas from them, “because these are the people involved with whom you are going to work”, and “they are the people who mostly interact with the learners. Even though you can decide, you need their contribution; you have to hear it from them”. “Whenever we have a problem we have to involve them” (HOD3). T1 also argued that “since they are not deciding on their own”, SMTs are promoting teachers to help them in whatever decision they are taking. In contrast, T2 argued that, “sometimes there are problems which are solved; if it is small issue, they will look at it, if the management brings it to the teachers”.

T1, T4 & T7 believed that they are involved in conflict resolution, but T5, T6 & T8, by contrast, thought that they are not really involved in conflict resolution. T3 claimed that:

Some individual staff members are also involved in looking for a mechanism that can be used in order to solve a certain conflict that arises. It is not necessary for everyone to come together as a group to discuss the issue, but if it is a problem like absenteeism, for example, it can be dealt with by all the staff members.

However T5 & T8 maintained that they were not involved in conflict resolution. T5 claimed that “I don’t think there are conflicts which are solved here”. She referred to the teacher who used to be absent when he needed to be consulted. No minutes of meetings indicated that the principal had involved teachers to confer about the issue of teachers’ absenteeism.

#### 4.7.4 Organising meetings and exchanging of information (communication)

Meetings and communication are essential in any organization to determine the practice of participative management. Both management members of the three schools who participated in the study indicated that the only opportunities that were provided to meet and discuss any issues pertaining to schools were through meetings and that's where they normally communicated and shared information with teachers or parents. HOD1 argues that "in most cases when we are initiating something for example ...maybe changing of rules and so on, then we have to plan a meeting and then in this meeting we have to talk about certain things which we want to change". HOD2 also shared the same sentiment, saying that "normally if we have a meeting, we ask the teachers to bring in their views, their problems" to look at as a group and share information. This was echoed by P1: "during staff meetings, everyone can participate" to share his/her views, while P3 also argued that "we are accepting any participation in the meetings and we guarantee a platform for them to bring up their concerns".

Furthermore, some participants believed that the floor of communication is fine in all directions: there's proper communication from the manager to the teacher, because that depends now on what type of information we need to communicate (T3, T4, and T6). However HOD1 stressed that management members:

Are encouraging teachers in communication because communication is very important. Once you are lacking communication, then the running of the school will be affected due to the fact that information has to reach this person or group.

SMTs believe that they are applying an open door policy to motivate teachers in school. HOD2 argued that their principal applied "open door policies" and "teachers who have concerns are free to approach me to help solve their problems". P1 reiterated that if you want your staff to communicate with you "sit around and have a discussion, make an open door policy whereby any teacher can come into your office and ask whatever he might need". T3 argued that "participative management is very important in that approach people could learn from one another in the process of sharing information... because you are able to get valuable information from other people, because one can learn from another, the manager can also learn from the teachers, you never know."

According to P1, "sometimes I give the information directly to them or sometimes they get information from their head of department". P1 highlighted that he created a culture of having a management meeting, a staff meeting, a departmental meeting and a subject meeting

at the beginning of every term.” P3 stressed that “the only platform that we can make use of is during meetings, but if you want to explain something, maybe we can call an urgent meeting and invite the teachers to participate in the management decisions”. P1 held that “if there is a lot of information to be shared, if they don’t get an opportunity during staff meetings, they might have their views aired during the departmental meetings or during subject meetings”.

The document analysis indicated a number of meetings that were held at the schools; in some cases the principals encouraged his HODs to use the departmental meetings as a panacea for teachers to view their concerns and to reduce the resistance to change (Hakana). In general, all the schools were applying participative management through means of meetings as a way of sharing information. P2 believed that communication helped to “create healthy relationships, and encourage team building in schools.” However some teachers felt that there is no communication at the school, for example T2 stressed that “the floor of communication is quite inactive”, because everyone is on his own and everyone deals with his own problems.” My observation of schedules revealed a lack of active communication and teamwork at these events.

#### **4.7.5. Establishing of school committees and Teamwork**

Participative management is believed to encourage the establishment of school structures such as committees and teams. It is seen as a way to involve teachers in school activities and to share responsibilities. Principals believe that they are involving all the teachers in management by creating various committee structures and encouraging them to work as a team as observed in the allocation of duties. P1 argued that:

Teachers are involved in various committees ... that we have at the school, just to mention a few, a tour committee, a farewell committee, a tea fund committee, an academic committee, an admissions committee, and others

The principals believed that every member of the school belonged to a certain committee. Some teachers echoed that everyone is allowed to participate through committees. T1 & HOD1 argued that:

Every staff member is involved in management because there are different departments at the school, like a sports committee, the language department, culture and extramural activities. Certain members - around five staff members - are part of the structures running specific activities.

According to HOD1, there are many groups and organisation structures. “All those groups have to report to the principal on what they did or what they have decided, so that at the end of the day some of that decision-making has to be included into the daily running of school activities”. T2 argued that part of participative management, is when teachers are given opportunities to become head of something, be it a coach of a certain sport, or a chairperson of a committee.

In terms of teamwork, participants believed that any organization that does not encourage teamwork could not achieve its common goal. P1 stressed that he do motivate them to “participate and to work together” as mentioned in section 4.5.3. P3 echoed that it was very important to work together as a team because if people do not exercise team spirit in a school “it will create division, reduce work and teamwork will be much less” and it is very hard for an organization to reach its “common goal”. P3 believed that sometimes teamwork is vital to get everybody to work together as a team, without division. Document analysis revealed that there were committees existing at the three schools, but tasks given to teachers at some schools were less meaningful, since these were only extramural activities such as sport, choir, culture etc, as stated by T7 & T8. The class visit consisting of SMTs at Hakana did not function well and as a result the principal requested the HODs to improve and at one school the principal was the only one responsible for buying school materials and everything was the responsibility of the principal. At one school, there was no budget report given to the teachers, and as a result teamwork and development of leaders is affected, to my understanding.

#### **4.8 The stakeholders’ need for participative leadership development**

In-service training and leadership workshops are believed to develop teachers’ management knowledge and skills for effective performance of school activities. Respondents believed that nothing is being done in terms of leadership development, especially at the circuit level, and even the Ministry of Education is not doing enough to train teachers for participative leadership purposes. P1 argued that:

The circuit or the Ministry of Education is not doing enough, because you find that some teachers haven’t attended a single workshop since they were appointed, they are just there to teach. So there is no development going on, there is nothing.

Similarly, P3 argued that “The Ministry is not doing quite enough, “it is only at the school level or circuit level where they can exercise participative management, but at the Ministry itself, the effort is not big enough to exercise participative management at the school”.

Furthermore, the principals also admitted that they were not conducting workshops or training for leadership development purposes, but P1 stressed that what he normally does at his school to attempt develop his teachers is giving “handouts” as mentioned in the previous section, while P2 claimed that he used to rotate the members of the management to develop their leadership skills. He argues that “in this way they learn how to become a manager or to be part of managerial activities”.

Therefore participants believed that it is very important for teachers and even principals to be trained, and to have at least an induction programme. P1 stressed that “currently at circuit level we organise workshops for circuit management (CM) teachers only when they go for subject meetings”, while P2 echoed that “the only meetings that are conducted are those in the management but not for ordinary teachers to be trained as a leader”. Similarly, HOD1 stressed that at circuit level “they are not doing much although sometimes they are calling only principals to talk about some school issues, especially the running of the school and that stuff, but they are not doing much about leadership with ordinary members or teachers”

Participants believed that training especially for novice teachers was “supposed to be done for leadership skills to be developed.” P1 maintained that, for instance, even us principals, when we are appointed we were just given the position then we have to start from scratch, no induction, nothing”. P3 echoed that novice teachers:

Need slight training, before or after they have joined the profession, because they are lacking different skills and the quality at large is not enough. They need to do training also...they want to be given some training in the school itself so that they can perform the work better.

In contrast some participants like T2 argued that “mostly staff don’t take advice from the young teachers, because they are labelled as... young, and even coming from the university, they don’t have knowledge and skills that, old teachers who have been in the profession for many years, so they know what they are doing, most of the time, they don’t take their contribution, even if they want to contribute in solving problems”. Some participants argue that they are contributing to that and their decision can also count (HOD3, T2 & T5).

Participants indicated that the MoE is not doing enough, “because they are the ones training teachers at the colleges, but when those teachers join the teaching profession, then they are dropped or left on their own. The Ministry must still try to feed them with some leadership skills”. P1 believes that teachers have to be “provided with information and so on. At the end of the day when those people are appointed as managers, then they will know already what to do”. Participants believed that “if the Ministry doesn’t involve everyone in their decision making” or principals “exclude them from participation then people will lack a lot of information/skills that should be a part of education” (P2)

However principals accepted that there is no programme in place but, they are encouraging teachers to get involved. P3 stressed that it is the responsibility of the mentor teacher to train others, especially novice teachers at school. The document analysis and observation at the schools indicated that schools are trying to encourage teachers to participate but not via workshops. However, P1 showed me some documents which he hands out to the teachers about classroom activities. According P1, he did it himself in order to let them know what they were supposed to do at school. The next section is the conclusion of Chapter four.

#### **4.9 Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have presented the data I have obtained mostly from the participants, especially interviews, school documents such as minutes of Management meetings and Staff meetings, allocation of duties, journal notes, and organisational structures. However, journal notes were not available at the senior secondary and only part of the data was available from the other two schools. Here I also presented some personal observations of events/activities as a participant observer in the three schools which took me about three weeks and some days. The three methods that I used appeared to support the literature and research questions. Mostly, the data used in this chapter originated from interviews as other tools were just used to support the evidence provided by the participants according to their perceptions, understanding and experience of participative management. In the next chapter, I discuss the data findings.

## **Chapter Five**

### **Data findings and presentations**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

In this chapter I discuss the data as it was provided by the participants in light of my research question and literatures review. The discussion is based on the perceptions, experiences and understanding of the teachers' participation in management and decision-making that surfaced as the main themes or categories in the data in Chapter Four. Other themes that emerged from the data and that also form part of this chapter are: political and collegiality, the features of participative management and the responsibilities of school principals in promoting the democratic leadership principle in ELM as indicated in Chapters One and Two.

The information collected by using research tools namely interviews, document analysis and observation, were incorporated, as I promised, so that the data will be triangulated whereby information collected from documents and observation were used to some extent to sustain the main research tool, which is the semi-structured interview- concentrating to the one that talked about participation of teachers in school management and decisions.

I begin with a review of the Ministry agenda behind participative management and decision-making and then the broader participation of stakeholders. I then move on to discuss the political and collegiality model that serves as a lens and tenet of participative management, before I outline the features of participative management in the schools. Next I discuss the role of school leaders in the growth of the theory in school and then outline the advantages and challenges of participative management as the main themes that emerged in the study. Finally I discuss the need for training in participative leadership of both teachers and management members.

#### **5.2 A review of the Ministry of Education agenda of the democratic principles**

The participants believed that their participation in school management and decision-making has to do with democracy. Therefore they have a right to participate in school governance,

Namibia, MBESC (1993, pp. 41-42) and MoE, Act. No 16 of 2001, also emphasises the equal involvement of all stakeholders in school governance as mentioned in Chapter One and Two. The policies of site-based management were a result of the bargaining activities by national leaders, since all “educational institutions operate within a legislative framework set down by national or state parliaments” (Bush, 2003, p. 11). As a result, teachers believed that “their involvement in decision-making has to do with democratic principles” (T2). It is really impossible for educational change to be successfully without the broader participation of teachers who act as a go-between during the change processes.

### **5.3 Broader participation of teachers**

#### **5.3.1 What are the stakeholder’s perceptions of participative management and decision making?**

In this study, it was established that participants understood the purposes of participative management as a practice that encourages good school governance, since participants believed that they always made decisions after consultation, and after involving everyone in discussions, though some believed that they are not part of school management. Principals understood that it is vital, if the practice is introduced in schools, to involve all the stakeholders so that they can hear more ideas from them. This is in line with Koopman & Wierdsma (1998) as cited by Somech, (2005) in Chapter Two who refer to participative management as a “shared influences” or responsibility of taking decisions in an organisation (p. 778). In fact, participation, in reality, emphasises that all stakeholders should play a role in school management and decision-making.

The data in Chapter Four, 4.3, revealed the tensions that existed between the views of the participants. For example, principals defined participative decision-making as the agreement between the management members and the rest of the staff members before a final decision was taken, after everyone had been involved and informed. In this case, SMTs thought that they were involving and consulting teachers in school management and everyone was taking part in every decision. However, some participants perceived that they were excluded from school management and decision-making and said participative decisions were not taking place at their schools. In addition to this, some teachers felt that they were involved, but not fully, as the management took most of the control in school decision-making. Swanepoel (2008:462) argues that it is important to involve teachers in school management and decision-making since they are the ones who interact with learners and they are the “agents of change”

in schools. In a similar vein, Van Wyk (2004:49) maintains that the rationale of site management and participative management requires that all stakeholders have to participate actively in the governance of schools.

