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The principal together with the school management team (SMT) of a public school is responsible for ensuring that all areas in the school function effectively. Effective school-based management is no longer a choice in South Africa but, rather, a must. Seventeen years into democracy, the Grade 12 pass rates in the Eastern Cape for the past three years were 50.6% in 2008, 51.0% in 2009 and 58.3% in 2010. Although there has been an improvement over the last three years, the Eastern Cape was still number seven out of the nine provinces in 2010. Against this background the question arose as to whether the schools in the Eastern Cape were effectively managed. The primary objective of the study is therefore to improve the organisational performance of public schools in the Uitenhage education district by investigating the relationship between the perceived effective implementation of basic managerial tasks (planning, organising, leading and controlling), on the one hand, and organisational performance of schools, on the other hand.

Convenience sampling was used to select 100 out of a possible 139 senior management team members from 26 public schools in the Uitenhage education district. The sample was stratified to include principals, deputy principals and heads of departments.

The empirical results revealed that the management tasks, leading and controlling, were the main determinants of the organisational performance of participating schools. The empirical results showed that planning and organising do not have a significant influence on the organisational performance of these schools. The managerial implications of the results are discussed and recommendations are made on the basis of these discussions.
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CHAPTER 1

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Manual for School Management of the Eastern Cape Department of Education (B-9) states that the principal together with the school management team (SMT) of a public school is responsible for ensuring that all areas in the school function effectively. Botha (2007: 28) states that school-based management is no longer an option but, rather, a reality in South African education. “This enables each school in South Africa to renew its management in a responsible and effective way.” (Botha, 2007: 28). Seventeen years into democracy, the Grade 12 pass rates in the Eastern Cape for the past three years were as follows: 2008 (50.6%), 2009 (51%) and 2010 (58.3%) (Qwase, 2008; Motshekga, 2011). Although there has been an improvement over the last three years, the Eastern Cape was still number seven out of the nine provinces in 2010. The question then arises: “Are the schools in the Eastern Cape effectively managed?” The present study is located in the Uitenhage education district investigating the organisational performance of public schools.

The importance of this study is to look at the organisational performance of public schools in the Uitenhage education district and analyse it on the basis of the managerial tasks which include planning, organising, leading and control. If schools can be more effectively managed, it will lead to an increase in the performance of learners, improved human resources and eventually more economic benefits to the country.
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Kydd, Anderson and Newton (2003: 15) state that an effective organisation is one that “produces” the highest-quality product or service and part of the purpose of leadership and management is to enable the organisation to achieve such outcomes. Clarke (2007: 3) states that management is about getting systems to operate effectively and mentions four key strategies managers use to ensure operational effectiveness, e.g. planning and budgeting, organising and staffing, controlling and problem solving as well as predictability and order. In his article on Teams in Schools, Walker (1994: 40) mentions that formal school leaders are being called upon to become more proactive and move from transactional to transformational roles. These leaders are encouraged to become more consultative, open and democratic, to promote staff ownership and create an internal support structure which allows for the development of teams.

“Schools that have become convinced of the value of team approaches and wish to make effective use of them need to:

- Delineate relationships between teams across the organisation, and between teams and top managers.
- Performance monitoring and recognition needs to be at the team level.
- Control mechanisms should not be allowed to stifle the work of teams.
- Leaders need to understand the basis of teamwork and how it is developed.” (Stott and Walker, 1999: 58.)

Ehrich and Cranston (2004: 23) state that the principal’s position is unique in the school management team, as he/she is both the leader of the team and at the same time a member of the team. It is further stated that if the team does not work, the principal may be held accountable. The responsibilities of principals on school management teams are thus significant, not only to be seen to be
supportive of collaborative decision-making, but to actually effect it in practice because of the likely benefits for the school (Ehrich and Cranston, 2004: 23). Ron Swartz (2008: 4) in his article 'Education, transformation and the role of school-based management in the Western Cape' highlights that many factors play a role in ensuring sustained, effective curriculum delivery. Most important among these is effective leadership and management in our schools (Swartz, 2008: 4).

Guest (2008: 19) makes the distinction between dysfunctional, functional and effective schools. It is believed that dysfunctional schools are those where there is total chaos and where there exists absolutely no culture of teaching and learning. A functional school could be defined as one where daily teaching and learning activities do take place, but there is no organisational culture that promotes the delivery of quality education. An effective school on the other hand could be described as one that achieves its educational outcomes. “The factors that constitute school effectiveness in achieving quality educational outcomes mainly concern academic analysts, policy makers and professional decision-makers.” (Guest, 2008: 19). Davidoff and Lazarus (1999: 67) suggest that relevant management issues would be systems management, time management, stress management and looking after the people in the school.

Management is defined as the attainment of organisational goals in an effective and efficient manner through the implementation of four basic management functions. These functions include planning, organising, leading and controlling of organisational resources (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 7). It is vital for a school management team to implement these functions to ensure the effective management of the school. The angle of investigation of the present study is to investigate the organisational performance of schools based on the effectiveness of the school management teams in terms of the four basic management functions.
1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1.3.1 Primary research objective

The main objective of the study is to improve the organisational performance of schools by improving the effectiveness of school management teams in public schools in the Uitenhage education district. More specifically, the study investigates the influence of the four basic management functions, planning, organising, leading and control on the organisational performance of schools.

1.3.2 Secondary research objectives

To achieve the primary research objective, the following secondary research objectives are investigated:

- to investigate the impact of planning on the organisational performance of schools;
- to investigate the impact of organising on the organisational performance of schools;
- to investigate the impact of leading on the organisational performance of schools;
- to investigate the impact of control on the organisational performance of schools; and
- the implications of the above-mentioned investigations to improve the organisational performance of schools.

1.3.3 Research design objectives

In order to achieve the above-mentioned primary and secondary research objectives, the following research design objectives are pursued:
- To conduct a secondary literature review on the four basic managerial functions and the relevance to the organisational performance of schools.
- Based on the secondary literature review, to construct a questionnaire for the collection of the primary data for the study.
- To conduct a pilot group of six participants in order to pilot test and improve the questionnaire.
- To finalise the questionnaire based on the recommendations from the pilot group.
- To execute the data collection process delivering the questionnaire to a stratified sample of at least 139 respondents in 26 public schools in the Uitenhage education district.
- To capture the data on the Excel computer software program.
- To analyse the data using the STATISTICA Version 10 (2010) computer software program.
- To interpret the findings and make conclusions.
- To provide recommendations to the District Director of the Uitenhage education district on ways of improving organisational performance of schools.

1.4 THE HYPOTHESES

The study focuses on the relationships among the variables included in the present study. The following null hypotheses were formulated in this regard:

HO1: Planning (as measured by the planning process, staff development, providing opportunities for leadership, change management, teamwork, etc.) has no influence on the organisational performance of schools.

HO2: Organising (as measured by deployment of resources, organisational structure, allocation of duties, tasks, roles and responsibilities, accountable
management structures, teamwork, etc.) has no influence on the organisational performance of schools.

HO3: Leading (as measured by how the SMT influences educators, how the SMT drives change, shared leadership, how SMT motivates and encourages the staff, how the SMT takes responsibility and accountability for their duties, etc.) has no influence on the organisational performance of schools.

HO4: Control (as measured by a systematic control process, effective monitoring by the SMT, effectively achieving outcomes, achieving quality academic results, etc.) has no influence on the organisational performance of schools.

The relationships based on the null hypotheses described above are graphically depicted in Figure 1.1.

**FIGURE 1.1: THE CONCEPTUAL RELATIONSHIPS BASED ON THE NULL HYPOTHESES**
1.5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.5.1 Research paradigm

Data can be described as qualitative or quantitative. Qualitative data are concerned with qualities and non-numerical characteristics while quantitative data are all data collected in numerical form (Collis and Hussey, 2003: 161). A phenomenological paradigm tends to produce qualitative data and a positivistic paradigm tends to produce quantitative data.

One of the main advantages of a quantitative approach to data collection is the relative ease and speed with which the research can be conducted. In this paradigm it is possible to use large samples whereas in a qualitative paradigm sample size may be small. The sample size in a case study may consist of only one respondent. A qualitative data collection method can be expensive and time consuming, although it can be argued that qualitative data provide a more real basis for analysis and interpretation (Collis and Hussey, 2003: 163).

This research project will follow a quantitative paradigm due to the nature of the problem statement where the researcher has to measure relationships between factors which impact on the organisational performance of schools.

1.5.2 The sample

Convenience sampling was used to select 100 out of a possible 139 SMT members from 26 public schools in the Uitenhage education district. The sample was stratified to include principals, deputy principals and heads of departments. The sampling design and the final sample that was used in this study are discussed in detail in Chapter 4.
A structured questionnaire was personally delivered to the respondents as outlined above. Anonymity and confidentiality were strictly guaranteed. Follow-ups were conducted to ensure a good response rate.

1.5.3 The measuring instruments

Self-constructed measuring instruments based on the literature review were used to measure the variables that are listed below:

- Planning
- Organising
- Leading
- Control
- Organisational performance

The instruments were anchored on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The measuring instruments are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4. The measuring instruments are depicted in Annexure B.

The computer program STATISTICA Version 10 (2010) was used to analyse the data, as far as scale reliability, discriminant validity and multiple regression analyses are concerned. The data were analysed by using both exploratory data analysis (descriptive statistics) and confirmatory data analysis (inferential statistics). The data were then interpreted using the results from analysing the data.
1.6 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

The study is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 outlines the scope of the study, the problem statement, the research objectives, the hypotheses and the research methodology.

Chapter 2 gives the literature review on the planning, organising, leading, control and the organisational performance of schools.

Chapter 3 describes the hypothesised model to improve the organisational performance of schools.

The research methodology is discussed in Chapter 4. This chapter also deals with the research paradigm, the sampling design and the measuring instruments. In this chapter the results of the validity and reliability assessments of the instruments that were used in the study are also discussed. The empirical results are also summarised and interpreted in this chapter.

In Chapter 5, the final chapter, the managerial implications are discussed. Conclusions and recommendations for future research arising from these results are also presented.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

2.1 INTRODUCTION

School improvement depends on the extent to which principals have the capacity and the will to take the lead. Without good leadership, there will be no meaningful change. It is important to realise that before the issue of quality is raised within the school, the quality of leadership needs to be explored. President Zuma in his address to principals on Friday, 7 August 2009, in Durban emphasised that the principals of schools have a critical role to play in any school improvement efforts (Zuma, 2009). President Zuma identified five things that successful principals do:

- They hire well-qualified teachers and ensure that unqualified teachers receive appropriate training to improve their knowledge and skills;
- They ensure that workbooks and textbooks are distributed to pupils on time;
- They ensure that teachers are in class, teaching;
- They monitor and evaluate the quality of learning of pupils and keep parents informed of their children’s progress;
- They work with the community and the Department of Education to remove obstacles to learning.

School management teams are therefore challenged to improve on the quality of management and leadership in their schools to ultimately improve the quality of teaching and learning. This in turn should lead to improved learner performance and an effective education system in the country. There is however a perception that members of the school management team lack the necessary management skills to manage their schools effectively. This study therefore investigates the
relationships between effective school management (in other words effective planning, organising, leading and control), on the one hand, and organisational performance of schools, on the other hand.

2.2 MANAGEMENT

2.2.1 Definition of management

Daft and Marcic (2004: 7) describe management as the attainment of organisational goals in an effective and efficient manner through planning, organising, leading and controlling organisational resources.

FIGURE 2.1: THE PROCESS OF MANAGEMENT

Source: Daft and Marcic (2004: 8)
The process of management is illustrated in Figure 2.1. The planning process should set the goals and the ways to attain them. In the organising stage, responsibilities for task accomplishment should be assigned. Leaders should use their influence to motivate the employees and in the controlling process the activities should be monitored and corrections be done as the process unfolds. Figure 2.1 also indicates that there should be interaction among these four management functions. The necessary resources should be available for these functions to be implemented properly and this should then lead to the achievement of the desired performance standards.

Good management is an essential aspect of any education service, but its central goal is the promotion of effective teaching and learning. The extent to which effective learning is achieved therefore becomes the criterion against which the quality of management is to be judged (Thurlow, Bush and Coleman, 2003: 35).