If teachers realise that they are not playing a role in school decisions, then it becomes an issue. Similarly, teachers also thought that their involvement had to do with “democracy”, and if the principal makes a decision without notifying them, they won’t be able to take part, though they have the right to do so. Teachers expect that whatever decisions are made at school, they at least are supposed to agree upon it. In reality, teachers may not buy into decisions they were not involved in, but they can be proactive in the ones in which they play a part. Teachers know their democratic rights and believe that democracy has paved the way for their participation in decisions. This kind of leadership whereby stakeholders are involved is meant to promote democratic leadership as mentioned by Mabuku (2009) & Botha (2006) in Chapter Two, section 2.4.

In addition to this, broader participation in decision-making is believed to be a way to prevent misunderstanding, resistance to change and the creation of divisions. The regulation of democracy stipulates that if other members do not accept the idea proposed then the decision cannot be made. Stofile (2005) maintain that “participation has the effect of overcoming resistance to change” and reducing stress on the part of the management (p. 11). However, Chapter Four reveals that teachers were consulted in the sense that they were just asked for their inputs, and they agreed that “we are partly involved in decision making”. For example, at Hakana Secondary, the HOD confirmed that normally, but not always, teachers participate in decision making. But it is not good to involve teachers in every decision that takes place at school, especially when it comes to school performance or policies.

Similarly, one teacher argued that the management is allowed to decide when they think it is good for teachers to just to receive information. I think that in participative management, there is no way a leader can make the decision, and then inform the subordinates what he has decided. The subordinates should be involved from the start of the process. One teacher in Nziya School reported in Chapter Four that the staff were only informed what the management had decided, but the decision should come from all the members. Mabuku (2009:19) advises that any decision that is related either to the teachers or learners should be solved by themselves (Chapter Two). In contrast, I argue in line with Tarter & Hoy that

“contingency perspective” can also play a role, because every approach to decision-making depends on the specific situation for its effectiveness (in Schultz, et al, 2006, 173).

My research observation revealed that participants are aware of what is meant by participation in school management in general, but there seems to be a slight problem and misunderstanding as regards the practice of teachers’ involvement in school decisions. Musore argues that, “participative refer to a mode of management in which emphasis is placed on giving people a chance to participate in the leadership or decision making of the organization”. (2009, p. 76). I think that this has partially materialised at the schools, since SMTs believed that teachers could only make decisions in their classrooms. In other words this kind of involvement can be regarded as partial participation, not really broader participation. However, teachers “expect to be included in the initial process of meaningful decision-making where their voices will be heard” (Carl, in Swanepoel, 2008, p. 40 & 2009, p. 464). However, as I mentioned above, the context is important, it is practically impossible to involve all the teachers, especially when dealing with serious issues. In these situations the management can take a stand, but when it comes to minor issues, such as the budget, and learner’s problems, teachers should play a role.

### **5.3.2 The relevance of Bush’s political and collegial models**

The political and collegial models appear to be in conflict with one another. According to Bush (2003) the political model refers to bargaining processes, while the collegial model refers to consensus between organisational members. However in this study, I use both models since both are evident in the schools according to the data revealed by participants, documents and observation. For example, SMTs believed that they were consulting and agreeing to decisions with staff before the implementation of decisions. In my view, this is in line with Bush & Middlewood (2005) who argue that in the collegiality “model, structures are flattened and communication tends to be lateral rather than vertical, reflecting the view that all teachers should be involved in decision making and ‘own’ the outcome of discussions” (p. 66).

The literature seems to suggest that the participative model is related to the political and collegiality model because it involves bargaining and consultation processes during decision-making. According to Bush (2003, p. 64) “Collegial models assume that organizations determine policy and make decisions through a process of discussion leading to consensus”. Participative management is also referred to as site-based management thus serves as a useful framework for making sense of how staff members operate in a “system of collegiality” and

“political systems” (Aipinge, 2007, p. 20; Van der Westhuizen, 2008, p. 104). Participative management encourages people to work together to solve problems through consultation and bargaining processes so as to achieve better solutions through collegiality and a political approach. Van der Westhuizen (2008:*ibid.*) refers to participative organisation as a “political system” and Bush (2003:78) refers to collegiality as the second relevant model to “participative leadership”. However, literatures reveal that in most cases, many organizations and managers use the political model in decision-making to satisfy their own interests (Bush 2003 & Schultz 2006).

In this study, the principals argued that they always consulted teachers whenever they had something to discuss that needed their contribution, and they shared decision-making in school. The data in Chapter Four confirmed that staff members always have to agree upon something by voting or having a majority count before something can be implemented. Teachers even warn that “it is very risky” if decisions are taken without consulting others. However, teachers believe that this happens, that principals make decisions without consulting others. I came to the conclusion that the principals are trying to run schools through a political and collegiality approach, because when teachers do not agree with a motion, then it cannot be enforced until everyone agrees or have been consulted. Bush (2003) argues that collegial models “emphasise that power and decision making should be shared among some or all members of the organisation who are thought to have a shared understanding about the aims of the institution” (p. 64).

In general in the study, it was known that consensus and consultation leads to acceptance of decision, and solitary decisions are regarded as a kind of autocratic leadership. Schultz, et al. maintains that “workers who make decisions more readily accept the outcomes and become more vested in making high quality decisions” (2007, p. 164). Bush (2003) stresses that it is vital for a spirit of collegiality to prevail in schools, because collegial and unity contributes to greater “mutual trust and willingness to work” (p. 64). The observations and staff minutes revealed that principals consult teachers and involved them in discussion, which I believe contributed to the higher turn out during morning briefing and meetings. So, as a result, I conclude that the political and collegiality approach increases the level of commitment and can help to ensure effective management in school. Similarly, Kambonde (2008) argues that the “aspiration toward collaboration that prevails in such schools is rooted in a collegial approach to management” (p. 15).

According to the data presented in Chapter Four on document analysis, the school budget was revised as a result of consultation, negotiations and opinions of staff members. This indicates that participative management is a good approach because it is more flexible when it comes to changes of fixed plans. Therefore, participatory practice, according to the study, is very vital because decisions are taken through the means of collaboration, compromise, bargaining and the influencing of decisions. As a result, Bush (2003) defined the political model as a model that “embraces those theories which characterize decision-making as a bargaining process” (p. 89). Consultation during decisions is vital because this indicates that teachers are part of the school. I think decision-making through political and collegial approaches is more vital than autocratic decisions that do not consider the feelings and inputs of others as significant features of management in the schools.

### 5.3.3 The features of participative management in the schools

This study revealed various features of participative management and decision-making (PMDM), as they emerged during the data collections from all three sources used. Teamwork, consultation, structures and committees, creativity and innovation, and open communication, meetings that are held every day or every week, sharing of responsibilities and decision-making, better achievement, etc, were observable variables in the schools. However this study reveals mixed feelings from members about the features of participative management.

**Teamwork:** According to Chapter Four, observation revealed that management and staff were working together as a team. For example in Hakana secondary, participants acknowledged that that they were struggling with teamwork or building a team in their school until this year as mentioned in Chapter Four . In a similar vein, the minutes of the school confirmed that the school has problems with teamwork. Middlewood defines teamwork as “a principle that embodies people working together as a group and sharing the same values in the same organization” (in Kambonde, 2008, p. 19).

Moreover, some respondents indicated that there was no teamwork at their school, while the management believed that they were working together as a team. The study noted events attempting to inspire teamwork by letting staff work as a team, by establishing various structures, as discussed in Chapter Four. In addition to this, one HOD shared a similar view that teamwork at their school was working because staff do whatever they decide together. In

this study I corresponded with one principal that it is important to work together as a team, since there is no organisation that will succeed if there is no teamwork. The SA, DoE (1996) define teamwork as a group of people working in a joint venture and engaging in activity based on account for common goal. I think it is really vital to work as a team in school, since teamwork encourages the achievement of common goals and benefits of all the stakeholders, not just an individual.

**Shared group decisions:** The study further revealed that some decisions were taken as a group and not as an individual. I observed school principals consulting with staff members sometimes to make group decisions. Participants in Chapter Four believed that, whether you have power or not, it does not matter. It is only when you hear from other colleagues and where they stand that you can decide. In contrast, some participants argued that there is lack of group decision-making in their school. For example at Nziya and Kazana Schools, teachers believed that they were excluded from taking decision in schools. This corresponds with Hargreaves & Bascia (in Swanepoel, 2009 p. 464), findings where teachers have a perception that they are being excluded from decision and management processes. However, Swanepoel (ibid) argues that teachers as stakeholders have equal rights and are entitled to participate in decisions affecting them. According to Erickson & Gwelch (in Mungunda, 2003, p. 25) as mentioned in Chapter Two “group management approach to school governance improves the quality of communication and decision making practices”. It is very important for a leader to encourage group decisions and problem solving to minimise antagonism and resistance to change.

**Shared responsibility:** Participants argued that all teachers and management members shared responsibilities such as counselling, budget, admission of learners, fund raising, and even extra-mural activities as mentioned in Chapter Four, 4.6 and 4.5.2. According to Bush & Middlewood (2005), currently in education there is an “increasing range and complexity of leadership and management responsibilities in schools” (p. 12) Thus, it is not possible for a principal to be a sole leader anymore, as it was in the past. The involvement of other stakeholders in sharing responsibilities can assist principals. Bush (2003) argues that “the burdens of leadership will be less if leadership functions and roles are shared” (p. 78). I think that the sharing of responsibilities in an organisation results in better relationships among staff members, because no one can blame the other when a plan does not work.

**Organisational structures/committees:** In Chapter Four, 4.3.1.2, the data revealed that the schools consisted of organisational structures/committees that involved teachers who were school board members, on the NANTU school committee and SMC/HODs and there are also various committees established to get staff members involved in school management and decision-making such as in admission committees, school finances/budget, counselling, etc. Each committee consisted of a representative like a chairperson who serves as a spokesperson. Kambonde (2008) argues that “the purpose of committees in schools is to help people to work together as a team, because a teamwork structure will ensure effective management practice in a school” (p. 60).

The establishment of structure and committees is the heart of participative organisation nowadays. According to Blandford (in Kambonde 2008, p. 59) a school can “design a structure” for effective participative management purposes. However, some participants said that everything is done by the school principal. As a result, I realised that the distribution of authority through structure/committees “depends on the size and complexity” of a school (Bush, 2003, p. 137). It is really fantastic when a principal distributes tasks among teachers and SMT members in a school, however the question remains: how are these structures formed and is the structure autocratic or democratic? (Moloi, 2002: 93). To me, this is a major sign of the participative method because it is easing the burden of the principals, however Noble and Pym (in Bush, *ibid.*) argue that committees can only make recommendations or suggestions to seek approval from management.

**Communication:** There was tension in the schools since participants have different views on this organisational feature. My observation in all schools revealed that school principals were trying to involve teachers to participate in school management by asking them if they had anything to raise. The literatures suggest that communication is important if you increase broader participation and accountability of staff members (Moloi, 2002, p. 94). As a result, the study found that there is no proper communication, as mentioned by T2, that the flow of communication is quite inactive (in Chapter Four, 4.7.4.) For example in Hakana secondary, one teacher revealed that everyone does his own thing and no one tells anybody anything. However, principals emphasised that teachers have many opportunities to raise their concerns, like through staff meetings, departmental (phase) meetings and subject meetings. The study observed that various meetings as mentioned by P1 are in place. Branch (2002) argues that “two-way communication” is important because “information is power” and

“those who do not have information or the ability to use it to influence decisions are disempowered” (p. 11). I believe proper communication must be treated as a right of people. Leaders must open up communication and create open door policies at school and accept criticism for development purpose. The flow of communication in schools should be encouraged by managers to allow teachers to participate and share information openly.

**Sharing leadership roles:** In this study principals believed that they were sharing leadership responsibilities in order to develop staff members for leadership purposes. A member of SMT was found to lead morning briefings and morning assembly as reported in Chapter Four, 4.5.2 at one school. SMTs maintain that teachers are also given responsibilities to lead meetings such as parent and staff meetings, observations confirmed this claim. As a result, Botha (2006, p. 341) in Chapter Two, 2.4 argued that leadership, must be provided to the members. It is also known that an organisation that provides opportunities for staff development in leadership is also documented as a democratic organization. However, the fact is that only a friendly, open and helpful manager can achieve this in his school. These kinds of activities are vital because they encourage commitment and empower teachers to have confidence in being leaders.

**Achievement:** Participants believed that participative management promoted quality decision-making and could increase higher productivity/school performance. For example, P1, in Chapter Four, reported that participative management increased school performance as their school performed well in 2010 results because teachers responded well. This indicates that the process of teamwork/collaboration, shared goals and shared vision can result in positive achievements, as Mabuku (2009) mentioned in Chapter Two, that outcomes can be extraordinary if people cooperate together. Higher achievement is the main feature of participative management and decision-making and for a school to achieve this, it is important for principals to inspire staff members to work for such common goals in schools.

**Interaction relationships:** The interaction relationship as a feature of a participative organisation was observed in some schools but not exactly as expected. HOD1 in Chapter Four maintained that teachers are not “proactive” in interaction because they are too reluctant. According to Tkach & Lyubomirsky (in Somech, 2009, p. 288), “social interaction can be a major source of pleasure and happiness for highly extroverted individuals, which, in turn, generates positive moods and ultimately overall happiness”. Lawler (1992) in Somech

(2009, *ibid.*) stresses that; “working in a participative management environment tends to foster more interaction among team members and requires individuals who have robust social skills” (p. 288). In reality the participative management expects stakeholders to be proactive in interaction with colleagues and open up their system of cooperation. However, I still believe that the principal is the steering wheel and the teachers are the wheels, if you don’t turn the steering, the wheels will not turn. Meaning that, principals must motivate teachers to be proactive in interaction and to encourage creativity as their key roles.

**Creativity and innovation:** As mentioned in Chapter Four, staff meeting minutes and observation data recorded that principals promote ‘creativity, innovation and taking risks’ in schools and teachers are allowed to deal with learners’ problems and SMTs to do what they can to improve school outcomes. Schultz (2006, p. 176) defines creativity as “the process of using imagination and skill to develop a new or unique product, object, process or thought”. Hoy and Miskel (in Aipinge, 2007, p. 28) warn that to supervise an organization such as a school, a principal must deal with a “wide array of problems, situations and people”. Welch (in Moloi, 2002, p. 94) argues that leaders “must invest in their staff, train them up and develop them, in order to tap their creative talents”. Therefore it is important for school principals as organisational leaders to motivate their staff to be creative and innovative in performing school activities as their major responsibilities.

## **5.4 The responsibilities of school principals in promoting participative management in schools**

The MBESC (1993) disclosed that the Namibian “education system which we have inherited has so many teachers who are not well prepared for their responsibilities, it is essential that we have an effective system of school and teacher support and supervision” (p. 162). It is therefore the school principal’s role to ensure broader participation and accountability in schools. This section discusses these roles.

### **5.4.1 Delegation and empowerment**

The management members in the study believed that they were delegating responsibilities to staff members with the aim of assigning everybody with the work around the school. For example as reported in Chapter Four , P1 argued that he is delegating to everybody so that they have to know what to do and empower them to do it on their own, even when the principal is not there. HODs echoed that teachers are given responsibilities so that they can gain more skills and experience doing certain things on their own. This is in line with what

Stoner et al. (1995) refer to as the assignment of power and accountability - to be responsible for activities in organisation (p. 355). In a similar vein, Van der Westhuizen (1991) describes delegation as “a basis for in-service training in which staff is exposed to greater responsibility (p. 173). In schools, delegation is one of the key factors because formal authorities are distributed throughout the organizational structure and the rest of the staff members.

The interviews and my observations uncovered that principals empower teachers by delegating them with tasks to perform during parent meetings (see Chapter Four). However in Kazana School teachers argued that they were given responsibility, but not managerial activities. In contrast, HODs held that they delegated tasks namely sport, choir, and culture and as well as management work. However, principals held that they were empowering teachers because it is their responsibility to motivate teachers to participate and fulfil their responsibilities. According to Short, Greer & Melvin (in Somech, 2004) “Empowerment is a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems” (p. 278).

As mentioned in Chapter Four, principals reiterated that teachers were not interesting in managing or becoming managers and leadership is only suited to some people and is not for everyone. This seems to me to be a negative response and not proper empowerment, because according to Maeroff (in Somech, 2009, *ibid.*) teacher empowerment consists of improved status, increased knowledge and access to decision-making. If you are not inspiring your teachers and exposing them to managerial activities, then they will not gain knowledge and skills, because by empowering others means you are investing for long term and ensuring ‘sustainability’ (Schultz, 2006, p. 153)

T3 argued that, “we are not empowered as such ...we do not have that mandate to decide much on the school issues” (in Chapter Four). This sounded a bit incredible and it revealed a real tension between the participants, since most of the teachers indicated that they were willing to participate in school management and decision-making but they were not given the opportunity. This was proved in observation, as mentioned in Chapter Four, that teachers are not empowered because of their lack of involvement in managerial activities. According to Stoner, et al. (1995) in Chapter Two, delegation is a foundation of acceptance and other advantages. In a similar vein, Schultz (2006, p. 147) regards empowerment as that which assists people in taking charge of their own destinies, achieving their full potential,

developing problem-solving capabilities, and encourages a positive impact of empowerment to be handed to all the people within an organisation.

However, the principals in the study maintained that they did not delegate some responsibilities because of the different abilities involved. For instance, P1 in Chapter Four mentioned that sometimes you may delegate responsibility but the person to whom you have delegated might not do the task as you would have expected. The fact is that some employees are not educated or skilful enough to do proper work. Greenberg and Baron in Schultz (2006, p. 175) argue that, “for groups to be superior to individuals, there must be a heterogeneous collection of experts with complementary skills who can contribute to their group’s product freely and openly”. The principals believed that when they delegated tasks they had to monitor and evaluate to ensure that the task was completed or is being carried out. However, Mullins (1999, in Schultz, et al, 2006) argues that managers need to relinquish close control in favour of greater empowerment of employees. Therefore, I think delegation and empowerment is the cornerstone of all organisations, and it serves as a gateway to solving job dissatisfaction issues and opens up a way for people to do things on their own. When decentralising tasks, a person must do things on his own pace not under close supervision which would be regarded as autocratic.

#### **5.4.2 Decentralization**

Actually, delegation and decentralization is almost one and the same thing, however there is a difference in that decentralization involves the transferring of power to another person, while delegation involves the giving of responsibilities and authorities to your subordinates to perform tasks. Karstanje (in Niitembu, 2007) emphasizes that “Decentralization involves the assignment of decision-making tasks to lower levels” (p. 29).

This means that in term of participative management/decision-making, a principal is expected to devolve power to his/her subordinates so that they will be able to take decisions on their own. However, the study found that the role of principals in participative theory like decentralization of authority, management functions and diffusion of power to be a challenge in some schools. Hargreaves (in Somech, 2010, p. 175), maintains that:

Scholars embraced the notion that flatters management and decentralized authority structures carry the potential for achieving outcomes unattainable under schools’ traditional top-down bureaucratic structure.

The majority of the teachers believed that they had no authority to decide on something on their own. This emotion was confirmed by principals: “Teachers are not allowed to make decisions, especially at this institution - when they make a decision they should consult me” (see Chapter Four).

At another school, teachers argued that the decentralisation of power did not materialise at their school. This reflected that despite the sharing of leadership errands with members of the management especially during meetings, the school did not decentralize power to the teachers even for school finance, like buying and budgeting which I think is not a good example. The International Institute of Educational Planning (IIEP, 2004, p. 3) reveals that:

Transparency in the management of resources is probably one of the main challenges to decentralization and paramount to its success. Ensuring that rules and regulations are known to all and that parents who contribute to school financing have an explicit right to know how these funds are spent is indispensable.

Some teachers believed that their principal sometimes devolved power to his subordinates. T4 in Chapter Four claimed that “the principal decentralizes power to the management members”. In fact, principals are expected to play the role of creating opportunities for teachers to acquire new skills and knowledge of leadership by decentralising power and responsibilities. My view of decentralisation is that principals should decentralise power where they can, because such an exercise is “in line with democratic ELM where there is sharing of power and authority” (Mabuku (2009, p. 83). Reluctance to establish governance structures and devolving power in school jeopardizes the working climate of employees.

#### **5.4.3 Establishment of school governance structure and committees**

Principals and HODs believed that they were involving all the teachers in management by creating various structures and committees and encouraging them to work as a team and take part in school management. In Chapter Four, the principals said that staff members were given various responsibilities to perform in schools, some teachers said that everyone was allowed to participate in school management in various structures. One of the school’s organisational structures reflected a top down design starting with the principal at the top, HOD, a member of the management and then teachers.

The line of accountability according to the structure is predominantly one-way which is the principal is only the person responsible for making decisions. Donald, et al. (2002:148) argues that structure arrangement facilitates the flow of information in school. Such a school does not promote participative management or follow a flatter management style. However, one school had a better organogram that illustrated all the management members, subject heads and subject teachers. I tend to agree with Van der Westhuizen (2008, p. 97), who believes that:

An organisation where only a few people tend to make all or most decisions is highly centralised, whereas an organisation where there is widespread and broad-based involvement in decisions is low in centralisation, or decentralised

In a similar vein, Van der Westhuizen argues that “organisation structures are designed and implemented to fit their particular goals, strategies, environment, people and technology” (in Aipinge, 2007, p. 81). The SMTs believed that they involved teachers in management by creating various structures and encouraging them to work as a team. Documents and observation confirmed allocation of duties to committees. The interviews showed that there were various committees at the schools that were established for the purposes of broader participation in decision-making as mention in Chapter Four.

In a similar vein, some participants echoed that all staff members are involved in management because there are different departments at the school and also in extramural activities, around five staff members are part of the structures responsible for activities. Furthermore, HOD1 argued that according to their organisation structure “all those groups have to report ... to the principal” as mentioned in Chapter Four. This is in line with what Schultz (2006, p. 228) called organisational chart/design, that reveals data about tasks performed by members, division of labour, spans of control and as well as a series of line and staff positions that even reveals who reports to whom.

In the case of structural arrangement, the study revealed that SMTs are divided into phases, while at another school they are divided into subjects, and at another school, one member will be at upper and another one at lower primary, and there are also subject teachers involved in some subjects. This is very important as Donald et al. (2002) argues that by “establishing structures that facilitate involvement, one can prevent the abuse of power” (p. 194) in schools. The study revealed that the role of school principals is to empower others to become

leaders by involving them in different kinds of practice in schools. However it was not possible to determine whether participative theory was effective or not since there were tensions in the data in all schools about teachers' participation. I think that this effort could reduce staff frustration and motivate teamwork in school if it involved all staff members.

#### **5.4.4 Motivation of teamwork**

The SMTs believed that it was their role to motivate teachers to work as a team. As management stressed in previous sections (5.3.3) teachers are involved in participative management and decision-making through teamwork structures. As stated in Chapter Four by P1, he motivated staff members to participate and work together as a team for the school to succeed within a team spirit. If a school lacked teamwork it created division, work could not go well and it made it difficult for the school to achieve its common goal. McLagan and Nel maintain that "increased interdependence requires increased participation" (in Branch, 2002, p. 19). I personally, being a former school principal, thought that motivating teachers to work as a team meant that they worked harder and were more committed, and had increased job satisfaction. Participants believed that "Teamwork is a fundamental tenet of democratic leadership and management in any organisation" (Mabuku 2009, p 85).

As I pointed out in Chapter Two, the concept teamwork means that a group of people work together as team, to achieve a common goal. The literatures emphasises that teamwork represents a group of people who are working together in an organisation (Middlewood in Kambonde, 2008, p. 18). In this study all principals stressed that there was teamwork at their schools as reported in Chapter Four, section 5.2.3. At Hakana School, the minutes of SMT and staff meetings revealed that as a result of the principal's motivation every meeting, it contributed to constructive teamwork as revealed in Chapter Four. According to Cardino (in Bush, et al. 2005: 108):

Teams abound in schools because they are structured in ways that allow teachers to work together to make curriculum and management related decisions. In settings where the implementation of education reform has increased the complexity of school management through devolution, principals have embraced the opportunity to share new tasks and decision- making with teams.

However, despite the advantages described above, in this study some participants have different views that teamwork does not materialise at their school since favouritism plays a role and some members are excluded from school activities. One teacher mentioned in Chapter Four that they only work together when it comes to teaching aspects, not in making

decisions because of favouritism by the manager. The data revealed that if teachers realised that there is no fair treatment or that they were not trusted because of favouritism and tribalism, then it will affect the teachers, and they will not participate actively as mentioned in Chapter Four. Everard, et al (in Niitembu, 2007 p. 30) maintains that, “teamwork depends on effective meetings, effective decision taking, effective communication, the identification of team roles and effective delegation”. It is therefore important for the manager to ensure effective teamwork and share management roles widely to avoid conflicts in schools.