“We have chosen to use the term “management” to mean the process for creating and supporting effective educational organisations; we do not equate management with administration and we make a distinction between management and leadership” (Department of Education, 1996: 28). This statement clarifies what the Department of Education expects from the management teams at schools. The manager is not appointed as an administrator, but as an individual who needs to create and support effective schools. The expectation is also that managers should not only manage, but should be visionary leaders who are innovative in promoting effective teaching and learning in schools.
2.2.2 The four basic management functions

The four basic management functions in schools are described by Thurlow et al. (2003: 8) as follows:

- Planning: Defined as a means for the educational leader to order and control a particular reality. It involves policymaking, normative decision-making and problem solving.

- Organising: Is about creating order through the development of function, line and staff organisational structures to ensure co-operation in the school. It involves subordination to the law, a flow of authority in decision-making, delegation and coordination.

- Guiding: Presupposes an authority-respect relationship. The guidance task involves people, building interpersonal relations, motivation, modification of behaviour and communication.

- Control: Aims at ensuring that all planned goals and objectives are attained. This is reflected in the tasks of planning, organising and guidance.

Schools should focus on implementing these basic management functions to improve the organisational effectiveness within the institutions. According to Daft and Marcic (2004: 9), organisational effectiveness is the degree to which the organisation achieves a stated goal. It means that the organisation succeeds in accomplishing what it tries to do. Organisational effectiveness means providing a service that customers value. Organisational efficiency refers to the amount of resources used to achieve an organisational goal. Efficiency can be calculated as the amount of resources used to produce a service. Performance is the attainment of organisational goals by using resources in an efficient and effective manner (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 9). Organisational performance in the context of the present study is therefore broadly defined as how a school attains its organisational goals using its resources efficiently and effectively.
2.2.2.1 Planning

Daft and Marcic (2004: 163) mention that a new approach to planning is to involve everyone in the organisation, and sometimes outside stakeholders as well, in the planning process. Planning comes alive when employees are involved in setting goals and determining the means to reach them. Planning entails the following:

- Start with a strong mission – A compelling mission can also serve to increase employee commitment and motivation. Employees may have to constantly adapt plans to meet new needs.
- Set stretch goals – Stretch goals are highly ambitious goals that are so clear, compelling, and imaginative that they fire up employees and fuel progress.
- Create a culture that encourages learning – Managers create a culture that celebrates diversity, supports risk-taking, and encourages constant experimentation and learning.
- Design new roles for planning staff – Planning specialists serve as facilitators and supporters; they do not decide on the substance of goals and plans.
- Use a temporary task force – A planning task force is a temporary group of managers and employees who take responsibility for developing a strategic plan.

Planning still starts and stops at the top. Even though planning is decentralised, top managers must show support and commitment to the planning process. Top managers also accept responsibility when planning and goal setting are ineffective, rather than blaming the failure on lower-level managers or workers (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 164).
Thurlow et al. (2003: 219) suggest that the planning process should lead to:

- “Improved understanding, communication and co-operation among governors, the principal and staff and the school’s partners.
- Better staff development, linking individual professional development and institutional improvement.
- Raised expectations about what ought to be achieved and what can be achieved in the school.
- A growing commitment to an improvement in the quality of teaching and learning.
- Greater confidence of governors, principal and staff in recognizing and building on strengths; assessing and remedying limitations; planning and executing change in manageable steps; devising systems of quality assurance which link accountability to school improvement; and deploying the talents and dedication of all involved through collaboration.”

The development planning process should also help to transform the whole climate of the school by promoting a shared vision for its future, giving every teacher some opportunities for leadership and generating the commitment and confidence that springs from success. Indeed this is one of the ways of promoting a shared vision that actually works (Thurlow et al., 2003: 220).

These claimed advantages of development planning, if given substance, represent powerful benefits for schools aiming to transform themselves in order to promote a high quality “culture of teaching and learning” (Thurlow et al., 2003: 220). The production of a good plan and its successful implementation depend upon a sound grasp of the processes involved (Thurlow et al., 2003: 220).
According to Thurlow et al. (2003: 222), the following questions might provide a valuable focus for initial thinking about development planning:

- How will it help improve the quality of the education we provide?
- How will it help us to manage change and cope with "innovation overload"?
- How will it help us enhance the partnership between educators, governors, parents and the education department?
- How will it help the staff to work together in realising the aims of the school?

The challenge in schools concerning planning is for school management teams to drive the planning process. All members of the SMT need to be involved in the planning process. Planning within the school environment should not reside with the principal alone. Teamwork in terms of planning is necessary if schools want to implement the plans successfully.

2.2.2.2 Organising

According to Daft and Marcic (2004: 234), organising is the deployment of organisational resources to achieve strategic goals. The strategy of an organisation defines what to do while organising in the organisation defines how to do it.

It is important that the relevant structures be created in the school for organising to occur. These organisational structures are to ensure that co-operation takes place in the school. It involves a flow of authority in decision-making, delegation and coordination. The necessary responsibilities should be assigned to these different structures for task accomplishment.

Structure refers to the formal pattern of relationships between people in organisations. Structure is created to distribute and co-ordinate the work of people
in the pursuit of organisational goals and objectives (Thurlow et al., 2003: 65). O'Neill (1994) argues that management structures have to serve two distinct and potentially conflicting purposes. First, they should differentiate, through the allocation of tasks and duties and the definition of specific roles and responsibilities. Secondly, they should facilitate integration, the linking together of roles to promote interdependence.

According to Harris and Bennet (2005: 103), the tasks which are involved in fulfilling the purposes of the organisation, have themselves to be organised. There needs to be some sort of structure that is intended to ensure that it can exploit its resources to deliver the activities involved in fulfilling its purpose. Structures imply that tasks and responsibilities are allocated and that resources reach the right place at the right time. Structures also imply that there should be accountability between members for the proper discharge of the tasks they have to complete in order to achieve the purposes of the organisation (Harris and Bennet, 2005: 103).

**Structure**

The organising process leads to the creation of organisational structure, which defines how tasks are divided and resources deployed. Organisational structure is defined as:

- The set of formal tasks assigned to individuals and departments;
- Formal reporting relationships, including lines of authority, decision responsibility, number of hierarchical levels, and span of managers’ control; and
- The design of systems to ensure effective coordination of employees across departments (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 237).
The span of management is the number of employees reporting to a supervisor. Sometimes called the span of control, this characteristic of structure determines how closely a supervisor can monitor subordinates. Traditional views of organisation design recommended a span of management of about seven subordinates per manager. However, many lean organisations today have spans of management as high as thirty, or forty, or even higher. Generally, when supervisors must be closely involved with subordinates, the span should be small, and when supervisors need little involvement with subordinates, it can be large (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 237).

Flat rather than hierarchical management structures often work best. Department heads are encouraged to make decisions (Taylor and Ryan, 2005: 6).

*Team approach*

Organising within an organisation leads to the creation of formal and supportive structures. People need to work in teams to successfully implement planned activities to achieve the set goals within the organisation. A team is a unit of two or more people who interact and coordinate their work to accomplish a specific goal. The team concept implies a sense of shared mission and collective responsibility. The team members meet regularly to solve ongoing problems of common interest (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 516).

There is a difference between a team and a group. A team generates positive synergy through coordinated effort. Their individual efforts result in a level of performance that is greater than the sum of those individual inputs. The extensive use of teams creates the potential for an organisation to generate greater outputs with no increase in inputs. High performance teams are characterised by high mutual trust among members. Members believe in the integrity, character and
Robbins (1998: 294) has identified five dimensions that underlie the concept of trust:

- Integrity
- Competence
- Consistency
- Loyalty
- Openness

The fact that organisations are divided into departments, necessitates teamwork. Probably the most widespread trend in departmentalisation has been the effort by companies to implement team concepts. Companies are trying to find ways to delegate authority, push responsibility to low levels, and create participative teams that engage the commitment of workers (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 243). Ehrich and Cranston (2004: 23) mention that the principal’s position is unique on the school management team, as he is both the leader of the team and at the same time a member of the team. It is further asserted that if the team does not work, the principal may be held accountable. According to Taylor and Ryan (2005: 3), a good school’s most important requirement is to have an inspiring, highly respected leader. However, it is also vital that a strong team of deputies and department heads backs up him or her. Good leadership can be driven by an inspiring individual, but that alone is not enough; it also requires teamwork. Teamwork is seen as essential in every school. This can have many positive benefits – and should play an important part in the management culture of the school (Taylor and Ryan, 2005: 111).
Building effective management teams and developing efficient accountable management structures are perhaps the most important work of any principal. This is because it is through these people and structures that he/she can best extend his/her influence, vision for the school, and grow the leadership and management expertise of the staff. In schools where these management structures are absent or perform poorly, it is likely that a principal will be found who is unsure of his authority, and/or lacks confidence, or is simply incompetent or disinterested in achieving what is best for the school.

According to Pather (2010: 45), the role of educators must also change. Whilst educators were previously only involved in managing their own classrooms, they should now become actively involved in designing policies, making decisions, creating the vision of the school, become responsible for resources and working with teams to bring about change and improvement in the school environment. They should become part of committees, groups and teams that are shaping the school environment and bringing about the necessary changes in order to realise the school’s goals and vision. Taylor and Ryan (2005: 110) share this sentiment and state that a good school is one where its entire staff feel they are part of a team, with shared goals and a chance for everyone to help influence their school’s future development. Smith (2008: 188-189) refers to well-functioning teams as functioning in an informal, relaxed and comfortable atmosphere in which members listen to each other and most decisions are reached by consensus. When actions are carried out, the team leaders do not dominate their teams, as the focus is not on who controls the team, but how the work or tasks are accomplished (Pather, 2010: 47).

Armstrong (2008: 65) proposes a checklist that could be used by teams in an organisation to analyse their performance. This could also be used by teams in schools to ascertain how effective they really are. Armstrong’s checklist for analysing team performance is as follows:
- How effective are we at achieving team goals?
- How well do we work together?
- Does everyone contribute?
- How effectively is the team led?
- How good are we at analysing problems and making decisions?
- How good are we at initiating action?
- Do we concentrate sufficiently on the priority issues?
- Do we waste time on irrelevancies?
- To what extent can team members speak their minds without being squashed by others?
- If there is any conflict, is it openly expressed and is it about issues rather than personalities?

Since the emphasis is now placed on teams, one should pay attention to hints on how to achieve good teamwork. Armstrong (2008: 65-66) refers to ten points that should be considered when building a team. These are as follows:

- Determine the need, how urgent it is and the direction.
- Choose the members for the team based on their skills and their ability to work with others, as well as their ability to work independently.
- Be particular regarding first meetings and actions.
- Try to agree on certain immediate performance orientated tasks and goals, as well as those that overlap. This means that certain individuals will be involved in more than one task at a given time, which will require multi-tasking individuals.
- Be aware of members in the team who have put in a tremendous amount of work and recognise their efforts. Assess the performance of the team not merely by its collective result, but also by the individual efforts of the team members.
- Acknowledge the performance of the team as a whole and give praise and rewards to the entire team.
- Work on building and maintaining team spirit by planning outdoor activities.
- Ensure that there are review meetings and focus on both the attainment of goals and the team process.
- It is imperative that opportunities are created for learning and development activities to hone and improve the level of members’ existing skills.
- Use the learning activities provided by the school that focus on teamwork.

Usually, it is the task of the team leader to provide the required direction, support and guidance, structure the activities of the group, assist each member of the team in fulfilling his/her role, enable each member to grow by promoting programmes for learning and development and discuss the team’s progress and development. Important also is that the team leader must also evaluate the performance of the team (Pather, 2010: 50). The key role of team leaders has now become that of co-ordinating and facilitating and their leadership style has become more supportive and facilitative; that is, there is a move away from the directive style of operation (Armstrong, 2008: 61).