#### **5.4.5 Involvement of teachers in conflict resolutions**

Conflict resolution can be defined as the process of involving different people with different skills such as communication skills and negotiation skills in order to find an amicable solution to a conflict. In schools conflict in teams is inevitable. As mentioned in Chapter Four, 4.6.3, managers believed that they were involving teachers in conflict resolutions, but it depended on what kind of problem it was that needed their involvement. Principals stressed that when problems arise that “need everyone then everyone should be involved but when it is confidential, or ‘very sensitive’ you don’t need everyone”. Two teachers in the last chapter echoed that some information is confidential and teachers just need to be informed of the latest developments. However, the literature suggests that in participative management, there is nothing like confidentiality, everything must be shared between a leader and stakeholders. Steyn, et al. (2009: 115) in Chapter Four argues that all the stakeholders must make decisions. In contrast, some teachers in Chapter Four mentioned that they are not involved in conflict resolution as mentioned by T5 in Chapter Four. Parnell & Crandall (2010, p. 2325) in Chapter Two argue that the manager should make decisions based on his or her expertise and the information available.

The data from SMTs show that conflicts are resolved by involving NANTU school committees, school board members and teachers can also be involve if no solution is found initially. Oduro (2004, p. 3) cautioned that “problem-solving through consultation is impossible with a single person’s wisdom”. Similarly, P2, quoted the metaphor that “the body does not have only a head; if only a head then is not a body, so it should have all the parts then it is a body” (Chapter Four ). Meaning that, everyone according to participants needs to be involved in conflict resolutions. Wagner (in Somech, 2008:288) argues that:

Participative management has the potential to balance the involvement of managers and their subordinates in information-processing, decision-making, or problem-solving endeavours

The data in Chapter Four revealed that teachers are mainly allowed to handle learners' conflicts in classroom situations. As Mungunda (2003, p. 15) echoed that "variables determine which practice, participative decision making or direction, is more appropriate in a given situation". According to Sato et al.(in Somech, et al, 2009. p. 285) "teacher involvement in the decision making process can generate job-related stress and role ambiguity and can create tension and conflict among teachers, principals, and administrators".

I think this can happen especially if teachers are not involved, for instance in teachers' absenteeism issues as mentioned by T5 in Chapter Four. However, Musore (2009) argues that "the more people are involved, the more differences or conflicts arise" (p. 81). The SMTs who participated in the study shared the same sentiment (Chapter Four). However, the data in Chapter Four revealed that principals sometimes involve teachers in conflict resolution in schools but not in every conflict. Participative management does not depend on superiority and subordination for its influence but respects employees and encourages them to take the initiative and seek new responsibilities and solutions (Branch, 2002, p. 10). Similarly, I think that in participative management, there is no confidential information; everything must be communicated and be open to subordinates to know what was done with each problem.

#### **5.4.6 Communication and open door policies**

The data of both management members of the schools who participated in the study point out that opportunities for communication and sharing of information exist, but that some teachers believe that there is breakdown in terms of communication and open door policies in school. Communication can be defined as the exchange of information between two people or a group of people. Marchant refers to "communication, participation and leadership" as "social norms" (in Rivera 2008, p. 1). The importance of good interaction between subordinates and leaders is that it results in proper communication and sharing of information.

The data in Chapter Four suggest that democratic management in a learning organisation is encouraged through broader participation, open communication and sharing of information. In a similar vein, participants also share the same sentiment that during meetings teachers are

asked to bring in their views or problems. In this study it became clear that the only way they communicate is in meetings as mentioned by participants in Chapter Four, section 4.6.4. As suggested by Jamali, et al. (2006) that meetings are a process of communication is believed to “facilitates the flow of data, information and knowledge” from one person to another or to a group of people (p. 345).

The data in Chapter Four divulge that during staff meetings everyone can participate and share his/her views, and that an open door policy is guaranteed since platforms are given to the staff members to disclose their concerns. Their views point out that managers are playing vital roles of promoting flatter management through sharing information with teachers during meetings, and motivating staff members to communicate directly with others openly. I observed that school principals are encouraging equal involvement in management by balancing the participation of staff members, but most of the time teachers are inactive. As a result, Brown (2007) argues that “a participative organization could be identified by its shared culture of flatter lattice management” (p. 1). Some teachers in the study felt that there is no proper communication at their school as mentioned in section 5.2.3.

However, SMTs persevere with open door policies at their schools. During morning meetings I observed managers asking staff questions like “what else?” or “anything more?” This is a sign of openness, even though it was difficult to verify whether the existence of open door policies is effective or not, because time for briefings was not enough. My observation, noted chairpersons of committees serve as communication officers, transmitting relevant information to staff members. Teachers shared the same sentiment that an open door policy exists at their school. Principals deemed that applying open door policies can motivate the generation of new ideas in schools as reported previously in Chapter Four.

Walker believes that schools should attempt “to adopt fundamental values expressive of a culture of openness, trust and participation among stakeholders” (in Kambonde 2008, p. 58). However, despite the views that the theory exists, I still think that a lot needs to be done by principals to achieve the flow of communication and open door policies, because there are still shortcomings and bad effects of participative management in the schools.

## **5.5 The effects of participative leadership**

In this section, I discuss both the positive and negative effects of PMDM of teachers as uncovered by the data gathered using the research tools mentioned in 5.1 and Chapter Four.

### **5.5.1 The advantages of participative management and decision making (PMDM)**

The data of the study illustrate various benefits or advantages of participative management, collegiality and site base management. However, in this section, I concentrate only on some of the most important benefits of participative management that emerged as sub themes after the triangulation of data in Chapter Four. These are very similar to data already discussed in previous section.

#### **5.5.1.1 Promote a sense of ownership in schools**

Respondents, especially members of management, believe that the approach can promote a sense of ownership if teachers are involved in the management and decision-making of schools. As mentioned in Chapter Four , the MC argued that involvement of teachers can motivate teachers to develop a sense of ownership of a school and can lead to unification of a group to realise that any decision taken at school belongs to everyone not only certain individuals. Hopkins et al. (in Bush, et al, 2005, p. 87) maintain that “the literature of educational change demonstrates that ownership of an initiative by those who are to implement it is crucial to success”.

Principals hold up that participation motivates stakeholders to take ownership of what is to be done, and when and where the decision can be carried out. Furthermore, by feeling that sense of ownership, they are also responsible for the smooth running of everything in the school. McCrimmon (2007) & Steyn (2009), as mentioned in Chapter Two, state that PDM creates a feeling of ownership. Lewin (in Weisbord 1991) also cautions never to do something alone in an organisation without involving others. Teachers also argue that it is more important when managers allow them to participate in decisions. What I know is that the involvements of teachers in any school decisions makes them feels more proud about it and boost them to work harder to achieve organizational effectiveness. In a similar vein, T6 in Chapter Four stressed that the wrong conclusions of brilliant ideas affect a conducive to learning environment.

Somech, et al., (2009, as discussed in Chapter Two , maintain that participative management offers a variety of benefits for the organization and for the workers. This reveals that participation can enhance the degree to which a member takes pride in his/her job, and feels a personal responsibility for the outcome of the work. As a result, I think when people are not

included in management and decision-making it discourages them from participating in any decision because they are not recognised for their presence. In this study, I observed that teachers can, develop a sense of ownership, because they will come up with various ideas that can help a learning organisation to transform. As a result, Peter Senge (in Moloi, 2002:2) defined a learning organisation as:

[o]rganizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together.

However, an appalling result was revealed in Chapter Four , in that teachers felt that their ideas are not accommodated and sometimes principals do not consider the majority decision of staff, as the principal would take his/her own decision. I observed that these can really demoralise teachers not to participate as they claimed. I have observed that teachers are developing a sense of caring and ownership in schools as stated in Chapter Four. The nurturing of staff can really help schools to grow, because every member will not hesitate to take part and contribute to an issue which is on the table as is sometimes happening now. At the moment the problems lies with principals, since they own schools like their home. The future leadership can only grow if ownership manifests as discussed in this chapter. I think the calibre of school leaders can have a dramatic effect on teacher-leadership development.

#### **5.5.1.2 No leader will live ... until the end of the world**

SMTs acknowledged that participation at their schools is not 100%, but perhaps only 80 or 90%. However, the SMTs stressed that they are involving teachers in management and decision-making to prepare them for future leadership positions and to gain more knowledge and skills how to do things on their own as discussed in Chapter Four. P1 argued that he is providing some handouts and readings for them something in the principal manual to build teachers for future leadership positions, while P2 mentioned that teachers' involvement is vital because it moulds them to become leaders.

Tatum, echoed the same sentiment that PDM can develop future leaders (2006, p. 2). This practice can lead to identifying strengths and weaknesses of staff members. The principal of Hakana revealed that he picked a vocal teacher and sent him for a mentoring workshop, because of his involvement in school discussions. This corresponds with what Bush et al (2009) argue that future leaders should be grown from teachers, middle teachers, and heads of

department/assistant principals (p. 114). Hence, the study found that at schools the theory is vital for the “professional development” of teachers for the future so that teachers can learn how to run a school smoothly. This view reflected what Foskett & Lumby claim that “providing staff with opportunities to develop is the final step which closes the circle of managing performance” (in Bush and Middlewood, 2005, p. 22).

The furnishing of opportunities and sharing of leadership responsibilities can help to grow future leaders. As mentioned by Nziya school principal in Chapter Four current principals “will not live for life until the last end of the world”, means that no school principal will be a leader until the end of his life. Therefore, teachers also deserve to be given opportunities to take part in school management, to prepare them for leadership because they also want to become leaders. From the participants’ point of view, I believe that to ‘fast track’ leaders into senior positions, and to encourage schools to ‘grow their own’ leaders will enable schools to find effective leaders for the future (Bush, 2009, p. 114).

The data revealed some tension, as some teachers argued that there is no identification of future leaders taking place in their school whereby teachers are nurtured to become future leaders, while principals claimed that they are doing so in various ways. Despite the contradiction, I believe that development and identification of future leaders is taking place there. For example, P2 has two ordinary teachers she is developing to become leaders, by involving them in management activities, and at secondary and primary school, a mentor teacher was selected to attend a workshop. Participative management in reality serves as in-service training and can help a lot to develop teachers for leadership positions. As a result, Moses suggests that “leaders should get in touch with their own humanity to enable their teachers and school to discover their own faithfulness” (in Schultz, et al., 2006, p. 197). Through this practice I think it will position leaders to realise the organisational goals, missions and objectives, and lead schools through teamwork effort, because displaying good leadership is important when you are inspiring people to become future leaders.

### **5.5.1.3 Foster Teamwork/teambuilding**

One of the chief advantages of participative management is that it is believed to encourage teamwork and teambuilding in schools. Teambuilding is useful in various situations such as “clarification, performance management, problem solving and organisational change” (Potgieter in Schultz, et al. 2006, p 110). The data of the study indicates that there is an interest among the school leaders to work as a team at their respective school environments,

as they believe that any organization that does not encourage teamwork, cannot achieve its “common goal” as mentioned by Middlewood (in Kambonde, 2008, p. 19) (see Chapter Two). The schools’ principals’ data disclosed that they do motivate teachers to participate and work together as a team for common goals as mentioned in Chapter Four and previous sections. Teamwork and active participation in any school is a sign of participative management, because there is high involvement of members and members are committed to the idea of working together to achieve school goals. Stofile argues that “Teamwork creates synergy because the sum of the effort of team members is far greater than the sum of individual efforts of people working alone” (2005, p. 15).

This is in line with what P3 discussed that sometimes it is vital to include everybody to work together as a team. Edmondson, (1999) hold a similar idea that a participative school “promotes teamwork, cooperation in solving problems” and at the same time it lends a hand to “teachers discover new opportunities and challenges and enables them to learn by acquiring, sharing, and combining knowledge” (in Somech, et al., 2009, p. 289). Furthermore, Mbambo (2009) argues that teamwork “occurs when individuals come together in one places to share knowledge and experience” (p. 67).

Through teamwork, it is common that most of the responsibilities of the principal are allocated among the staff at the lowest possible level, not according to hierarchical structures. Copland maintains that “participative leadership has the potential to ease the burden on the principal” (as cited by Bush, 2003, p. 79), because power and responsibilities are shared among the teams. However, in this study, differing opinions came out about whether there is teamwork or not. The document analysis of allocations of duties and staff minutes, and the interviews revealed that there are committees established to foster teamwork and teambuilding, showing that teachers are also included in some managerial works. I think that the access of teachers in active teamwork would enable teachers to engage in the activities that would advance their knowledge and skills to participate in school issues. If these kinds of activities are not conducted it can affect teachers’ morale, creativity and innovations.