Harris, Day, Hadfield, Hopkins, Hargreaves and Chapman (2003: 146) state that it is necessary to develop the problem-solving skills and leadership capacity of middle management by adopting a team-building approach. This has included formal training for middle managers from external providers supported by informal interactions with members of the school management team. Harris et al. (2003: 146) mention that the expectations are put on team leaders to get the most out of their teams and to recognise that team leaders are the next people to be developing their teams.
Turner (2005: 3) states that managers will undertake three different roles in the area of interpersonal relationships, which are derived from their formally delegated authority. These roles may be reinterpreted as:

- a figurehead, which may more correctly be described as a Head of Department (HOD) acting as a role model, particularly in his/her willingness to embrace and adapt to change.
- a leader, which might be more appropriately described as a team leader, since the quality of teamwork and collegial practice which is achieved in the department is vital to its success, as well as being proactive in the area of professional development.
- A manager who liaises with others, which is crucially important for Heads of Departments as a great deal of their work involves communicating and taking decisions with members of the department, other Heads of Departments and with members of the School Management Team (SMT), not to mention non-teaching staff, governors, parents and pupils. This liaison role also involves monitoring the quality of the departmental work.

2.2.2.3 Leading

Leadership is the ability to influence people toward the attainment of goals. Daft and Marcic (2004: 376) assert that by understanding what causes people to behave as they do, managers can exercise leadership to achieve positive outcomes. They can foster behaviours such as organisational citizenship, that is, work behaviour that goes beyond job requirements and contributes as needed to the organisation’s success. An employee demonstrates organisational citizenship by being helpful to co-workers and customers, doing extra work when necessary, and looking for ways to improve products and procedures.
Goleman (2002: 14) makes the following statement: “There are many leaders, not just one. Leadership is distributed. It resides not solely in the individual at the top, but in every person at every level who in one way or another, acts as a leader”. Lindstrom and Speck (2004: 7) also argue that principals should not be seen as the only ones responsible for professional development, since leadership within the school learning community is shared. This view is also shared by Clarke (2007: 131-133) stating that change leadership is no longer restricted to a person at the top of an organisation who is expected to drive the change forward; shared leadership is a core component within the school community (Lindstrom and Speck, 2004: 8).

“Good leaders captivate, enthuse and inspire us. We all know good leadership when we see it, like good schools or good teaching it is relatively easy to identify and describe. Good leaders have integrity, charisma, strong values, emotional intelligence and moral purpose. They have energy, drive and enthusiasm. They motivate us, challenge us, and remain optimistic even in the face of adversity” (Harris and Lambert, 2003: 1).

Barth (2001: 85) suggests that all educators can lead. If schools are going to become places where all children and adults are learning in worthy ways, all educators must lead.

Riley and Louis (2000: 47) suggest that:

- There is no single package for school leadership, no single model to be learned and applied regardless of culture or context, though leadership can be developed and nurtured.
- School leadership is more than the effort of a single individual.
- School leadership is not static.
School leaders do not learn how to do leadership; they are often rule breakers and are willing to change in response to new sets of circumstances.

Smith (2008: 242) states that for years school leadership was described in management terms – keep order, get the buses to run on time, clear the hallways – or in terms of the heroic figure. Times are different now. Effective school leaders, who serve as successful change facilitators, cannot afford to be just managers to look for silver bullet solutions. They must provide dynamic, exciting, and even inspirational leadership. Today, school leadership is more demanding and dynamic. It requires a principal with a different profile. Day, Harris, Hadfield, Tolley and Beresford (2000) share this idea by stating that the contemporary school leader must be politically astute, a successful professional entrepreneur, a skilled mediator and an effective agent of change.

The principal is seen to play a critical role in ensuring motivation and performance of staff. This can be achieved through “effective leadership”, a predominantly democratic leadership style and competent management (Gounden and Dayaram, 1990: 310). Sergiovanni (2001: 16) mentions that it is rare that an effective school does not have an effective head; and with teacher leadership added to the equation it ensures that school improvement becomes a way of life in the school.

Recent assessments of the leadership role within school improvement imply that giving others real responsibility and developing others is the best possible way of the organisation moving forward. One of the most consistent findings from recent studies of effective leadership is that authority to lead need not be located in the person of the leader but can be dispersed within the school in between and among people (Day et al., 2000).
The degree to which managers possess authoritarianism will influence how they wield and share power. The degree to which employees possess authoritarianism will influence how they react to their managers. If a manager and employees differ in their degree of authoritarianism, the manager may have difficulty leading effectively (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 392). The trend toward empowerment and shifts in expectations among younger employees for more equitable relationships has contributed to a decline in strict authoritarianism in many organisations. Much more emphasis is put on communication and building relationships than on ruling with an iron hand. As football coach, Steve Mariucci, said: “This is not old Rome with gladiators. This is modern day football … If you cannot relate to today’s player; you are through as a coach (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 393).

### TABLE 2.1: LEADER AND MANAGER QUALITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADER QUALITIES</th>
<th>MANAGER QUALITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUL</strong></td>
<td><strong>MIND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>Tough-minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courageous</td>
<td>Structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>Deliberate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates change</td>
<td>Stabilising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal power</td>
<td>Position power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Capowski (1994: 12)

Louis and Miles (1990: 26) make the distinction between leadership and management and emphasise that both are essential. Leadership relates to
mission, direction, inspiration. Management involves designing and carrying out plans, getting things done, and working effectively with people. Management and leadership are both important to organisations. Effective managers have to be leaders, too, because there are distinctive qualities associated with management and leadership that provide different strengths for the organisation (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 412).

Daft and Marcic (2004: 413) state that management and leadership reflect two different sets of qualities and skills that frequently overlap within a single individual. A person might have more of one set of qualities than the other, but ideally a manager develops a balance of both manager and leader qualities. These leader and manager qualities are listed in Table 2.1.

*Emotional Intelligence (EQ)*

School leaders bring their values, knowledge, experience and skill to their work each day. The understanding and appropriate application of emotional intelligence is key to effective leadership. As the challenges, demands and complexities of the principal's role increase, this competence will continue to be the foundation of dynamic, successful and effective leadership (NAHT, 2007: 9).

Goleman (2004: 8) states that the rational mind has the ability to comprehend, to be aware, to be thoughtful and to ponder and reflect. Next to this rational mind is another system of knowing, namely, the impulsive, powerful emotional mind. Principals in the past were expected only to produce good school results, the forces of change now necessitate a type of leadership that will not only secure good results, but also sustain reform and the effective functioning of the school. Good leaders should now also be able to handle frustration and stress. They must actually have the psychological maturity to deal with any problem or circumstance they are faced with. The implication of this is that organisations can no longer rely
only on rational skills, but also need interpersonal behaviour and emotional stability (Pather, 2010: 74-75).

People who are emotionally intelligent are able to understand and express themselves, to understand and relate well to others and to cope successfully with the demands of daily life. People leadership concerns itself mainly with relationship management. Principals need to develop competencies such as inspirational leadership (motivation), conflict management and team building and collaboration to manage staff effectively (Heystek, et al, 2008: 76).

Emotional intelligence as described by Daft and Marcic (2004: 389) includes five basic components:

- Self-awareness: This is the basis for all the other components; being aware of what you are feeling. People who are in touch with their feelings are better able to guide their own lives and actions.
- Managing emotions: The ability to balance one’s moods so that worry, anxiety, fear or danger do not cloud thinking and get in the way of what needs to be done.
- Motivating oneself: The ability to be hopeful and to persist in the face of obstacles, setbacks, and even outright failure. This ability is crucial for pursuing long-term goals.
- Empathy: Being able to put yourself in someone else’s shoes, to recognise what others are feeling, without them needing to tell you.
- Social skill: The ability to connect to others, build positive relationships, respond to the emotions of others, and influence others.

Studies have found a positive relationship between job performance and high degrees of emotional intelligence in a variety of jobs (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 390).
Locus of control

The locus of control of an individual might have an impact on the effectiveness of the leadership of the individual. The locus of control is the tendency to place the primary responsibility for one’s success or failure either within oneself (internally) or on outside forces (externally) (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 390). Some people believe that their actions can strongly influence what happens to them. They feel in control of their own fate. These individuals have a high internal locus of control. Other people believe that events in their lives occur because of chance, luck, or outside people and events. They feel more like pawns of their fate. These individuals have a high external locus of control. People with an internal locus of control are easier to motivate because they believe the rewards are the result of their behaviour (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 391). They are better able to handle complex information and problem solving, are more achievement oriented, but are also more independent and therefore more difficult to lead. People with an external locus of control are harder to motivate, less involved in their jobs, more likely to blame others when faced with a poor performance evaluation, but more compliant and conforming and, therefore, easier to lead (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 391).

Given the wide variation among personalities and among jobs, an important responsibility of managers is to try to match employee and job characteristics so that work is done by people who are well suited to do it. This requires that managers be clear about what they expect employees to do. The extent to which a person’s ability and personality match the requirements of a job is called person-job fit. When hiring and leading employees, managers should try to achieve person-job fit, so that employees are more likely to contribute and be satisfied.

Continuous learning in organisations involves the processes and systems through which the organisation enables its people to learn, share their growing knowledge, and apply it to their work. Managers should focus on how they and their
employees can learn from mistakes, rather than fostering a climate in which employees hide mistakes because they fear being punished for them. Managers can foster continuous learning by consciously stopping from time to time and asking: “What can we learn from this experience?”

**Leadership styles**

There are different styles of leadership. An autocratic leader is one who tends to centralise authority and rely on legitimate reward and coercive power to manage subordinates (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 417). A democratic leader delegates authority to others, encourages participation, and relies on expert and referent power to influence subordinates (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 417).

The concept of leadership is also changing because of dramatic changes in today’s environment and organisations. A recent five-year study conducted by Jim Collins identified the critical importance of what Collins calls Level 5 leadership in transforming companies from merely good to truly great organisations. A key characteristic of Level 5 leaders is an almost complete lack of ego. Level 5 leaders often seem shy and unpretentious. Although they accept full responsibility for mistakes, poor results, or failures, Level 5 leaders give credit for successes to other people. Yet despite their personal humility, Level 5 leaders have a fierce determination to do whatever it takes to produce great and lasting results for their organisations. They are extremely ambitious for their companies rather than for themselves. This becomes most evident in the area of succession planning. Level 5 leaders develop a solid corps of leaders throughout the organisation, so that when they leave the organisation it can continue to thrive and grow even stronger (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 432-433). Managers may also become servant leaders who facilitate the growth, goals and development of others to liberate their best qualities in pursuing the organisation’s mission. In all of these new ways of leading, managers rely more on personal power than on position power (Daft and
Marcic, 2004: 437). Matthew 20: 25 states: “Ye know that rulers of the Gentiles lorded over them, and that their great ones exercised authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant” (Sergiovanni, 2007: 34). Servant leadership describes well what it means to be a principal. Principals are responsible for “ministering” to the needs of the schools they serve. They minister by providing leadership in a way that encourages others to be leaders in their own right (Sergiovanni, 2007: 34).

2.2.2.4 Control

Control is a critical issue facing every manager in every organisation today. Organisational control is the systematic process of regulating organisational activities to make them consistent with the expectations established in plans, targets, and standards of performance. Control can focus on events before, during, or after a process. Control that monitors ongoing employee activities to ensure they are consistent with performance standards is called concurrent control. Concurrent control assesses current work activities, relies on performance standards, and includes rules and regulations for guiding employee tasks and behaviours. Feedback control focuses on the organisation’s outputs – in particular, the quality of an end product or service (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 552).

The feedback control model is illustrated in Figure 2.2. Managers set up control systems that consist of the four key steps:

- Establish standards
- Measure performance
- Compare performance to standards
- Make corrections as necessary
Continuous improvement strategies can be implemented as control measures to improve effectiveness in the organisation. Continuous improvement is the implementation of a large number of small, incremental improvements in all areas of the organisation on an ongoing basis. In a successful Total Quality Management (TQM) programme, all employees learn that they are expected to contribute by initiating changes in their own job activities. The basic philosophy is that improving things a little bit at a time, all the time, has the highest probability of success (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 564).

2.3 EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

A major area of concern in many parts of the world in recent times, and one which is high on the agenda in South Africa, is that of improving the quality of schooling (Thurlow et al., 2003: 216). Good leadership and good teaching are at the core of successful schools. This does not emerge by accident. It needs strong teacher and leadership training, and good continuing professional development. It needs good schools to work in partnership with others to share their best practice. Good
leaders need strong middle managers if they are to make their mark and their schools are to succeed (Taylor and Ryan, 2005: 269). Barth (1990: 64) pointed out that there seems to be an agreement that with strong leadership by the principal, a school is likely to be effective and without capable leadership, it is not. It is interesting to note that, according to Gray and Streshly (2008: 15), when relationships at school improve, schools get better. If relationships remain the same or get worse, schools regress.

Guest (2008: 19) makes the distinction between dysfunctional, functional and effective schools. It is believed that dysfunctional schools are those where there is total chaos and where there exists absolutely no culture of teaching and learning. A functional school could be defined as one where daily teaching and learning activities do take place, but there is no organisational culture that promotes the delivery of quality education. An effective school on the other hand could be described as one that achieves its educational outcomes.

Sergiovanni (2007: 6) makes the statement that schools managed by incompetent leaders simply do not get the job done. These schools are characterised by confusion and inefficiency in operation and malaise in human climate. Learner achievement is lower in such schools. Learner absenteeism, discipline and violence may be problems. Teachers may not be giving a fair day’s work for a fair day’s pay. Competent schools, on the other hand, measure up to these and other standards of effectiveness. They get the job done in a satisfactory manner. Excellent schools, however, exceed the expectations necessary to be considered satisfactory. Learners in these schools accomplish far more and teachers work much harder than can ordinarily be expected (Sergiovanni, 2007: 7).

The concept of school effectiveness is closely related to a means-end relationship. In the school effectiveness research the central aim is to judge whether differences in resources, processes and organisational arrangements affect pupil outcomes.
and, if so, in what way (Harris and Bennet, 2005: 8). School improvement research studies have been chiefly concerned with understanding how schools change and become more effective (Harris and Bennet, 2005: 12).

For school improvement to occur, there has to be a commitment to changing “the way we do things around here” for the better. School improvement is essentially a process of changing school culture (Harris and Lambert, 2003: 14). The first step in the drive for continuous improvement is the setting of challenging but realistic targets for improvement. This requires a careful audit of a school’s strengths and weaknesses. Successful schools will almost always set targets for improvement in the key subjects of Mathematics, Science and English (Taylor and Ryan, 2005: 38). People need to be involved in the implementation of improvement strategies within the school environment for continuous improvement to be successful.

Harris and Lambert (2003: 24) recognise that there are two dimensions of involvement – breadth and skilfulness:

- **Broad-based involvement** – involving many people in the work of leadership. This involves head teachers, teachers, parents, pupils, community members and universities.
- **Skilful involvement** – a comprehensive understanding and demonstrated proficiency by participants of leadership disposition, knowledge and skills.

The intersection of these two dimensions creates a dynamic relationship that allows us to describe conditions in schools with different levels of leadership capacity.
TABLE 2.2: LEADERSHIP CAPACITY MATRIX – LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>HIGH INVOLVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 1 – Stuck school</td>
<td>Quadrant 2 – Fragmented school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Head is autocratic</td>
<td>- Head is laissez-faire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Co-dependent relationships</td>
<td>- Undefined roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Norms of compliance</td>
<td>- Norms of individualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of innovation</td>
<td>- Erratic innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pupil achievement is poor</td>
<td>- Pupil achievement static overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>HIGH INVOLVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 3 – Moving school</td>
<td>Quadrant 4 – Improving school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Head and key teachers as purposeful leadership team</td>
<td>- Head, teachers, as well as pupils as skilful leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Polarised staff – pockets of resistance</td>
<td>- Shared vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Norms of reflection and teaching excellence</td>
<td>- Norms of collaboration and collective responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effective innovation</td>
<td>- Reflective practice consistently leads to innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pupil achievement shows slight improvement</td>
<td>- Pupil achievement is high or improving steadily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Harris and Lambert (2003: 25)

According to Harris and Lambert (2003: 25), the leadership capacity matrix describes the different levels of involvement. These different levels of involvement
are illustrated in Table 2.2. The four different quadrants, which are depicted in Table 2.2, are explained in more detail below:

**Quadrant 1**

- The visibly “failing school”
- These types of schools are poor at the day-to-day management tasks and tend to be reactive rather than proactive in their approach to deadlines or problem solving.
- Necessary organisation and planning not in place.
- These schools do not have clearly articulated goals, plans and vision.
- Head often exercises autocratic leadership.
- The flow of information is one-way – from the head to the teachers.
- Relationships are co-dependent – that is teachers depend on the head for answers and guidance and the head depends on the teachers to validate and reinforce his or her autocratic style.

**Quadrant 2**

- “appears” to be coping
- Less tightly managed and controlled than a quadrant one school.
- Programmes and relationships are fragmented, lacking any coherent pattern in the school.
- Since there is no school-wide focus on teaching and learning, poor teaching sometimes goes unnoticed.
- These types of schools neglect developmental work.
- These schools are not obviously failing as they appear to be efficiently run.
- However, their reluctance to develop or to take on new ideas means that they will at best, remain where they are and at worse, gradually deteriorate.
- Overall pupil achievement is static.
Quadrant 3

- May be making progress towards reforms
- Approach innovation with great enthusiasm
- Viewed by external world as lively and exciting
- Drive forward innovation at the expense of involvement
- There are pockets of strong innovation and excellent classrooms, but focus on pupil learning is not a school-wide norm.
- Although pupil achievement is showing slight gains, the long-term pattern is similar to quadrant two.

Quadrant 4

- Is initially a “professional learning community”
- Highly skilled at generating internal change
- Provide opportunities for teachers to work together
- Continual drive for improvement and where teachers are involved in change and development
- There is a feeling of energy and enthusiasm within these schools
- Danger of “burn-out” as levels of activity may be too high
- Improving school has high leadership capacity
- School-wide focus is on both pupil and adult learning and where decision making is shared
- Roles and responsibilities are overlapping, each person taking personal and collective responsibility for the work of leadership
- Pupil achievement is steadily improving.

The ideal quadrant to be in is quadrant four where there is a high level of involvement as well as high skills levels. This is the quadrant where the improving school lies. The principal, teachers and learners are skilful leaders. There is a
shared vision and norms of collaboration and collective responsibility. The learner achievement is high or is improving steadily.

According to Thurlow et al. (2003: 119), after they have reflected on research literature, suggest that the following are characteristics of effective schools:

- Professional leadership which is firm and purposeful with a participative approach.
- Shared vision and goals.
- A learning environment with an orderly atmosphere and an attractive working environment.
- Concentration on teaching and learning, the maximisation of learning time and learning and a focus on achievement.
- High expectations all round.
- Positive reinforcement with clear and fair discipline.
- Monitoring progress of pupils and the school.
- Pupil rights and responsibilities and high pupil self-esteem.
- Purposeful teaching in an efficient organisation with clarity of purpose and structured lessons.
- A learning organisation with school-based staff development.
- Home-school partnership and parental involvement.

From the works of Harris and Lambert (2003) and Thurlow et al. (2003), it can be seen that school improvement or school quality, in contrast to effectiveness, may be considered with changes to factors that are indirectly rather that directly related to student achievement. For example, school improvement may stress the professional development of staff, which is expected will indirectly lead to student success (Thurlow et al., 2003: 126). School improvement is about raising learner achievement through enhancing the teaching-learning process and the conditions
that support it. It is about strategies for improving the school’s capacity for providing quality education (Hopkins, 1994: 75).

Thurlow et al. (2003: 5) also state that there is mutual lack of respect in many schools. Principals may claim that learners and the educators are undisciplined and that educators are failing to do their job. Educators complain that the principal is both incompetent and authoritarian, while learners accuse educators of sexual abuse, harassment, corporal punishment and of being both unprepared and uncaring. Many principals find it difficult to change from a highly authoritarian, hierarchical structure to one that requires a sharing of control with educators, parents and learners. Newly appointed principals are often unprepared professionally for management roles and lack the leadership skills that are required when dealing with a crisis situation (Thurlow et al., 2003: 6). This study therefore investigates how the organisational performance of schools could be improved by improving the management and leadership teams of schools.

2.4 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter outlined the four basic management functions, namely planning, organising, leading and control. The impact of these management functions which relate to schools in general and school management teams in particular were highlighted as well as the effect and relevance thereof for education today.

In the next chapter the hypothesised model to improve organisational performance of schools and the methodology to test the model are discussed.
CHAPTER 3

THE HYPOTHESESIED MODEL TO IMPROVE THE ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOLS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Management is defined as the attainment of organisational goals in an effective and efficient manner through planning, organising, leading and controlling organisational resources (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 7). It is important for a school management team to implement these functions to ensure the effective management of the school. The angle of investigation of the present study is to investigate the organisational performance of schools based on the four management functions. In this chapter, the different hypotheses are formulated on the basis of what the literature reveals about the different relationships represented in the hypothesised model. The study investigates the relationships between each of the independent variables, i.e. planning, organising, leading and control, and what impact these variables have on the dependent variable, i.e. the organisational performance of schools.

3.2 THE EFFECT OF PLANNING ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Planning is generally defined as “a process that managers use to identify and select appropriate goals and courses of action for an organisation” (George and Jones, 2006: 191). In the context of schools, four aspects of planning are found in the literature, namely common planning time, professional development planning, collaborative planning and strategic planning.
3.2.1 Common planning time

The study conducted by Cook and Faulkner (2010: 1) reveals how schools in Kentucky used common planning time, including factors that enhance common planning time effectiveness, which resulted in a common vision and mission, clearly defined goals for all types of planning and effective building leadership as factors for enhancing the effectiveness of common planning time. Common planning time is a specific, planned period of time during the school day in which the teachers who are on the team have the opportunity to meet in order to plan curriculum and assessments, share instructional strategies, organise team events, discuss student issues and communicate with parents (Cook and Faulkner, 2010: 2). The results of the study indicate that common planning time was viewed as essential to the schools’ success (Cook and Faulkner, 2010: 6). The teachers at all grade levels and in all core subjects expressed the positive effects that the regular scheduled planning time had on student performance, instruction and faculty morale (Cook and Faulkner, 2010: 6). Daily or regular common planning time is essential so that teams can plan ways to integrate the curriculum, to analyse test data, to review student work and to reflect on the effectiveness of instructional approaches (NMSA, 2010: 32). The study also indicates that for common planning time to be effective, it should focus on the academic and relationship needs of the students (Cook and Faulkner, 2010: 10).

3.2.2 Professional development planning

Zimmerman (2011: 112) states that principals should develop a professional development plan with clear, specific goals and concrete practical steps which will yield the most improvement. This will ultimately lead to effectiveness within the school if the plan is effectively implemented.
3.2.3 Collaborative planning

Thousand, Villa and Nevin (2006: 239) explored the benefits of collaborative planning and teaching. One of the findings of Thousand et al. (2006: 240) is that learners at all grade levels with diverse learning characteristics can be educated effectively in general education environments in which the teachers, support personnel and families collaborate. Through this collaborative planning, there were also improvements in academic and social relationships (Thousand et al., 2006: 240).

3.2.4 Strategic planning

The study by Leitzel, Corvey and Hiley (2004: 37) sought to undertake a strategic planning process at the New Hampshire University (UNH) with the goal of improving the University’s effectiveness. These types of processes normally take one of two forms: It can redirect the institution in fundamental ways, or it can focus on the things that it is doing especially well and organise the future around them (Leitzel et al., 2004: 37). UNH produced an Academic Plan to drive all other university planning and decision-making (Leitzel et al., 2004: 39). The academic planning was not to be simply one aspect of institutional planning. The Academic Plan was the university plan, and all other planning would support it. In support of the academic priorities, the Academic Plan included a strategic theme focused on institutional effectiveness. The main value was accountability. It was required that evidence be produced about performance through assessment of students, faculty performance, programme results, organisational arrangements and financial systems (Leitzel et al., 2004: 40).

One of the major recommendations that emerged was to form an Institutional Effectiveness Committee which would be responsible for overseeing the integration of planning, resource allocation, assessment and programme review and quality
improvement (Leitzel et al., 2004: 41). The process design that was used was to design a planning process that was as inclusive as possible in order to guarantee the buy-in of key constituencies and then to bring in the experts needed for effective decision-making (Leitzel et al., 2004: 41).