#### **5.5.1.4 Encourage creativity, innovation and quality decisions**

*There is no doubt that creativity is the most important human resource of all. Without creativity, there would be no progress, and we would be forever repeating the same patterns.—Edward de Bono.*

The respondents indicated that the approach is actually good because it encourages all members to participate in decision-making openly and to say whatever good things they want to say or they feel. P2 said that the young teachers are so flexible in everything. Serrat (2009) defines creativity as “the mental and social process—fuelled by conscious or unconscious insight—of generating ideas, concepts, and associations, while innovation is, the successful exploitation of new ideas” (p. 2). This resonates with the argument of T6 in Chapter Four who stressed that the importance of participative management is to lobby for creative ideas and various innovative ideas about how to run a school.

The data that emerged in Chapter Four reveal that teachers are ready and willing to do whatever the school is faced with if they are allowed to take part. The respondents believe that new ideas can come in, since “people are different and talents are different” and they can come up with something new that will lead to the development of schools. According to Tannenbaum & Allport (as cited in Yohe, 2003), as discussed in Chapter Two, participative decision making increase creativity, productivity, and increase organization development. Creativity and innovation can only be encouraged by allowing people to say whatever they want during decision-making and allowing people to do whatever they think is good for them. When people are prevented from engaging in what they believe is not good, it can affect their personal confidence and can increase absenteeism, turn over and resistance.

Moreover, participants believe that it is good if all members are involved to “compromise” when making decisions and not to “rush for conclusions”. In similar vein P2 emphasised that “when everyone is not involved, it can cause contradiction, misunderstanding and misinterpretation” of information. The respondents hold up that through the participative method, a leader can be directed better how to decide certain things and make a right decision. For this reason, Yohe, 2003 argues that participative decision-making can “enhance organizational effectiveness and increases productivity and decision quality” p. 3).

Furthermore, teachers in this study thought that they are not encouraged enough to become creative, since there is a lack of transparency, as mentioned in Chapter Four. Wall & Rinehart emphasise that teacher involvement in school activities empower them and therefore is “perceived as a crucial factor that affects school effectiveness” (as cited by Somech, 2010, p. 277). Teachers’ commitment increases in the process. I think it is good that teachers are

allowed to air their views about how things need to be done to build confidence and creative ideas because “[w]ithout innovation and creativity the world of today, and of yesterday, would appear quite different” (Paolo Legrenzy cited in Serrat, 2009, p. 1).

### **5.5.2 The disadvantages of participative management in schools**

Participative theory is not without its negative aspects. In this section I will discuss some of the challenges of participative theory.

#### **5.5.2.1 Authoritarian leadership**

An authoritarian management style emerged from the data as one of the challenges affecting teachers from participating in school management and decision-making. During this study some participants disclosed that autocratic leadership is still prevailing in the three schools in the Kavango region of Namibia. Autocratic/selfish leaders are the leaders that do not consider others when it comes to participation and decision-making, distribution of work (delegation) and decentralisation of authorities. This is in line with Boje who maintains that authoritarian leadership “centralize authority, dictate work methods, make unilateral decisions [and] limit employee participation” (in Mabuku, (2009, p. 9). Autocratic leaders still exist as some teachers mentioned that “authoritarian leadership still or partly exists at the school” (T6 & T8).

The teachers interviewed revealed a number of autocratic signs: in some schools teachers said that they are excluded from decision-making, conflict resolution and financial issues. All this information revealed that there is a shortcoming in the schools’ management since autocratic leadership is still prevailing. This contradicts McLagan & Nel, as mentioned in Chapter Two, that participative leadership developed before the twenty-first century and when autocratic government came to an end (in Niitembu, p. 28), since there are still signs of autocracy in schools. Hence, this contradicts what White & Lippitt describe, that democratic leadership “emphasize[s] group participation, discussion, and group decisions encouraged by the leader” (in Choi, 2007, p. 245).

Furthermore, the Management members asserted that “sometimes you have to be autocratic; although democracy is very important, sometimes you have to apply autocracy, especially in decision-making”. They also said there should be a “limit of participation”. However, Lewin argues “that you cannot do things to people but only with them” (in Weisbord, 1991, p. 89).

According to Muczyk & Reimann this type of management shows that “autocratic superiors act in more self-centered ways” (in Van De Vliert 2005, p. 2). I also believe that participation of teachers has to depend on contingency situations, because there is no way teachers will be at the side of their principals for every decision. In the same vein, SMTs argued that teachers always argue that a decision must not be taken if it is not in their interest.

The data of the study noted tension in the way the schools are run, for example conducting meetings and involving teachers in discussions, while ultimately the decision in general is taken by principals. In addition to that, an organogram of one of the schools, according to my observation, revealed that the school does not practise “flatter organisation” in terms of participation, empowerment, sharing of information, teamwork and trust (Werner, in Schultz, 2006, p. 196). As stated in the previous section, partial and window-dressing participation are noted as the practise at the schools according to the data of the study. However, the study also revealed unwilling participation from subordinates.

#### **5.5.2.2. Unwillingness to participate in school management and decision making**

One of the challenges that emerged from the data of the study is that teachers are not willing to accept responsibilities in school (when they are given responsibilities) and that they are unwilling to participate in discussions. This is highlighted by Schultz et al. who argue that participative management can be affected by unwilling participation of employees (2006, p. 192). In contrast, other researchers revealed that most teachers feel honour when they are involved in the decision-making process (Somech, 2010). This is in line with what some of the teachers I interviewed said that they are willing to participate in decision-making.

However, management said that they are always trying to invite their subordinates to participate in decision-making, but the teachers are not willing to participate (see Chapter Four). The SMTs suggested that teachers are unwilling to accept responsibilities and to participate in school decisions because they are afraid either of failure or burdens in the future. This sentiment was echoed by one teacher who said that teachers don't want responsibilities because of heavy workload. However, Somech (2010) argues that teachers' are willing to participate and take on responsibilities at their schools. Teachers maintain that they are not really involved by school managers. According to Lilyquist teachers' “participation is not only about taking part in the decision making processes but it is also

about being valued” (in Khoza, 2004, p. 17). This infers that if teachers’ emotions are not valued it may lead to their unwillingness to participate.

I also think that sometimes it is not good to constrain people in a way that they only listen or simply receive information, but that they should be actively involved. School principals need to implement participative theory by involving teachers through meaningful professional development programs and ensuring that teachers are given enough time and opportunities to put what they have learned into practice. As I mentioned in Chapter Four, the study came across this kind of event whereby teachers showed their unwillingness to participate in discussion in both schools, and, as a result, the principal took decisions like making holiday classes, since he is accountable for the failure if things do not work.

### **5.5.2.3 Challenge of accountability**

Accountability is also documented as the root cause for managers taking solitary decisions instead of involving other stakeholders. Teachers argue that participative management is good, but if something does not go well in school the person who will be accountable is not the teacher, but the school principal. For example, in Hakana School, two teachers argued that the manager, being the head of an organisation, is accountable for decisions.

From my experience as a school principal, I came to agree with participant T4 that a principal is held accountable, even when it comes to school results. As mentioned in the previous chapter, I noted some activities that revealed the effort made by the managers to make the HODs accountable in their departments, but still they are not fully accountable for failures. According to Stoner, et al., “delegation causes employees to accept accountability and exercise judgment” and at the same time improves employees “self -confidence and willingness to take initiative” in schools (1995, p. 355). However, Mabuku argues that “despite delegating, the head remains accountable for the attainment of organisational goals, which may be achieved by clarifying tasks and effective monitoring of the delegates’ performance” (2009, p. 22). Therefore, respondents argued that there should be a limitation in the involvement of teachers’ decision-making, because more involvement can mislead and confuse managers.

Too much participation in decisions affects an organization because everyone would like to bring in his/her own views and different views can lead to failures. As mentioned in Chapter Four (and partly in the last section) “teachers sometimes are too defensive” and they waste

time by arguing for the sake that they don't want to be part of the responsibilities. Elmore maintains that school restructuring gives decision making authority to stakeholders but not accountability for the decisions (in Wildy & Loudon, 2000). In Namibia, principals are always the target, and some principals are demoted if his/her school is not performing.

A good example I can give here is a principals' meeting that I attended on 28 January 2010 (after the grade 10 learners had performed poorly) during which senior officers in the region informed all school principals that they would be accountable for each of their school's performance. I think principals are held accountable, as the data revealed, but this does not guarantee that others must not be involved in decisions. According to Clawson if a "leader trusts his or her followers and would consequently be comfortable to share power, responsibilities and accountability with the rest of them" (as cited by Mabuku, 2009, p. 14) it would allow him/her to have time to attend to other responsibilities.

#### **5.5.2.4. Time consuming method**

Poor use of time was one of the challenges that came out from the participants' point of view in this study. Participants argued that time is a stumbling block since the methods demand that everyone share the same view, or have a clear understanding of the decision to be taken, before a final decision will be taken. Participants mentioned that the "democratic principle is time consuming" because of the involvement of all stakeholders at all levels. The barrier of participation or self-based management (SBM) is associated with meetings and it is therefore a time consuming process. This idea corresponds with Mabuku who said that democratic ELM has the shortcoming of being time consuming, and that in emergency situations there is no time to hold meetings (2009, p. 29).

As a result, principals reiterated that there must be a limit on participation since there are a number of things to be done within a given time and teachers sometimes argue for their own advantages, forgetting the advantages of the school. As mentioned in Chapter Four, this happened when because of arguing and limited time a decision about holiday classes had to be taken the next day. As a result, I align with Branch (2002) that time is one of the major weaknesses of participative leadership theory, because I personally used to experience unnecessary arguments, especially by novice and inexperienced teachers. I also believe, as stated by principals in this study, that the moment you give teachers too much room, they might overrule some good decisions.

However, T2 in this study argue that taking solitary decisions due to the time cannot hold water. As a result, Louden & Wildy (2000) in Chapter Two, argue that time consuming is a challenge principal's experience since they are accused of being autocratic when they take solitary decisions. However, Hersey point out that there is "no proof that democratic decision making, is more effective than decisions that are made by one individual only" (in Van Westhuizen, 1991, p. 157). This means, sometimes, even solitary decisions can contribute to positive outcomes in schools, it just depends on what kind of decision is being taken. Having said that, I think training for staff members is a vital part of the theory.

### **5.6 The need for participative management/leadership training in education**

It emerged from the participants that they feel it is very important for all the stakeholders to be trained according to the needs of participative management. Moloji (2002) emphasises that "educators' efforts to learn continuously must be supported and recognised because their knowledge is important, not only for their own growth, but also for school-based curriculum changes, team development, effective class room and school management, and organisational development and effectiveness" (p. 2). Participants considered that the theory serves as in-service training and it can help to develop teachers for leadership positions. As a result, the novice teachers argued that training is vital since they are being victimised as they are still young in the teaching profession, and, for the most part, staff do not take contributions from young teachers, even if they want to contribute in solving problems (see Chapter Four). Bush and Middlewood maintain that "newly qualified teachers are regarded as competent to teach but their skills are immature and need to be nurtured" (2005, p. 162). However, some participants believed that they are contributing and their decisions also count.

School principals maintained that workshops/training (especially for novice teachers) is vital to develop their skills. For example, the principal of Kazana School emphasised that novice teachers "need slight training" before or after they have join the teaching profession, because young teachers lack different skills and the quality of commitment and delivering is not good. In addition, one principal mentioned that some teachers had not attended a single workshop since they were appointed even by advisory teachers. The data revealed that neither the school, nor the circuit office, nor even the Ministry of Education is doing enough to train teachers, especially for participative leadership purposes. Scholars believe that, "Participation is a core characteristic of democratic leadership; and the ideal of democratic leadership is friendly, helpful, and encouraging participation" (Luthar, 1996, in Choi, 2008, p. 246). In

fact, the ministry is not even doing enough to monitor the quality of the training offered at various institutions, as they show lack of skills and immaturity as mentioned in this section above by Bush and Middlewood (2005). Bush, et al. argue that university programmes are predominantly aiming at “knowledge for understanding” (2009, p. 116). Bolam maintains that leadership should be developed into four modes: “Knowledge for understanding, knowledge for action, improvement for practice and development for a reflexive mode” (1996, *ibid.*).