Based on the above evidence, it is reasonable to believe that planning should have a positive influence on organisational performance. Therefore, it was hypothesised that:

H1: Planning exerts a positive influence on the organisational performance of schools.

3.3 THE EFFECT OF ORGANISING ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Organising is basically a process of division of labour accompanied by appropriate delegation of authority (Ghillyer, 2009: 178). According to Ghillyer (2009: 178), organising improves the efficiency and quality of work through synergism. In the context of schools, five aspects of organising are found in the literature, namely collaborative networks, formal structures, school culture, supportive structures and teamwork.

3.3.1 Collaborative networks

According to Angelides (2010: 460), the existence of small collaborative networks in schools created the conditions for more efficient leadership and management. Through these collaborative networks there exist well-organised teams that force, demand and suggest a positive environment and the school be progressing as far as management is concerned (Angelides, 2010: 460). These collaborative networks ensured that there was a gradual positive change in the school culture (Angelides, 2010: 461). By developing these small collaborative networks within
schools, teachers work together, they begin to trust each other, share good practices and discuss common problems that they have. Through this teachers become more confident about their work, their self-esteem is raised and they take over leading roles in their schools, all resulting in improvement (Angelides, 2010: 464).

### 3.3.2 Formal structures

Instructional improvement is more successful when the formal organisation of reform activities is aligned with the social organisation of the school. Principals who put formal structures in place to enhance teachers’ informal networks will strengthen collegial bonds, enhance trust, and increase collective responsibility for learning, all contributing towards improved collegial decisions about instruction. (Printy, 2010: 123)

### 3.3.3 School culture

Engels, Hotton, Devos, Bouckenooghe and Aelterman (2008: 160) argue that school culture is a system of meaning that influences how people think and how they act at school. According to Engels et al. (2008: 160), a “good” school culture is considered as one in which meaningful staff development and enhanced student learning are practiced. There is evidence that school culture has an effect on student performance. There is also a strong association between effective principals and school culture that supports learning (Engels et al., 2008: 160).

### 3.3.4 Supportive structures

Murphy, Smylie, Mayrowetz and Louis (2009: 186) state that if distributed leadership is to take root, new and more supportive structures will need to be established and in a broader sense, schools will have to be restructured in
significant ways. Principals are in the right position and have the influence to create school structures conducive to distributed leadership (Murphy et al., 2009: 186). These support structures will enhance the organisational capacity of the school, which in turn should lead to an improvement in the effectiveness of the school management structures.

### 3.3.5 Teamwork

Ehrich and Cranston (2004: 23) mention that the principal's position is unique on the school management team, as he is both the leader of the team and at the same time a member of the team. It is further stated that if the team does not work, the principal may be held accountable. According to Taylor and Ryan (2005: 3), a good school's most important requirement is to have an inspiring, highly respected leader. But it is also vital that he or she is backed up by a strong team of deputies and department heads. Good leadership can be driven by an inspiring individual, but that alone is not enough; it also requires teamwork. Teamwork is seen as essential in every school. This can have many positive benefits – and should play an important part in the management culture of the school (Taylor and Ryan, 2005: 111).

Based on the above evidence, it is reasonable to believe that organising should have a positive influence on organisational performance. Therefore, it was hypothesised that:

H2: Organising exerts a positive influence on the organisational performance of schools.
3.4 THE EFFECT OF LEADING ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Leadership as a process is “the use of non-coercive influence to shape the group or the organisation’s goals, motivate behaviour toward the achievement of those goals and help to define the group or organisation’s culture” (Griffin, 2008: 469). In the context of schools, four aspects of leading are found in the literature, namely the principal as leader, distributed leadership, school leadership and leading the school culture.

3.4.1 The principal as leader

Pashiardis, Savvides, Lytra and Angelidou (2011: 538) describe principals’ leadership as a complex, nonlinear and multilevel process. Successful school leaders are driven by a personal value system and are able to articulate this value system with total conviction, creating a clear sense of institutional purpose and direction (Pashiardis et al., 2011: 538). Emphasis is placed on the moral nature of leadership in which successful principals communicate their vision to the teachers, parents and to the students on a daily basis. Through this, successful principals manage to create workplace conditions that offer learning opportunities and learning experiences for the professional development of the staff as well as for the improvement of students’ academic and social outcomes (Pashiardis et al., 2011: 538).

Pashiardis et al., (2011: 539) argue that the central idea of successful leadership is for leaders to create meaningful relationships with teachers, staff, students and with other stakeholders. Successful leaders make heavy emotional investments in their relationships (Pashiardis et al., 2011: 539). These leaders need to show emotional understanding and empathy for the people around them to make them feel they work in a safe, respectful and caring environment (Pashiardis et al., 2011: 539). Principals are also concerned with team harmony and group cohesion.
Successful principals seek the opinions of teachers, students and parents, and should strive for mutual understanding. Principals also support shared decision-making by involving everyone in school discussions and encouraging the staff to participate in discussions about values and beliefs (Pashiardis et al., 2011: 539).

People-centred leadership and clearly communicated values and visions combined with a strong emphasis on the promotion of learning, the use of networked leadership as well as the creative management of competing values outline the elements of a comprehensive and, indeed, successful kind of leadership. (Pashiardis et al., 2011: 551)

3.4.2 Distributed leadership

Muijs (2011: 45) investigates the importance of leadership as a key factor in school effectiveness and improvement. Muijs (2011: 46) states that principals of effective schools are strong leaders; also that there is a strong relationship between school effectiveness and factors such as principals developing a clear shared mission, and developing a focus on learning and teaching in the school. Distributed leadership implies that the practice of leadership is stretched within or across an organisation and that there are high degrees of involvement in the practice of leadership (Muijs, 2011: 51). This concept of distributed leadership is a form of leadership that brings together both lateral and formal leadership processes in order to generate organisational change and development (Muijs, 2011: 51). According to Muijs (2011: 51), distributed leadership clearly holds theoretical promise in terms of organisational improvement and achievement. Muijs (2011: 54) states that there is evidence that leadership does make a difference to organisational effectiveness and even to pupil performance; there is even evidence that transformational and distributed leadership in particular can contribute to organisational effectiveness.
3.4.3 School leadership

Halsey (2011: 7) mentions that school leadership is recognised to be complex, challenging and crucial to the quality of the learning experiences and outcomes of students. Harris and Lambert (2003: 2) argue that the potential of leadership to influence school improvement remains uncontested but it is the type of leadership required to sustain school improvement, which remains a debate. Leithwood, Luis, Anderson and Wahlstrom (2004: 1) concluded that leadership does not only matter; it is in fact second only to teaching among school related factors in its impact on student learning.

3.4.4 Leading the school culture

Roby (2011: 782) argues that creating a successful learning environment with a strong, sustainable culture is paramount for total ownership. For effectiveness to be part of the school, teacher leaders as well as other staff members must be involved in creating and supporting a cultural shift at the school (Roby, 2011: 782). Schools generally seek a culture that supports good work and high student achievement (Roby, 2011: 783). It was found that a sense of community or culture was a key factor in cultivating a sense of excellence in schools (Roby, 2011: 783).

Based on the above evidence, it is reasonable to believe that leading should have a positive influence on organisational performance. Therefore, it was hypothesised that:

H3: Leading exerts a positive influence on the organisational performance of schools.
3.5 THE EFFECT OF CONTROL ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE

According to Daft (2008: 454), organisational control refers to “the systematic process of regulating organisational activities to make them consistent with the expectations established in plans, targets and standards of performance.” In the context of schools, five aspects of control are found in the literature, quality control in schools; management by objectives; school capacity, instructional quality and student achievement; continuous improvement and hierarchy of authority.

3.5.1 Quality control in schools

Quality control refers to the methods use by schools to access, safeguard and assure their quality and improve the teaching and learning processes and their schools' performance (Hofman, de Boom, Hofman, 2010: 335). The entire school team, both teachers and principals, have to be aware of the usefulness of school self-evaluation and quality control (Hofman, et al., 2010: 348).

3.5.2 Management by objectives

In a different study, Lindberg and Wilson (2011: 64) state that management by objectives (MBO) is a system in which specific performance objectives are jointly determined by the subordinates as well as their supervisors; the progress toward the objectives is then periodically reviewed and rewards allocated on the basis of this progress. According to Lindberg and Wilson (2011: 64), the greatest advantage of management by objectives is perhaps that it makes it possible for the manager to be in control of his own performance. Self-control means stronger motivation, which means a desire to do your best rather than do just enough to get by. This in turn is associated with higher performance goals and a broader vision.
3.5.3 School capacity, instructional quality and student achievement

King and Bouchard (2011: 653) investigated the necessity to build organisational capacity in schools. There is a clear consensus that the factor with the most immediate and powerful influence on student learning is the quality of instruction that teachers provide (King and Bouchard, 2011: 654). The collective power of an entire department or faculty to strengthen student performance throughout the school can be summarised as school organisational capacity (King and Bouchard, 2011: 654). The relation between the capacity to sustain instructional quality and student achievement on the other hand is depicted in Figure 3.1. Figure 3.1 indicates that student achievement is affected most directly by the quality of instruction, which in turn is influenced by five key dimensions of capacity, i.e. teachers’ knowledge, skills and disposition; the professional community; technical resources; programme coherence and the principal leadership or distributed leadership.

The work of Wisconsin Idea Leadership Academy (WILA) attempts to address one of the critical tensions around school reform, framed alternatively as external control versus internal commitment (King and Bouchard, 2011: 664). The need for external intervention is inversely proportionate to how well the school is progressing. If there is persistent failure, dramatic, assertive leadership and external intervention appear to be necessary (King and Bouchard, 2011: 664). In the long run, however, effectiveness depends on developing internal commitment in which the ideas and internal motivation of the vast majority of staff members become activated (King and Bouchard, 2011: 664).
3.5.4 Continuous improvement

Robinson, McNaughton and Timperley (2011: 724) argue that in the high performing countries of East Asia, a tradition of collective lesson planning and lesson study, which is led by master teachers, provides teachers with high quality,
job-embedded opportunities to learn from expert peers. In systems as different as Japan, Finland and Shanghai-China continuous improvement at the school level is pursued through teacher cultures in which the practice of individual teachers is open to inspection by other teachers in the school, and the quality of teachers’ practice seen as a matter for all teachers to be concerned about (Robinson et al., 2011: 725). Routines that drive school improvement are regular features of every teacher’s work, and are not limited to an annual appraisal approach (Robinson et al., 2011: 725). Robinson et al. (2011: 729) state that as teachers develop capability they develop a better understanding of the norms and practices that are required if school improvement goals are to be met. These understandings enable them to be collectively accountable and responsible for the quality of leadership, teaching and learning (Robinson et al., 2011: 729).

3.5.5 Hierarchy of authority

Cheng and Yau (2011: 175) mention that in order to make schools effective:

- the development of education processes should be facilitated;
- the dynamics of interaction within effective functioning of the whole school system should be lubricated;
- effective conditions and efforts for uniting all sub-units in the school should be created and
- the managerial, structural and cultural conditions should be conducive to effective schools.

According to Cheng and Yau (2011: 181), to maximise rational decision-making and administrative efficiency, there needs to be a hierarchy of authority where each lower office is under the supervision and control of a higher one.
Based on the above evidence, it is reasonable to believe that control should have a positive influence on organisational performance. Therefore, it was hypothesised that:

H4: Control exerts a positive influence on the organisational performance of schools.

Sections 3.2 to 3.5 explained the hypothesised relationships among the variables investigated in this study. These different relationships are graphically depicted in Figure 3.2.

FIGURE 3.2: THE HYPOTHESESSED MODEL TO IMPROVE THE ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOLS
3.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter reasonable evidence was provided to suggest that the basic management functions have a positive influence on the organisational performance of schools. The relationships between these management functions, on the one hand, and the organisational performance of schools, on the other hand, now constitute the hypothesised model to improve the organisational performance of schools.

In the next chapter the research design methodology that was used in this study is outlined. Detailed information is given concerning the research paradigm, the sample, the pilot group as well as the measuring instrument. The reliability and validity of the measuring instrument are also discussed in Chapter 4. Furthermore, the data collection process is explained and the data analyses presented.
CHAPTER 4

THE METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY AND EMPIRICAL RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the research design methodology that was used in this study. Details are given concerning the research paradigm, the sample, the pilot group as well as the measuring instrument. The reliability and validity of the measuring instrument is also discussed. An explanation is given of how the data collection process unfolded. An analysis of results of the study will also be provided.

4.2 RESEARCH PARADIGM

According to Collis and Hussey (2003: 1), research should be organised and must be conducted systematically by using appropriate methods to collect and analyse the data to address a specific problem. Collis and Hussey (2003: 47) state that there are two main research paradigms or philosophies which can be labelled as either a positivistic or a phenomenological paradigm.

Data can be described as qualitative or quantitative. Qualitative data are concerned with qualities and non-numerical characteristics while quantitative data are all data collected in numerical form (Collis and Hussey, 2003: 161). A phenomenological paradigm tends to produce qualitative data and a positivistic paradigm tends to produce quantitative data.

The positivistic approach, according to Collis and Hussey (2003: 52), seeks the facts or causes of social phenomena, thus applying logical reasoning to the research with much emphasis on objectivity, precision and rigour. Larger samples
are used and this approach is mainly concerned with testing of hypotheses. The data are highly specific and precise and the reliability is high (Collis and Hussey, 2003: 55). A phenomenological paradigm uses small samples and is concerned with generating theories. The data are rich and subjective and the reliability is low (Collis and Hussey, 2003:55).

One of the main advantages of a quantitative approach to data collection is the relative ease and speed with which the research can be conducted. In this paradigm it is possible to use large samples while in a qualitative paradigm sample size may be small. The sample size in a case study may consist of one respondent. A qualitative data collection method can be expensive and time consuming, although it can be argued that qualitative data provide a more real basis for analysis and interpretation. (Collis and Hussey, 2003: 163)

This research project has followed a quantitative paradigm due to the nature of the problem statement where the researcher has to measure relationships between factors, i.e. planning, organising, leading and control that affect organisational performance of schools.

4.3 THE SAMPLE

A sample is made up of some of the members of a population. A population may refer to a body of people or to any other collection of items under consideration for research purposes. A good sample must be chosen at random, it must be large enough to satisfy the needs of the investigation being undertaken and must be unbiased (Collis and Hussey, 2003: 155).

There are two major categories of different sampling techniques: probability and non-probability sampling. In probability sampling subjects are drawn from a larger population in such a way that the probability of selecting each member of the
population is known (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006: 119). Examples of probability sampling methods include simple random sampling, systematic sampling, stratified random sampling and cluster sampling. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2006: 125), non-probability sampling does not include any type of random selection from a population. The researcher uses subjects who happen to be accessible or who may represent certain types of characteristics. Non-probability sampling methods include convenience sampling, purposeful or judgmental sampling and quota sampling (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006: 125-126).

The principals, deputy principals and heads of departments in the twenty-six (26) schools were targeted. In total, there were 139 SMT members in the twenty-six schools. This was the sampling frame for this study. All of these SMT members were targeted, but only 100 responded. Convenience sampling was used to select 139 possible respondents from fifteen (15) Public Primary and eleven (11) Public High Schools in the Uitenhage Education District. The sample was stratified to include principals, deputy principals and heads of departments of each of the sampled schools. Some of the sampled schools had two appointed deputy principals, and in some selected sampled schools, no deputy principal was appointed.

A self-constructed questionnaire was personally delivered to the respondents as outlined above. Anonymity and confidentiality were strictly guaranteed. Follow-ups were regularly conducted to ensure a good response rate. Respondents were asked to either submit their responses to the principal or the secretary of the school where they were then collected. One hundred (100) questionnaires were collected from the twenty-six (26) sampled schools. This translates into a response rate of 72%, which is depicted in Figure 4.1.
Figure 4.1 illustrates the survey questionnaire response rate. The response rate is 72% with 28% of responses outstanding.

Figure 4.2 illustrates that 55% of the respondents were from Primary Schools and 45% from High Schools.

Figure 4.2: RESPONSE RATE BY TYPE OF SCHOOL

- 55% from Primary Schools
- 45% from High Schools
The demographic composition of the respondents is depicted in Table 4.1.

### TABLE 4.1: DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 +</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3 shows that 47% of the respondents were female and 53% were male. This indicates that there is a seemingly fair distribution of gender in the school management teams of the sampled schools.

### FIGURE 4.3: RESPONSE RATE BY GENDER

![Response rate by gender](image)
Figure 4.4 illustrates that 26% of the respondents’ ages were fifty-five years and above. Altogether 52% of respondents were aged between forty-five and fifty-four years and 22% were aged between thirty-five and forty-four years. It is interesting to note that of all the schools that were sampled no respondent falls in the categories thirty-four years and younger. This should ring some alarm bells for these schools. This is an indication that the school management teams are mature people, but the fact that 26% of them are fifty-five years and older also indicates that many of these school management team members will reach retirement age within the next five years. Schools should tap information from these experienced individuals while they are still employed.

**FIGURE 4.4: RESPONSE RATE BY AGE GROUP**

![Response rate by age group](image)

Table 4.2 illustrates the level of education, current level of appointment on the SMT as well as the teaching experience of respondents. It also indicates the total number of years on the SMT as well as the years of experience in the current SMT position.
**TABLE 4.2: LEVEL OF EDUCATION, CURRENT APPOINTMENT AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest qualification</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Diploma</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current appointment</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total length of teaching experience in years</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 – 24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 +</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of years’ experience on SMT</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – 24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of years’ experience in current SMT position</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – 24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.5 indicates that 41% of SMT members obtained a teacher’s diploma while 38% obtained Bachelor’s degrees. The response rate from Honours degree graduates was 19% while 2% of respondents had obtained a Master’s degree. There were no respondents who had obtained Doctoral degrees and no respondent with only matriculation as a qualification.

FIGURE 4.5: RESPONSE RATE BY LEVEL OF QUALIFICATION

The response rate by current appointment on the SMT is depicted in Figure 4.6. Some 24% of the respondents were principals, 22% were deputy principals and 54% were heads of departments.
The total number of years’ experience in the teaching profession by the respondents is illustrated in Figure 4.7. Only 1% of respondents had teaching experience of between one (1) and eight (8) years. A further 9% of respondents had teaching experience between nine (9) and sixteen (16) years. There were 33% of respondents with teaching experience between seventeen (17) and twenty-four (24) years. There were also 35% of respondents with teaching experience between twenty-five (25) and thirty-two (32) years. There were 22% of respondents with teaching experience of thirty-three (33) years and more.
The numbers indicated in Figure 4.8 show the years of experience of respondents on the SMT. Altogether 23% had experience on the SMT of between one (1) and six (6) years. A further 22% had SMT experience of between seven (7) and twelve (12) years. There are also 33% of respondents with SMT experience of between thirteen (13) and eighteen (18) years. A further 14% of respondents had SMT experience of between nineteen (19) and twenty-four (24) years and 8% of the respondents had SMT experience of between twenty-five (25) and thirty (30) years.
In Figure 4.8 the response rate of respondents was given by years’ experience on the SMT. Figure 4.9 indicates the years of experience in the current SMT position. Almost half of respondents (49%) are in their current SMT position for between one (1) and six (6) years. A further 17% of respondents are in their current SMT positions for between seven (7) and twelve (12) years. Some 21% of respondents are in their current SMT positions for between thirteen (13) and eighteen (18) years. There are also 11% of respondents in their current SMT positions for between nineteen (19) and twenty-four (24) years while only 2% of respondents are in their current SMT positions for between twenty-five (25) and thirty (30) years.
4.4 THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Questionnaires are associated with both positivistic and phenomenological methodologies. A questionnaire is a list of carefully structured questions that are used to obtain reliable responses from a chosen sample. The main aim of the questionnaires is to find out what a selected group of participants do, think or feel (Collis and Hussey, 2003: 173).

A self-constructed measuring instrument in the form of a questionnaire was constructed and it was used to collect the data and measure the variables. The questions that were used in this study were all closed questions. The content of these questions was based on the literature review done in Chapter 2. These questions were anchored on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The measuring instruments are depicted in Annexure B. The STATISTICA Version 10 (2010) computer software program was used to conduct the statistical analyses in the study.
The self-constructed measuring instruments were based on the literature review in Chapter 2 and these literature review sources were used to measure the variables as indicted below:

4.4.1 Planning

There were eight (8) statements on planning derived from various literature sources. Daft and Marcic (2004: 164) state that planning still starts and stops at the top. Thurlow et al. (2003: 220) mention that the planning process should transform the whole climate of the school by promoting a shared vision and giving every teacher some opportunities for leadership. Thurlow et al.(2003: 219) also state that the planning process should lead to a growing commitment to an improvement in the quality of teaching and learning. These themes informed the construction of the questionnaire statements.

4.4.2 Organising

There were twelve (12) statements on organising derived from the following literature sources. According to Harris and Bennet (2005: 103), structures imply that tasks and responsibilities are allocated and also that resources reach the right place at the right time. Pather (2010: 45) states that educators should now become actively involved in designing policies, making decisions, creating the vision of the school, taking responsibility for resources and working with teams to bring about change and improvement in the school environment. According to Armstrong (2008: 65-66), it is important to choose members for the team based on their skills and their ability to work with others, as well as their ability to work independently.
4.4.3 Leading

There were eleven (11) statements on leading which informed the construction of this latent variable. Clarke (2007: 131-133) states that change leadership is no longer restricted to a person at the top of an organisation who is expected to drive the change forward; shared leadership is a core component within the school community. Harris and Lambert (2003: 1) indicate that good leaders have integrity, charisma, strong values, emotional intelligence and moral purpose. The leaders have energy, drive and enthusiasm. Goleman (2004: 8) mentions that good leaders should now also be able to handle frustration and stress. Sergiovanni (2007: 34) is of the opinion that leaders must provide leadership in a way that encourages others to be leaders in their own right. This type of servant leadership describes well what it means to be a principal.

4.4.4 Control

There were six (6) statements underpinned by the cited literature that informed the construction of the instrument to measure control. According to Daft and Marcic (2004: 552), control monitors ongoing employee activities to ensure they are consistent with performance standards. Armstrong (2008: 65-66) indicates that there should be review meetings and a focus on both the attainment of goals and the team process.

4.4.5 Organisational performance of schools

Thirteen (13) statements measured the latent variable, labelled organisation performance. These statements were derived from the following literature sources. Harris and Lambert (2003: 14) state that school improvement is essentially a process of changing school culture. Sergiovanni (2007: 6) indicates that schools managed by incompetent leaders simply do not get the job done. Learner
achievement is lower in such schools and learner absenteeism, discipline and violence may be a problem. According to Gray and Streshly (2008: 15), when relationships at school improve, schools become more effective.

4.5 THE PILOT STUDY

A questionnaire with close-ended questions anchored on a five-point Likert scale was constructed. The five-point Likert scale was used for the respondents to rate their level of agreement from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) for each given statement on the instrument. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2006: 202), it is highly recommended that researchers do a pilot study of their questionnaires before using them in their studies.

The questionnaire was validated by conducting a pilot study with experts from the education field. These experts included two principals, two deputy principals as well as two heads of department. Each of them had more than twenty years’ teaching experience and each of them had more than ten years’ experience in a school management position. The feedback and discussions with the pilot group led to improvements being made to the questionnaire. The final product of the questionnaire after feedback and consultations with the pilot group was used in the actual data collection process.

4.6 THE RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

According to Collis and Hussey (2003: 58), reliability is concerned with the findings of the research and is one aspect of the credibility of the findings. Collis and Hussey (2003: 58) suggest that if a research finding can be repeated, it is reliable. McMillan and Schumacher (2006: 183) state that reliability refers to the consistency of the measurement. According to Collis and Hussey (2003: 186), there are three ways of estimating the reliability of the responses to questions:
- The test re-test method where questions are asked of the same people, but on two separate occasions. The responses from the two different occasions are correlated and the correlation coefficient of the two sets of data computed, to provide an index of reliability.