The information emerged that the SMTs are not doing enough since there is no effective programme in place as mentioned in Chapter Four. Teachers also echoed that there is no programme at their schools. According to Stoll, et al. it is important to “involve [teachers], training them to perform roles that will enhance the school, build their personal efficacy, use [sic] their skills” (in Bush and Middlewood, 2005, p. 35). As a result, participants believed that it is very important for stakeholders to be trained. Principals in this study asserted that at circuit level they organise workshop for circuit management (CM) but not for ordinary teachers to be trained as a leaders, unless they go for subject meetings.

Furthermore, Mbambo argues that “apart from the training, workshops, formal meetings and conferences, learning is also experienced through reading, doing research, experiments, informal meetings, and many other activities that teachers do or face on a daily basis” (2009, p. 80). This shows that it is good for a supervisor to do something for his/her staff like offering mini workshops or induction. As a result, Jurasaitė-Harbison argues that “teachers need to use various opportunities for learning and continuous professional growth” (cited in Mbambo, *ibid.*). “Most of all, democratic leaders must seek to make members into leaders” (Theilen & Poole, in Gastill, 1994, p 959). I believe that providing various opportunities for leadership development to the teachers can assist the ministry to grow future leaders. At the same time it is vital to offer training to staff members to be aware of the logic behind the democratic principle as mentioned in the conclusion in chapter 6.

## **5.7 Conclusion**

In this chapter I discussed the findings of my research in light of the theories that advocate participative management, namely: political, collegiality, shared leadership, teamwork, delegation and decentralisation, in terms of running a school. Themes that originated from the presentations in Chapter Four and the literature review that support participative theory are mostly the ones discussed here. It was interesting, however, to find that the role of a principal

in ELM determines and encourages teachers' participation in school management and decision-making. It was learned that it can promote a favourable teaching and learning environment as is required by the democratic system. Broader participation in decision-making is a necessity in the education system to drive organizational goal and transform management successfully for better performance. In this chapter, I noted that there was tension between teachers and SMTs since teachers indicated their willingness to be part of decision-making, while managers believed that there should be limitations on teachers' involvement. This observation led me to make more recommendations about the training needs in my conclusion.

## Chapter Six

### Conclusion

#### 6.1 Introduction

This study investigated the participation of teachers in the management and decision-making process of three schools in the Kavango region of Namibia. The aim was to find out stakeholders perceptions and experiences of the teachers' involvement in school affairs and gain insight about the advantages and challenges involved in this phenomena. Another thing was to find ways how to employ the approach in schools. In this final chapter I provide a summary of the main findings, the potential value of the study, training needs and some recommendations and suggestions for future research. This chapter also reveals the limitations of the study, and my conclusion.

#### 6.2 Summary of main findings

The aim of the Ministry of Education in the policy document *Toward Education for All* was to transform education by encouraging all the stakeholders to participate in school management and decision-making. As a result, the prominent findings that emerged in this research from all the research sources used (namely interviews, document analysis and observation) based on the research goal and questions as indicated in Chapter one and four reveal some positive outcomes and, at the same time, some negative aspects. The main findings of this research signified that the participants have an understanding of participatory management in line with the policy document of Namibia, *Toward Education for All*, 1993 and with the requirements of Education Act, no 16 of 2001 in which democratic management and decision-making in schools is stipulated. The participation of teachers in schools may be described as one of the "thick" data in this research type more especially in the area where the research took place for the first time.

The study found that decisions are made at the schools according to the principle of democratic participation which requires the involvement of all legitimates stakeholders and that teachers had rights and opportunities to participate and make contributions. Participants revealed that participative management leads the organisation to achieve higher goals since it encourages teamwork, collaboration, consultation, and broader participation in decision-making. These signify that there is at least some progress and improvement in terms of the teachers' participation in decision-making. The data revealed that managers at least are committed to involving teachers in school decision-making. In a similar vein, the study showed an average commitment among teachers towards participative management and decision-making.

Commitment was a prominent feature of the findings as shown by teachers' attendance during meetings.

The participants' perceptions and experience of participation in school management and decision-making show that teachers are consulted and decisions are taken through consensus and democratic majority count. Furthermore, the study revealed that democratic participation exists in the schools since teachers are encouraged to share their views and ideas when there is a problem. The political style of solving problems and taking decisions by involving staff members, bargaining, compromising and exchanging ideas was also observed. The major finding in this study was that staff members are sharing responsibilities, sharing leadership by the establishment of committees that are distributed with managerial responsibilities. The involvement of teachers through committees/structures was uncovered as the best way of letting teachers participate in school matters as their democratic right and obligation to share and reduce the manager's burdens.

The principal's strategy of delegating leadership responsibilities to teachers and SMTs enhance leadership development and growth of stakeholders. The involvement of teachers who are School Board members and NANTU School committees and ordinary teachers in conflict resolution is a significant practice of participative management. The existence of teamwork was found to encourage democratic participation and collegiality since people are encouraged to work together. When I probed participants on the importance of teamwork in school, they said it motivates teachers to participate and work together as a team for common goals. Communication and sharing of information between the management and teachers was observed during meetings to share information about the school, and it was observed as a strategy to encourage creativity and innovations. It was obvious that teachers were committed to help in developing the school, and yet they were passive during meetings. The study detected that meetings are the main source of communication and exchanging of ideas in which participative management is encouraged.

The study reported again that teamwork, communication and sharing of leadership roles via various committees/structures, motivate and empower teachers not only to become committed to school achievement, but also to develop self-confidence to be able to do work on their own. Participation through teamwork and committees helps teachers feel that they are also part of the school, and promotes a sense of ownership among staff members by

involving them in decision-making. Moreover, this study suggested that it is a leader's responsibility to ensure that teachers take part in decision-making as a mechanism to avoid resistance to change, encourage trust and avoid misconceptions. The findings revealed that "workers who make decisions [then] more readily accept the outcomes and become more vested in making high-quality decisions" (Schultz, 2006, p. 165). The theory serves as in-service training for staff development purpose. It reveals the readiness of managers to nurture others since they will not be leaders for life. The findings indicated that decentralisation of power can be more effective if teachers are given authority to take final decisions. This indicated that "a super leader leads in such a way that followers learn to lead themselves" (*ibid.*)

However, the findings of the research also revealed tensions between the teachers and management members. The study revealed a number of instances where the SMTs and teachers differ in opinion, for example in their thoughts on teamwork, communication, sharing of leadership, decision-making, delegation and decentralisation of authority. The study revealed challenges such as autocratic or authoritarian leadership, unwillingness to consult others and to accept management responsibility on the part of teachers, solitary decisions, lack of motivation and transparency, all of which impinge on the implementation of the theory. Mabuku argues that leaders "centralize authority, dictate work methods, make unilateral decisions [and] limit employee participation" (2009, p. 9). The findings also revealed that participative management depends on the willingness to participate or involve others in school management when there are problems. The study revealed another of the major challenges as a lack of teachers' involvement in school finance, for instance in the school budget and expenditure, and conflict resolutions.

Time consuming and accountability challenges were also observed as stumbling block for not involving others in decision-making and, as a result, some principals make selfish decisions and enforce their interests in school. Traditional decision-making before consultation was also reported and observed. Furthermore, the issue of lack of knowledge and skills of the theory mostly from novice teachers appeared as a major challenge in the schools. Moreover, the study disclosed the strategy employed by principals to promote participative management and management decision, however the study found out there is a misunderstanding with the whole requirement of the theory. As a result, the participants suggested participative management training to address the situation.

### **6.3 The need for participative leadership training**

The findings of the research indicate the necessity for all stakeholders to receive training. The study found that not enough is being done at the schools, the circuit office, or even the Ministry of Education to train stakeholders for participative leadership purposes. As a result, the majority of respondents suggested that training on the subject of participative management is needed in education. This came in as a result of uncertainty in understanding the implementation of participative theory in the schools involved in the investigation.

### **6.4 Significance of the study**

This research has prospective value for me personally and professionally as an employee of the Ministry of Education in the position of an executive. In addition to that, the research has a paramount value to the policy makers and implementers of educational policies in Namibia, and to the regional level and the national level of the Ministry of Education. This study identified some shortcomings and potentials that will aid the government in improving the management system of education. It embraces significant value for future researchers within the field of educational leadership and management, and various learning institutions in general. The research in general has developed my understanding on the phenomena of participation of teachers in school management and decision-making in terms of skills and knowledge about how to approach the trend

The experience I gained about the strategy and effects of the theory from the participants' point of views, as well as from the international literatures, are vital for my profession. The research has uncovered specific areas in which educators need to get better and to serve our education system better. I regard this exercise as a wake up-call and I can use the knowledge gained to address the shortcomings in the management approach that is being practised at schools. The effectiveness of participative theory, and the knowledge and skills therein, show it has a role to play in providing effective guidance to other employees of the ministry.

The findings of the study may help the Ministry of Education in Namibia, as well as other southern African countries, to find ways of educating stakeholders about their democratic right when it comes to participative management. The findings of the study may play a major role in schools to remind stakeholders to understand what participative management is all

about and how decisions should be taken at schools. The findings of the study may also encourage higher education institutions to revise their curriculum to include contemporary theory like participative management, and thereby equip students with proper leadership skills.

The findings address the call of school management teams for young or novice teachers to be aware of what it is expected from them and change their behaviour to fit the professional codes of conduct. As mentioned in this section, this study may influence principals to adapt their leadership style, for instance their unwillingness to share responsibilities, delegate tasks, and devolve power to stakeholders. Furthermore, the findings of this study contribute to the current research literature in the field of Education Leadership and Management (ELM) in general, and more specifically concerning contemporary leadership theory, such as transformational leadership, distributed, servant, and teacher leadership. Again, this study has established all over how the participative management theory embraces the perception of leadership development in education.

### **6.5 Recommendation for participative leadership development/training needs**

As a result of the findings, I am now in a position to make some recommendations which are listed below. The transformational process of educational leadership and management (ELM) was based on the following principles that: “Management is about doing things and working with people to make things happen. It is a process to which all contribute and in which everyone in an organisation ought to be involved” (DoE, 1996, p. 27). Therefore, the unwillingness to involve others and accept management responsibilities among teachers and school principals in the schools is a threat to democratic achievement. Therefore it is vital that:

- The Ministry of Education needs to put forward the call for the training needs of its stakeholders on democratic management. The training should include inspectors, subject advisors, school principals, teachers, school board members, learners, and any other stakeholders that have an interest in education, in order to empower them to move towards the common goal of the phenomena and the educational system’s needs.
- Subject advisors, regional managers and inspectors should provide information to the higher institutions training teachers and offer in-service training courses about the needs of the society, and quality of skills and knowledge that is expected from the graduates. It is vital for students to know the importance of the democratic principles

to prevent them from waiving their democratic right of participation in school management and decision-making.

- School principals' needs to enter training programmes in order to understand what participative management involves to a large extent. Therefore, the need to be involved in various training workshops will motivate them and enhance their leadership capacity to carry out their responsibilities efficiently.
- School principals must be informed to be aware that they have a major role to play as role models that inspire others to become leaders. Leaders should be trained and motivated to have that courage of training others and the willingness to accept criticism and admit mistakes.
- The managers should be ready to devolve most of their responsibilities to the stakeholders. They have to know that delegation of responsibilities and decentralisation of power does not mean that they are giving all of their power or authority to the subordinates, but that they must share the responsibilities of an organisation; this is the heart of the participative leadership phenomenon.
- Teachers in schools also want to become leaders in the future, and therefore they need motivation and training to get involved in the management roles as part of their leadership development.

Lastly, the research also found that schools in the remote areas need general support of resources, especially the combined and primary schools. My observation indicated that not enough is being done by the Ministry to develop those schools when compared to schools in the urban areas (see Chapter Four, 4.2 School contexts).

## **6.6 Recommendations for future research**

The findings of the research, especially as stated in section 6.4, strongly show that participative management in schools remains a challenging phenomenon. This indicates that there is an urgent need for wide-ranging research to find mechanisms to redress the shortcomings in Namibian schools, specifically in the Kavango region where the study was conducted. There was an indication in this research that the Ministry of Education is not doing enough to improve management skills and leadership knowledge of stakeholders. I therefore recommend that future researchers should explore perceptions of the similar trends to a larger extent by involving other stakeholders.

- Future researchers should explore the perceptions and experiences of school board members (parents), learners, institutions workers, and other interested groups. These stakeholders might have diverse perceptions of participation in

school management and decision-making that will help to overcome the challenges currently being experienced and contribute to planning for future development.