- The split-halves method where the questionnaires or interview record sheets are divided into two equal halves and a correlation of the two data sets is computed.

- Internal consistency method where every item is correlated with every other item across the entire sample and the average inter-item correlation is then taken as the index of reliability.

According to Cook (2009: 115), reliability measurement is ideal when the sample size consists of 200 or more respondents. Cook (2009: 115) also suggests that the Cronbach alpha is an ideal measuring tool when participants respond to questions that are anchored on a Likert scale. McMillan and Schumacher (2006: 186) state that the Cronbach alpha is generally the most appropriate type of reliability for survey research and other questionnaires in which there is a range of possible answers for each item. This Cronbach alpha calculation examines inter-correlations among test items and the closer a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha is to 1.00 the higher the instrument’s internal consistency and reliability. According to Zikmund, Babin, Carr and Griffin (2010), a Cronbach alpha of below 0.60 is regarded as poor reliability, 0.60 is fair, 0.70 is good and above 0.80 is very good reliability.

In this research study, the Cronbach alpha coefficients were used to calculate the internal consistency regarding the reliability of the measuring instrument. The results, which are reported in Table 4.3, indicate that all the measuring instruments returned alpha values of more than 0.85, which are regarded as very reliable.
TABLE 4.3: CRONBACH ALPHA VALUES OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURING INSTRUMENTS</th>
<th>CRONBACH ALPHA VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>( \alpha = 0.90 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising</td>
<td>( \alpha = 0.91 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>( \alpha = 0.93 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>( \alpha = 0.89 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational performance of schools</td>
<td>( \alpha = 0.94 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 THE VALIDITY OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

According to Collis and Hussey (2003: 58), validity is the extent to which the research findings accurately represent what is really happening in the situation. Collis and Hussey (2003: 59) mention that the most common is face validity, which involves ensuring that the measures used by the researcher do actually measure or represent what they are supposed to measure. Content or face validity is the degree to which the content of the items adequately represents the universe of all relevant variables in the study, while criterion-related validity is the degree to which the predictor is adequate in capturing the relevant aspects of the criterion or variable (Collis and Hussey, 2003: 59).

Collis and Hussey (2003: 59) mention that there is also another form of validity, called construct validity, which measures characteristics, known as hypothetical constructs which are not directly observable, such as motivation, satisfaction, ambition and anxiety. These hypothetical constructs are assumed to exist as factors which explain observable phenomena. It is important that a questionnaire statement purporting to measure a particular construct (for example, planning) does measure planning and not organising. If that does not happen, that particular
questionnaire statement is not a valid measure of planning, because it could not discriminate between planning and organising. Discriminant validity is therefore a form of construct validity.

A factor analysis is usually conducted to assess discriminant validity. Large samples are however required to conduct a factor analysis. In this study discriminant validity could not be used due to the size of the sample. Content validity was used in this study based on the input from experts in the education field as mentioned under the pilot study.

4.8 THE EMPIRICAL RESULTS

From the empirical results, it can be deduced that reliable and valid measuring instruments were used in this study. A multiple regression analysis was then conducted to statistically investigate the relationships among the four basic management functions, i.e. planning, organising, leading and control, which were the independent variables and the organisational performance of schools which was the dependent variable.

4.8.1 Descriptive statistics: School management teams’ perceptions

The analysis of data consisted of the calculation of the percentages, mean scores and standard deviation per questionnaire statement. The strongly disagree and disagree responses were combined to form disagree. Likewise, the strongly agree and agree responses were combined to form the agree responses. This was done to make the analysis more meaningful and easy to understand.

Table 4.4 to Table 4.8 is a summary of the respondents’ perceptions of the basic management functions, i.e. planning, organising, leading and control in schools as well as their perceptions of the organisational performance of schools.
### TABLE 4.4: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAMS’ PERCEPTIONS ON PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Neutral</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>StandardDeviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLAN1</td>
<td>Our Principal shows a great deal of commitment and support to the planning process of our school.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN2</td>
<td>At our school, better staff development is facilitated by effective planning.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN3</td>
<td>At our school, individual professional development and school improvement are effectively linked by planning.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN4</td>
<td>The planning process leads to a growing commitment to improving the quality of teaching and learning at our school.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN5</td>
<td>The planning process transforms the whole climate of our school by promoting a shared vision for its future.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN6</td>
<td>At our school, the planning process provides every teacher with opportunities for leadership.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN7</td>
<td>At our school, the planning process helps us to manage change.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN8</td>
<td>The planning at our school helps the staff to work together in realising the aims of the school.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE MEAN, PERCENTAGE AND STANDARD DEVIATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.785</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 depicts the responses on how the SMT members view planning in their respective schools. The mean scores achieved on the eight statements of planning as a basic management function in schools covered a range between 3.61 and 4.30, while the standard deviation covered a range of between 0.674 and 0.952. The average mean score and standard deviation of 3.81 and 0.785 respectively are an indication that SMT members rate the effectiveness of the planning processes in their respective schools highly.
Ninety-two percent (92%) of respondents reported that Principals show a great deal of commitment to and support for the planning processes at the school. About sixty-four percent (64%) of respondents reported that effective planning facilitates improved staff development. The highest percentage of disagreement is thirteen percent (13%) of respondents who reported that the planning process does not provide every teacher with opportunities for leadership.

4.8.1.2 Organising

Table 4.5 depicts the responses on how the SMT members view organising in their respective schools. The mean scores achieved on the twelve statements of organising as a basic management function in schools covered a range between 3.27 and 4.23, while the standard deviation covered a range of between 0.679 and 1.030. The average mean score and standard deviation of 3.70 and 0.885 respectively are an indication that SMT members give a reasonably high rating for the effectiveness of the organising processes in their respective schools.

Ninety-three percent (93%) of respondents reported that clearly defined tasks, duties, roles and responsibilities are allocated to all the SMT members. Twenty percent (20%) of respondents reported that the school’s resources do not reach the right places at the right time. It is also interesting to note that fifty-nine percent (59%) of respondents reported that the educators at the school accept full responsibility for the use of resources to improve the school environment, whereas 23% remain neutral on this item and 18% disagree with the statement.
## TABLE 4.5: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAMS’ PERCEPTIONS ON ORGANISING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Neutral</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGN1</td>
<td>Our school's resources are effectively deployed to achieve our strategic goals.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN2</td>
<td>An effective organisational structure is created to distribute and co-ordinate the work of people in the pursuit of our school's goals and objectives.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN3</td>
<td>At our school, clearly defined tasks, duties, roles and responsibilities are allocated to all SMT members.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN4</td>
<td>Our school's resources reach the right places at the right time.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN5</td>
<td>At our school, effective management teams are used to achieve the school's objectives.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN6</td>
<td>At our school, efficient accountable management structures are developed to achieve the school's objectives.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN7</td>
<td>At our school, every staff member feels part of the team.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN8</td>
<td>Educators are actively involved in designing policies for the improvement in our school environment.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN9</td>
<td>Educators at our school are actively involved in decision making of the school.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN10</td>
<td>Educators at our school accept full responsibility for the use of resources to improve the school environment.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN11</td>
<td>At our school, SMT members are selected based on their skills and their ability to work with others.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN12</td>
<td>At our school, SMT members are selected on their ability to work independently.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE MEAN, PERCENTAGE AND STANDARD DEVIATION** | **12.58** | **19.00** | **68.42** | **3.70** | **0.885** |
### 4.8.1.3 Leading

**TABLE 4.6: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAMS’ PERCEPTIONS ON LEADING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Neutral</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAD1</td>
<td>The SMT members have the ability to influence educators toward the attainment of our school's goals.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD2</td>
<td>The principal and SMT effectively drive change at our school.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD3</td>
<td>Shared leadership by the SMT is a core component within our school.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD4</td>
<td>SMT members at our school are people with integrity and moral purpose.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD5</td>
<td>SMT members at our school are emotionally intelligent.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD6</td>
<td>The SMT members at our school have energy, drive and enthusiasm.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD7</td>
<td>The SMT members play a critical role in ensuring motivation and performance of staff at our school.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD8</td>
<td>The SMT members at our school effectively provide opportunities to educators to develop them as leaders.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD9</td>
<td>The SMT members at our school have the ability to effectively handle frustration and stress.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD10</td>
<td>The SMT makes sure that they effectively match employees and job characteristics so that work is done by people who are well suited to do it.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD11</td>
<td>The SMT at our school facilitates the growth, goals and development of others in order to liberate their best qualities in pursuing the school's mission.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE MEAN, PERCENTAGE AND STANDARD DEVIATION**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>73.18</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6 depicts the responses on how the SMT members view leading in their respective schools. The mean scores achieved on the eleven statements of leading as a basic management function in schools covered a range between 3.46 and 4.08, while the standard deviation covered a range of between 0.706 and 0.984. The average mean score and standard deviation of 3.80 and 0.844 respectively are an indication that SMT members rate the effectiveness of leading they exhibited at their respective schools highly.

Eighty-five percent (85%) of respondents reported that the SMT members have the ability to influence educators toward the attainment of the school’s goals. A further eighty-three (83%) percent of respondents reported that SMT members at their schools are people with integrity and moral purpose. A high percentage of respondents (27%) remained neutral whether the SMT members at their schools are emotionally intelligent. It is also interesting to note that fifteen percent (15%) of respondents did not agree that the SMT members at their schools have the ability to effectively handle frustration and stress. A further twenty-five percent (25%) remained neutral on the same statement.

4.8.1.4 Control

Table 4.7 depicts the responses on how the SMT members view control in their respective schools. The mean scores achieved on the six statements of control as a basic management function in schools covered a range between 3.55 and 3.95, while the standard deviation covered a range of between 0.788 and 0.963. The average mean score and standard deviation of 3.71 and 0.883 respectively are an indication that SMT members rate the effectiveness of the control processes in their respective schools highly.

Seventy-eight percent (78%) of respondents reported that strong emphasis is placed on achieving quality academic results. Also seventy-four percent (74%) of
respondents reported that strong emphasis is placed on effectively achieving outcomes. An area of concern is that sixteen percent (16%) of respondents reported that the SMT does not effectively monitor ongoing educator activities to ensure they are consistent with performance standards at the school. Another sixteen percent (16%) of respondents remained neutral on this same statement.

**TABLE 4.7: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAMS’ PERCEPTIONS ON CONTROL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Neutral</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONT1</td>
<td>At our school, a systematic process is used to regulate whether the school's activities are consistent with expectations established in plans, targets and standards of performance.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT2</td>
<td>The SMT effectively monitors ongoing educator activities to ensure they are consistent with performance standards at our school.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT3</td>
<td>At our school, strong emphasis is placed on effectively achieving outcomes.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT4</td>
<td>At our school, strong emphasis is placed on achieving quality academic results.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT5</td>
<td>The SMT at our school is effectively implementing a large number of small incremental activities to achieve school improvement.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT6</td>
<td>SMT members at our school initiate corrective action whenever there is a deviation from a required performance standard.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE MEAN, PERCENTAGE AND STANDARD DEVIATION

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONT1</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>69.17</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 4.8: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAMS’ PERCEPTIONS ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Neutral</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERF1</td>
<td>Our school is effective in achieving curriculum development.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF2</td>
<td>Our school is effective in achieving leadership development at all levels of our school.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF3</td>
<td>Our school is effective in achieving the development of teaching.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF4</td>
<td>Our school is effective in improving professional relationships among staff members at the school.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF5</td>
<td>Our school is effective in managing learner absenteeism.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF6</td>
<td>Our school is effective in maintaining learner discipline.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF7</td>
<td>Our school is effective in promoting excellence in our school.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF8</td>
<td>At our school, every educator performs to the best of his/her ability.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF9</td>
<td>At our school, effective teaching and learning take place.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF10</td>
<td>At our school, learner rights are effectively promoted.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF11</td>
<td>At our school, learner self-esteem is effectively developed.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF12</td>
<td>The SMT members at our school have the necessary skills to effectively deal with crisis situations at school.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF13</td>
<td>At our school, learner responsibilities are effectively promoted.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE MEAN, PERCENTAGE AND STANDARD DEVIATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 depicts the responses on how the SMT members view organisational performance in their respective schools. The mean scores achieved on the thirteen statements of organisational performance of schools covered a range
between 3.39 and 3.91, while the standard deviation covered a range of between 0.712 and 1.198. The average mean score and standard deviation of 3.67 and 0.943 respectively are an indication that SMT members were reasonably satisfied with the organisational performance of their respective schools.