- A large scale research that includes different school phases would add an advantage to the research data and shed light on the phenomena under investigation. I recommend that two or more of each school phase (senior secondary schools, combined and primary schools) should be the sample of the next study, because a large study about participative management is needed in different circuits/regions in order to facilitate the government thinkers and the Ministry of Education when it comes to leadership (staff) development needs throughout the country, and to prioritise according to circuit or regional training needs.
- The needs for participative leadership and in service- training will enable the Ministry of Education to achieve its goals of democratic involvement in school governance and to improve the principle of site-based management in education. School managers will be in a position to change their leadership style in order to accommodate other stakeholders in the affairs of schools and reduce the traditional way of leading and supervising institutions.
- The higher institutions that are offering educational leadership, as well as the management field and other education fields, will be able to evaluate their admission requirement in order to admit those matured individuals who will make a big difference in society in terms of leadership and management. Teaching activities and learners' performance will improve if they are taught by very skilful and matured academic professionals.

### **6.7 The limitations of the study**

It is a fact that every situation has a limit. Therefore, it was the case in this study despite the perception that it was a success in terms of data gathering; still it faced a number of limitations as mentioned in Chapter Three. The duration of this study - just one week in each site - has caused a limit of data to analyse since I was unable to attend major meetings to observe the interaction and participation of stakeholders. Observations were recorded during morning briefing/meetings and break time, which I feel was not enough. According to Merriam (2001, p. 204) long term investigation would have allowed me to collect more data, and this would have increased the

validity of my research findings. In this research, the validity was asserted by using various sources and triangulating the data collection. Denzin (in Maxwell, 2007), states that “qualitative studies generally rely on the integration of data from a variety of methods and sources of information, a general principle known as triangulation” (p. 236). This strategy assisted me to reduce the risk that my conclusions would reflect only the systematic biases or limitations of a specific method (*ibid.*).

Another limitation I experienced in this study was the lack of documents. For example, I planned to obtain valid data at a secondary school from journal notes, but unfortunately the document does not exist at that school, only at two schools where I managed to get some information from SMTs’ personal dairies/notebooks. As a result, I only used sources available, such as organograms, minutes of meetings, and allocation of duties. Disturbance by noisy learners during interviews also contributed to limitations because most of the staff working at the schools were coming from town every morning and leaving immediately after school, making the only opportunity to interview them during their free periods. Very few participants were interviewed after school as explained earlier in Chapter Three.

The study succeeded in including three schools and fourteen participants, but I thought the validity of the research could have been strengthened if I could have involved a greater number of people in each school, like I did at the senior secondary school. However, the case study was a small scale study, focused only on a few sites and stakeholders to provide light on the phenomena as explained in Chapter Three. The data’s strength in a qualitative case study lies in its focus on the particular case. The validity of the study was also limited in observation of teacher participation and interaction, because one principal was not present for the whole week, and because of the organisational arrangement of having only one morning briefing per week at some schools.

As a result, Musore argues that “the findings of a case study are sometimes not generalisable except in so far as a reader can ‘recognise’ findings and place them in a similar context” (2009, p. 107). Therefore, this study could have been generalised if it represented a larger population of the participants and a greater number of schools in the circuit where the research was conducted. In a similar vein, Maxwell argues that “Indeed, the value of a qualitative study may depend on its lack of generalizability in the sense of being representative of a larger population” (in Bickman & Rog 2008, p. 245). As a result, the study

suggested that the phenomenon needs a large scale study to include many stakeholders and schools. Denscombe argues that generalization “is based on [the] statistical probability of [an] event happening everywhere and it is a probability that relies on a large sample which is representative of the wider population” (2007, p. 299). Literatures stressed that a research based on small numbers and qualitative data needs an alternative way of addressing the issue of “transferability” and “conformability” than when conducting a large study, since this one focussed on few individuals to shed light on the phenomena (Lincoln & Cuba, 1985, in Denscombe, *ibid.*). Stake refers to this kind of generalization as “naturalistic generalization” (1995, p. 85). A particular situation can only be transferable or generalized to a similar school of a similar size, level, and population (Merriam, 2001, p. 210).

## **6.8 Conclusion**

In this chapter I summarised the main findings of the study. I also discussed the value of the research to Namibia and Ministries of Education at large. In general, stakeholders, namely inspectors, school managers, teachers, and even the school board members and other interest groups, may benefit from this study. The chapter summarised and disclosed the outcomes of the stakeholders’ perceptions and experiences, managers’ roles, and the extent of teachers’ participation in management, including the challenges, limitations, and benefits of participative approach. I personally learned a lot during this study, from both the international perspectives and from the participants of the study. Therefore, I personally think that this study will be a great asset and highly important for our education system in Namibia. The recommendations made in this section, if implemented well, can facilitate the speedy improvement of participative management issues that are affecting the achievements of the Ministry of Education in terms of quality education in Namibia.

## References

- Aipinge, L. P. (2007). *Cluster Centre Principals' perceptions of the Implementation of the School Cluster System in Namibia*. Unpublished master's thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Bogler, R. and Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 20(3), 277–289.
- Boleslaw, R. (2009). Ethical context of the participative leadership model: taking people into account. *Corporate Governance Journal*, Vol. 9(4), 461-472.
- Botha, N. (2006). Leadership in school-based management: a case study in selected schools. *Southern African Journal of Education*, Vol. 26(3), 341-353.
- Branch, K. M. (2002). Chapter 10. *Participative management and employee and stakeholder involvement*. Retrieved 2011/10/24.
- Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and Approach to the Planned Change: A Re-appraisal Manchester School of Management. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 46(6), 22-23.
- Burton, N., Brundrett, M., & Jones, M. (2008). *Doing your Education Research Project*. London: Sage.
- Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). London: Sage.
- Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: theory, policy, and practice. *South African Journal of Education*. Vol. 27(3), 391-406.
- Bush, T. and Middlewood, D. (2005). *The principal of Educational Leadership & Management* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) London: Sage.
- Bush, T., Bell, L. & Middlewood, D. (Eds). (2009). *The principles of Educational Leadership & Management* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). London: Sage.

- Chen, F. Y., and Tjosvold, D. (2006). Participative Leadership by American and Chinese Managers in China. The Role of Relationships. *Journal of Management Studies*. Vol. 43(8), 1727-1752.
- Choi, S. (2007). Democratic Leadership: The lessons of exemplary models for democratic governance. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 2(3), 243-262.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methodology in education* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methodology in education* (6<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Denscombe, M. (2007). *The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects* (Third Ed.). London: Open University press.
- Donald, D., Lazarus, S., & Lolwana, P. (2002). *Educational psychology in social context* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Donald, S., Lazarus, S., & Lolwana, P. (1997). *Educational Psychology in Social Context: Challenges of development, social issues, & special need in southern Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Flick, U., von Kardorff, E., & Steinke, I. (2004). *A companion to qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gastill, J. (1994). A definition and illustration of democratic leadership. *Human Relations*, 47(8), 953-975.
- Gillham, W. (2000). *Case study research in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Hancock & Algozzinne, R, D. & Algozzine, B. 2006. *Doing Case Study Research. A Practical Guide for Beginning Researchers*. New York: Teachers College press.
- International institute for educational planning*. Vol. XXII. (4), (2004, October-December). Retrieved in 14 October 2011. <http://www.unesco.org/iiep/eng/training/virtual.htm>
- Jamali, D., Khoury, G., & Sahyoun, H. (2006). From bureaucratic organization to learning organizations: An evolutionary roadmap. *Journal of Education*, Vol. 13(4), 337-352.

- Kamonde, A. S., (2008). *Teachers' perceptions on participative management in a primary school in Namibia*. Unpublished master's thesis. Grahamstown. Rhodes University.
- Kapapero, F. (2007). *Namibian school principals' perceptions of their management development needs*. Unpublished master's thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Kendra, C. (2010). *Lewin's leadership styles*. Accessed <http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/a/leaderstyl.htm> Retrieved 21 October 2011.
- Leedy, P. D., and Ormrod, J, E. (2005). *Practical Research: Planning and Design (8<sup>TH</sup> Ed.)*. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Litchman, M. (2010). *Qualitative Research in Education: A users Guide*. California: Sage.
- Mabuku, R. N., (2009) *Democratic leadership and management practices in a rural Namibian secondary school*. Unpublished master's thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Maxwell, A. J. (1998). *Designing Qualitative Research*. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.). *Designing a Qualitative Study: Applied research designs (3rd Ed.)* (pp. 214-253) California: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach (2nd Ed.)*. California: Sage.
- Mbambo, M. S. (2009). *The role of teachers' resource centres from the perspective of school managers and teachers*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- McCrimmon, M. (2007). What is participative leadership? *The importance of involving employees in making decisions*. Access@<http://www.suite101.com/content/what-is-participative-leadership-a23335>. Retrieved on 07/05/2011.
- McEwan, E. K., & McEwan, P. J. (2003). *Making sense of research: what is good, what is not, and how to tell the difference*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- McMillan, A. (2007). Chapter 10. *Participative Styles*. <http://www.reference for business.com/management/log-mar/management-styles.htm> Retrieved. 24/10/2011.

- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Wesley: Longman.
- Merriam, S. B (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative Research in Practice: Examples for Discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mncube, V., (2008). Democratisation of education in South Africa: issues of social justice and the voice of learners? *South African Journal of Education*. Vol. 28(1), 77-90.
- Moloi, K. C. (2002). *The school as Learning Organisation: reconceptualising school practices in South Africa*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Moloi, K. C. (2007). An overview of education management in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*. Vol. 27(3)463-476.
- Monette, D. R., Sullivan, T. J., and de Jong, C. R. (1998). *Applied solid research* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed). Fort Worth: Brace College.
- Mungunda, C. (2003). *An investigation into school principals' experience and perceptions of Participative management*. Unpublished master's thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Musore, P. V. (2009). *Unionism in schools: blessing or curse?* Unpublished Master's thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Namibia. (1990). *Constitution of the Republic of Namibia*: Windhoek. Namprint.
- Namibia. (1999). *Presidential Commission on Education, Culture and Training Report*: Windhoek. Namprint.
- Namibia. *Education Act 16 of 2001*. Windhoek: Government printer.
- Namibia. Ministry of Education (2006). *Education and Training Sector Improvement Programme: planning for a learning nation*. Windhoek: Government Printers.

- Namibia. Ministry of Education and Culture. (1993). *Toward education for all: A developmental brief for education culture and training*. Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan.
- Nekhwevha, F. (1999). No matter how long the night, the day is sure to come: Culture and educational transformation in post-colonial Namibia and post-apartheid South Africa. *International review of education*, 45(5/6), 491-506.
- Niitembu, M. M, (2006). *Stakeholders' perceptions of parents' involvement in the governance of a Namibian rural school*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Oduro, G.K.T. (2004). Distributed leadership in schools: *what English head teachers say about the pull and push factors*. An unpublished paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Manchester, 16-18 September 2004.
- Parnell, John A. (2010) 'Propensity for participative decision making in Latin America: Mexico and Peru', *The international Journal of Human Resources Management*, Vol. 21(3), 2323-2338.
- Potgieter, T. (2006). The dynamics of groups and teams. In H. Schultz (Ed), *Organisational behaviour: A contemporary South African perspective* (pp. 95-116). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Prew, G. M. (2006). From Botha to Mandela: *How South Africa is transforming its school managers from an authoritarian to democratic mode of leadership*. Paper for CCEAM Conference held in Cyprus, 15 October 2006.
- Reese, G. D. Jr. (2009). *An examination of the role of participatory management in academic special collections departments*. Vol. 23(4), 161-167.
- Rivera, M., (2008). Participative Management. Conceptual Overview. *The online Journal*, Volume 6 Issue 4.
- Schultz, H. (2006). *Organisational Behaviour. A contemporary South African perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

- Serrat, O. (2009). Knowledge solutions: *Harnessing creativity and innovation in the workplace*. Regional and Sustainable Development. Asian Development Bank (ADB). Manila. September/61.
- Shennu. B. (2010) *Participative leadership*. Access @ [http://www.ehow.com/list\\_7417305](http://www.ehow.com/list_7417305). Retrieved 12 June 2011.
- Smith, C., (work in progress), *Organisation development (OD): what it is and how it works*. Department of Education. Rhodes University: Grahamstown.
- Sodhi, K., J (2009). *Team cooperation in participation management*. Access @ [www://http.authorstream.com](http://www.authorstream.com)
- Somech, A. (2002). Explicating the complexity of participative management: an investigation of multiple dimensions. *Educational administration quarterly*, vol. 38(3), 341-371.
- Somech, A. (2010) Participative Decision Making in Schools: A Mediating-Moderating Analytical Framework for Understanding School and Teacher Outcomes. *Educational administration quarterly*, Vol. 46(2), 174–209.
- Somech, A., (2005). Directive versus participative leadership: Two complementary approaches to managing school effectiveness. *Educational administration quarterly*, Vol. 41, (5), 777-800.
- Somech, A., and Benoliel, P., (2009). *Who benefits from participative management?* Faculty of Education, Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. 48(3), 285-308.
- South Africa. Department of Education. (1996). *The Task Team Report on Education management Development*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: Sage.
- Steyn, J. C., de Klerk, I., & Du Plessis, W, S. (2009). *Education for Democracy (4<sup>th</sup> Ed)*. Durbanville: Wacha Publishers.
- Stofile, M. A. (2005). *An exploratory study into various stakeholders' perceptions and experiences of participative management in a high school in the Cala district, Eastern Cape*. Unpublished master's thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Stoner, J.A.F, Freeman, R.D, & Gilbert, D. R., (1995). *Management (6<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. Prentice-Hall: Mills Litho.

- Sukirno, U. and Sonunta S. (2010) Does participative decision making affect lecturer performance in higher education. *International Journal of Educational management*, Vol. 25(5), 494-508.
- Swanepoel, C. (2008). The perceptions of teachers and school principals of each other's disposition towards teacher involvement in school reform. *South African Journal of Education*. Vol. 28(1), 39-51.
- Swanepoel, C. (2009). A comparison between the views of teachers in South Africa and six other countries on involvement in school change. *South African Journal of Education*, Vol. 29(4), 461-474.
- Taylor, D.J. L. (2004). Effective School Governing Bodies: *The misnomer of the idea of a "balance between governance and management"*. Department of Educational Policy studies. University of Stellenbosch.
- Van De Vliert, E. (2006) Autocratic leadership around the globe. Do climate and wealth drive leadership culture? *Journal of cross-cultural Psychology*, Vol. 37(1), 52-59.
- Van der Mescht, H. (1996). *A phenomenological investigation into the educational leaders' perception of themselves, their followers and their organisational context*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Van der Westhuizen, P.C., (2008). *Schools as organisations (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.)*. Cape Town: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Van der Westhuizen, P.C. (1991). *Effective educational management*. Pretoria: Kagiso.
- Van Wyk, N. (2004). School governing bodies: The experiences of South African educators. *South African Journal of Education*, Vol. 24(1)49-54.
- Van Wyk, N. (2007). The rights and roles of parents on school governing bodies in South Africa. *International Journal in Education*, Vol. 1(0), 132-139.
- Weisbord, W. (1991). Productive workplaces. Organizing and Managing for Dignity, Meaning, and community. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Werner, A. (2006). Contemporary developments in leadership and followership. In H. Schultz (Ed), *Organisational behavior: A contemporary South African perspective* (pp. 185-203). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Wildy, H., and Loudon, W. (2000). School restructuring and the dilemmas of principals' work. *Educational Management Administration Leadership*; 28(2), 173-184.

Yohe, W. S., and Hatfield, L. (2003). Moderating factors in participative proceedings of the academy of organizational culture, communications and conflict, 7(2 management.) *Allied Academies International Conferences*, Las Vegas, 2003.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Interview Questions for school Principals

1. What are the major challenges do you experience in running the school of this level?
2. Is participative management being practise here at this school?
3. What is your understanding of participative management?
4. To what extent do you consult teachers' with regard to matters of management?
5. How do you get all teachers' ' in board/involve in the management of the school?
6. What are your perceptions of teachers' ' participation in management and decision making at the school?
7. What are the qualities/advantages of participative management/decision making in school?
8. What is going well in term of team building/teamwork in your organization?
9. What are the challenges/effects of participation of teachers' in decision making at the school?
10. What is your role as a principal in bringing about this kind of management?
11. Does the school or circuit conduct workshops for teachers' development in term of participative management?
12. What do you think the Ministry of Education can do to improve participative management/decision making in schools?

## **APPENDIX 2: Interview questions for HODs (SMT)**

1. How long have you been a Head of department of this school?
2. What are your responsibilities at the school?
3. What can you tell me about decision-making ways that are being applied here at your school?
4. Does the school practise participative management?
5. How does the school involve teachers' in decision-making?
6. What are the most significant challenges involved in participative management?
7. What is your perception of teachers' participation in decision making at the school?
8. To what extent do all staff members get involved in decision making concerning the school?
9. What are the benefits/advantages of participative management/decision-making?
10. What is your role as a management member in promoting teachers' involvement in school management/ decision-making?
11. Do you also take final decisions at the school?
12. Is there any leadership development program in place that sensitises (prepares) teachers' for participation in school management?
13. What is your general comment about participative management at the school?
14. Do you think the government is doing enough in developing teachers' for leadership position?

### Appendix 3: Interview questions for Teachers

1. Apart from teaching, what other responsibilities do you have at the school?
2. Can you tell me about decision-making ways that are applied here at the school?
3. Is participative management being practised here at the school?
4. What roles do teachers' play in formulation of school policies?
5. To what extent does the manager involve teachers' in school management?
6. Does the school management promote/encourage teachers' participation in decision-making?
7. What are the advantages of participative management?
8. How do the school solve conflicts that affect teachers or learners?
9. Can an ordinary teacher also take a final decision?
10. What are the major challenges/problems do you know at this school about the way decisions are taken?
11. Does the school offer some leadership training/workshops for teachers' for development purposes in site- management?
12. What do you expect from your supervisor/ the Ministry of Education to do in terms of participative management?

## **Appendix 4: Requisition for interview permission and ethical issues details for participants.**

Dear Sir / Madam

### **APPLICATION/LETTER FOR PERMISSION TO INTERVIEW YOU**

I hereby apply for permission to interview you at your school. I am currently registered for an M Ed Degree in Education Management and Leadership at Rhodes University in South Africa.

**My research topic is: Participation of teachers' in school Management and decision making: A Case Study.**

Your name has been selected by means of purposive sampling method with the rationale that you could be rich with information concerning my study. Therefore, I would like to inform you that you are one of the participants in the school will be interviewed.

I hereby undertake to inform you of the following ethical issues:

I will keep your name confidential at all times by coding your responses on transcription of the data. You will not be subject to any physical or emotional harm. At the same time, you are allowed to withdraw from the research process any time without any consequence as your participation is a voluntary basis. The researcher will use your responses for research purposes only. After the whole process of the research and transcribing of your responses, the recorded voices or video will be erasing. I will arrange time with you to interview you at a time that will be convenient to you. I will attempt to make interview results available to you for data check-up. I will report the outcomes with reasonable honest without misinterpretation of your responses.

I got permission to conduct this research from both the principal, circuit inspector and the Regional Director of Education. I would be grateful if you could grant me this permission.

Yours faithfully

Muronga M

Cell. No. 0735575870 (SA)

## Appendix 5: Consent form for research participants

To Whom It May Concern:

### INFORMED CONSENT

I \_\_\_\_\_ (Surname and initials of participant), hereby agree to take part in the research project that is undertaken by Mr Michael Muronga. My participation is based on the following conditions:

I have the right to withdraw from the study at any point without consequences. I have been informed that my participation is basis on voluntary and the researcher has given me all information about the research mission. I will not be exposing to any physical or emotional risk. My name shall remain confidential at all times and anonymity will be maintained by the researcher as it shall only appear as a code in the research project. My responses to the questions shall only be used for research purposes and under no circumstances the researcher will misinterpret my responses. The voice recorder or video the researcher use will be erasing after transcription or verifying of data. The researcher will return my responses after transcribing for member checking. I hereby give permission to Mr. Muronga to record my voice/video camera for the interview I will be involved for his study purpose.

.....

.....

SIGNATURE

Date

## Appendix 6: Observation schedule

Name of observer: Muronga M

Date:..../07/11

Principal code: { .....

Day.....

School Pseudonym Name.....

Time.....

Focus for observation during morning briefing	Tick	Events/comments
Relationship		
Interaction/teamwork		
Participation/Involvement		
Communication		
Strategy		
Encouragement/ empowerment		
Caring/support		
Environment/atmosphere		
Quality decisions		
General observation on participation in decision making ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... .....		

## Appendix 7: Document analysis schedule

School Pseudonym Name: .....

Date:...../...../2011

Critical events

Document type	Date	Comments
Organisational/governance structure		
Delegation/decentralisation/allocation of duties		
School policies (rules)		
Dairies/Journal notes		
Minutes of Management and staff meetings		
General summary of documents ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... .....		

## Appendix 8: A letter to request permission to conduct research in the region of Kavango



**RHODES UNIVERSITY**

Grahamstown • 6140 • South Africa

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
Tel: +27 (0) 46 603 8383  
Fax: +27 (0) 46 622 8028  
PO Box 94, Grahamstown, 6140  
E-mail: education@ru.ac.za

17 June 2011  
Mr Alfons Dikuwa: Director  
Kavango Region  
Private Bag 2134  
RUNDU

Dear Mr Dikuwa

### Permission to conduct research in your region

I am writing to obtain your permission for Mr Michael Muronga (student number 11M1626) to collect data from a school in your region. He is a registered Masters student at Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa in the field of Educational Leadership and Management. He has reached the point where he is ready to conduct his research. He wants to investigate participative management among principals at selected schools in your region.

Mr Muronga will need access to documents, to observe the school in action to get a sense of its climate and culture, and to interview selected teachers, the principal and possibly other senior staff members. He deserves all the assistance he can get for this project. Management is an important issue in education in Namibia and the rest of Southern Africa but as yet under-researched. Mr Muronga has done well so far in his coursework and I have every confidence that he will produce a good study.

Thank you in anticipation for your permission and support. If you have any queries please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely

(Prof) Hennie van der Mescht (Supervisor)

## Appendix 9: A letter to request permission into schools in the circuit



**RHODES UNIVERSITY**

Grahamstown • 6140 • South Africa

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
Tel: +27 (0) 46 603 8383  
Fax: +27 (0) 46 622 8028  
PO Box 94, Grahamstown, 6140  
E-mail: education@ru.ac.za

17 June 2011  
Mr K Sanzila  
Inspector of Education  
Bunya Circuit  
Kavango Education Region  
NAMIBIA

Dear Mr Sanzila

Permission to conduct research in your circuit

Mr Michael Muronga (student number 11M1626) is a registered Masters student at Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa in the field of Educational Leadership and Management. He has reached the point where he is ready to conduct his research. He wants to investigate participative management in selected schools in your circuit. The purpose of this letter is to obtain your permission for him to collect data from selected schools.

Mr Muronga will need access to documents pertaining to management and leadership, to observe the school in action to get a sense of its climate and culture, and to interview selected teachers, the principal and perhaps some senior staff. He deserves all the assistance he can get for this project. Management is an important issue in education in Namibia and the rest of Southern Africa but as yet under-researched. The caliber of Mr Muronga's work so far suggests that he will produce a sound thesis and add significantly to the field of Educational Leadership and Management.

Thank you in anticipation for your permission and support. If you have any queries please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely

(Prof) Hennie van der Mescht (Supervisor)

Appendix 10: A letter for permission to conduct research in the region of Kavango



REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA  
KAVANGO REGIONAL COUNCIL

DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION

Tel. (065) 258.9141.....  
Fax (065) ...2589213/2589320/258.9222

Privat Bag 2134  
RUNDU

Enquiries: Alfons M. Dikuua  
Our Ref.: 11/2/1

Your Ref.: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 30 June 2011

Mr. Michael Muronga  
P.O. Box 1720  
RUNDU  
NAMIBIA


Dear Mr. Muronga

**RE: PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE A RESEARCH STUDY IN KAVANGO REGION**

Your letter dated 17 June 2011 requesting for permission to conduct a research study in this region has reference.

Approval is herewith granted to you to go into the schools to carry out your study. The normal teaching and learning activities should **NOT** be disrupted in the process.

Yours faithfully,

  
.....  
Alfons M. Dikuua  
DIRECTOR

Cc: - Inspector of Education: Bunya Circuit  
- All Principals



All official correspondence must be addressed to the Chief Regional Officer

**Appendix 11: A permission and confirmation letter for visiting schools from the inspector**



REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA  
KAVANGO REGIONAL COUNCIL  
DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION

BUNYA CIRCUIT OFFICE

PRIVATE BAG 2134, RUNDU, NAMIBIA

Enquiries	: Sanzila K.M	Telephone No.	: +264-66- 257316
Email	: ksanzila@yahoo.com	Fax No.	: +264-66-257308
Ref. No.	:	Cell	0816731044

14/10/11

To : Rhodes University

This is to certify that Mr. Muronga Michael currently studying for a Master Degree in Management at Rhodes University was granted permission to carry out a Research at the following school on the dates indicated:

Senior Secondary School	11/07/11-15/07/11
Combined School	18/07/11-22/07/11
Primary School	25/07/11-29/07/11

Mr. Muronga was physical seen carrying out the Research at the mentioned dates.

Thank you,

Sanzila M.K  
Inspector of Education  
Bunya Circuit