Just more than half of the respondents (56%) reported that every educator at the school performs to the best of his/her ability. Also fifty-seven percent (57%) reported that the school is effective in managing learner absenteeism and fifty-nine percent (59%) reported that the school is effective in maintaining learner discipline. These are areas for concern and need attention by the school management teams to improve effectiveness, because at least forty-one percent (41%) of the respondents disagree with the preceding highlighted statements.

4.8.2 Multiple regression analysis

The STATISTICA Version 10 (2010) computer software program was used to analyse the data. It was used to test the relationships between the dependent variable, i.e. the organisational performance of schools and what the influence of the four basic management functions (independent variables), i.e. planning, organising, leading and control was on the dependent variable.

Table 4.9 indicates the results obtained from the multiple regression analysis. The empirical results show that all four independent variables, planning, organising, leading and control are important \( (r^2 = 0.88) \) to attain organisational performance of schools. These independent variables account for 88% of the variance in organisational performance of schools. All four independent variables play a role in the organisational performance of schools. Planning and organising are important but not significant. Leading and control on the other hand play the most significant role.
### TABLE 4.9: MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Summary Statistics DV: Organisational performance of schools</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93630486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87666680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87147382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(4,95)</td>
<td></td>
<td>168.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 100</th>
<th>b*</th>
<th>Std. Err. of b*</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Std. Err. of b</th>
<th>t(95)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.216087</td>
<td>0.170172</td>
<td>-1.26981</td>
<td>0.207252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>0.055993</td>
<td>0.097631</td>
<td>0.066894</td>
<td>0.170172</td>
<td>0.11016</td>
<td>0.912514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGN</td>
<td>0.013139</td>
<td>0.119272</td>
<td>0.014902</td>
<td>0.135275</td>
<td>0.107762</td>
<td>0.912514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td>0.421975</td>
<td>0.097270</td>
<td>0.467492</td>
<td>0.107762</td>
<td>4.33818</td>
<td>0.000036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>0.479309</td>
<td>0.0875517</td>
<td>0.485520</td>
<td>0.088651</td>
<td>5.47675</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: P-values in bold indicate a significant relationship

4.8.2.1 The influence of planning on the organisational performance of schools

Hypothesis H1 stipulated that planning exerts a positive influence on the organisational performance of schools. The null hypothesis formulated in this regard was:

HO1: Planning exerts no influence on the organisational performance of schools.

The empirical results indicate that planning does not have a significant ($r = 0.06$, $p > 0.05$) influence on the organisational performance of schools. The hypothesis H1 is therefore not supported, while the null hypothesis HO1 is supported. It means that a focus on planning does not significantly influence the organisational performance of schools.
4.8.2.2 The influence of organising on the organisational performance of schools

Hypothesis H2 stipulated that organising exerts a positive influence on the organisational performance of schools. The null hypothesis formulated in this regard was:

HO2: Organising exerts no influence on the organisational performance of schools.

The empirical results indicate that organising does not have a significant (r = 0.01, p > 0.05) influence on the organisational performance of schools. The hypothesis H2 is therefore not supported, while the null hypothesis HO2 is supported. It means that a focus on organising does not significantly influence the organisational performance of schools.

4.8.2.3 The influence of leading on the organisational performance of schools

Hypothesis H3 stipulated that leading exerts a positive influence on the organisational performance of schools. The null hypothesis formulated in this regard was:

HO3: Leading exerts no influence on the organisational performance of schools.

The empirical results indicate that leading is significantly positively (r = 0.42, p < 0.001) related to the organisational performance of schools. The hypothesis H3 is therefore supported, while the null hypothesis HO3 is not supported. It means that effective leading leads to increased organisational performance of schools.
4.8.2.4 The influence of control on the organisational performance of schools

Hypothesis H4 stipulated that control exerts a positive influence on the organisational performance of schools. The null hypothesis formulated in this regard was:

HO4: Control exerts no influence on the organisational performance of schools.

The empirical results indicate that control is significantly positively ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$) related to the organisational performance of schools. The hypothesis H4 is therefore supported, while the null hypothesis HO4 is not supported. It means that effective control leads to increased organisational performance of schools.

4.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The research design methodology that was used in the study was discussed in this chapter. It gave an overview of the research paradigm, the sample, the measuring instrument as well as the pilot group that was part of the study. The reliability and validity of the measuring instrument were also discussed and an explanation was given of how the data collection process unfolded.

In this chapter, the empirical results were analysed and reported. The data from the 100 questionnaires collected from school management team members in the Uitenhage Education District were analysed. The responses from the individual questionnaire statements were analysed to obtain the responses regarding the school management team members’ perceptions about the four basic management functions as well as the organisational performance of schools. The focus was to test relationships between the independent variables, i.e. planning, organising, leading and control and the dependent variable which was organisational performance of schools.
A multiple regression analysis was done to test the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The empirical results indicate that all four independent variables, planning, organising, leading and control play a role in the organisational performance of schools. Although they are all important, the study shows that controlling and leading play a more significant role to increase the organisational performance of schools. Controlling and leading are therefore the more important management tasks that school management teams should focus on.

In Chapter 5, the managerial implications of the empirical findings are discussed, as well as the conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER 5

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the final chapter, the empirical results of the study are discussed as well as the managerial implications forthcoming from this study. These empirical findings are also compared with findings from the literature review and conclusions are drawn based on these comparisons. There will also be recommendations made based on the gaps that were identified during the course of this study for future researchers to explore.

5.2 MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS BASED ON FINDINGS

In the literature review in Chapter Two the four basic management functions were highlighted, i.e. planning, organising, leading and control as well as strategies that school management teams can use to improve the organisational performance of schools. In this section, the results are evaluated that were derived from the descriptive statistical analysis and the regression analysis for each of the variables in relation to the literature.

5.2.1 Planning

In this study, the relationship between planning and the organisational performance of schools was investigated. The average mean score for planning was 3.81 and the average standard deviation was 0.785 as indicated in Table 4.4. This suggests that the SMT members rate the effectiveness of the planning processes at their respective schools reasonably highly.
Daft and Marcic (2004: 164) state that even though planning is decentralised, top managers must still show support and commitment to the planning process. The rest of the SMT members need to be incorporated in this process so that it is not only the principal but also the SMT as a collective that shows this commitment and support. From this collective commitment, all SMT members from the principal, the deputy principal and the heads of department should take the lead to implement whatever was planned and make sure that the necessary control measures are in place to achieve the planned outcomes.

There is an indication that effective planning facilitates better staff development. Thurlow et al. (2003: 219) suggest that the planning process should lead to better staff development, which should link individual professional development and institutional improvement. The SMT therefore needs to design staff development opportunities for their respective staff members by taking the lead and ensuring that the necessary controls are put in place to see that the staff development programmes realise. If they remain as plans, they will not have an impact on effectiveness. The SMT members have to show commitment to improving the quality of teaching and learning by taking bold leadership and ensuring that the necessary control measures are in place. The findings show that planning on its own does not guarantee good organisational performance of schools. It should include strong leadership and effective control.

The planning process should help to transform the whole climate of the school by giving every teacher some opportunities for leadership (Thurlow et al., 2003: 220). The SMT needs to create these opportunities within their respective departments and staffs, especially as the findings indicate that leadership plays a significant role in ensuring organisational performance of schools. It is indicated in the findings that the planning process helps the teachers to manage change. The SMT needs to take the lead in being change agents. By doing so their different departments and eventually the schools will become effective in what they are doing. The
planning process also helps the staff to work together in realising the aims of the school. The challenge to the SMT is to facilitate opportunities for the staff to work together in realising the aims and goals of the school. The SMT needs to initiate teamwork, take the lead in these teamwork initiatives and ensure that these teamwork activities are controlled. This in turn should lead to effectiveness in the school as a whole. However, the empirical results reveal that although the above-mentioned planning activities do take place in their schools, these activities do not have a significant effect on the organisational performance of the schools.

5.2.2 Organising

In this study, the relationship between organising and the organisational performance of schools was investigated. The average mean score for organising was 3.70 and the average standard deviation was 0.885 as indicated in Table 4.5. This suggests that the SMT members give an above-average rating to the effectiveness of the organising processes at their respective schools.

According to O’Neill (1994), the management structures have to allocate tasks and duties and define the specific roles and responsibilities. The SMT has to ensure that although these tasks, duties and responsibilities are allocated, they are actually carried out. The principal needs to lead the SMT by putting the necessary control measures in place to ensure that these duties are done. This emphasises that organising without strong leadership and effective control mechanisms is not going to improve the organisational performance of the school.

It is stated by Taylor and Ryan (2005: 110) that a good school is one where its entire staff feel they are part of a team. This should start in the SMT itself. The principal should ensure that every SMT member feels as if he/she is part of the team. If the SMT members do not work as a team, they will find it difficult to get their subordinates to work with them as part of a team. Teamwork is very
important. The SMT members should initiate and encourage team activities within their departments and schools. Although the Heads of Department lead their respective teams, they must also allow the other members in their team to take the initiative and let them grow through teamwork. Keep in mind that leadership is one of the more important management tasks that the SMT should focus on to improve organisational performance. It is imperative to realise that control measures are central even in teamwork activities.

Educators should become actively involved in decision-making processes at the school (Pather, 2010: 45). The SMT needs to realise that it is of utmost importance to involve as many of the role-players as possible in the decision-making process. Therefore, the management team should create the necessary structures and opportunities so that all stakeholders can contribute and be part of the decision-making. This makes the decisions more inclusive and it becomes easier for the SMT members to lead and effectively control the implementation of these decisions. This in turn should then lead to an improvement in the organisational performance of schools.

Armstrong (2008: 66) suggests that members of a team should be chosen based on their skills and their ability to work with others, as well as their ability to work independently. The School Governing Bodies need to ensure that when these SMT vacancies are filled, that the skills and abilities of applicants are considered. An SMT member needs to work independently, but also needs the skill to work with other people. The relationships with people play a significant role for a person who is part of the management team. SMT members need to have the necessary management skills to do the basic management functions.

Although the above-mentioned organising tasks do take place in their schools according to the respondents, the statistical analysis reveals that the organising management task does not influence school performance significantly. It appears
that the respondents are of the view that SMTs are generally effective in planning and organising activities and resources, but that implementation is driven by leading and controlling, which is the focus of the next two sections.

5.2.3 Leading

In this study, the relationship between leading and the organisational performance of schools was investigated. The average mean score for leading was 3.80 and the average standard deviation was 0.844 as indicated in Table 4.6. This suggests that the SMT members give a high rating to the way the SMT leads at their respective schools.

The empirical results showed that leading has a significantly positive influence \((r = 0.42, p < 0.001)\) on the organisational performance of a school. In the context of this study, it means that SMT members must be able to influence educators toward the attainment of the school's goals; effectively drive change at the school; exhibit shared leadership; be people of integrity and moral purpose; be emotionally intelligent; have energy, drive and enthusiasm; play a critical role in ensuring the motivation and performance of the staff; provide opportunities for educators to develop as leaders; be able to effectively handle frustration and stress; find a suitable match between staff and the required job characteristics; and facilitate the growth, goals and development of others in order to liberate their best qualities in pursuing the school's mission.

Leadership is the ability to influence people toward the attainment of goals (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 376). The best way to influence people is to set an example for them to follow. The SMT needs to set the standard within the school. All SMT members, starting from the principal, the deputy principal and the heads of departments need to have the integrity to lead and this must be inculcated by the principal.
Change leadership is no longer restricted to one person at the top of an organisation who is expected to drive the change forward (Clarke, 2007: 133). Another finding is that the SMT effectively drives change at the school. The SMT needs to have a staff development programme in place. Through this programme, the SMT can learn how to initiate change, how to drive change and how to successfully implement change. It is also very important that the SMT members be equipped to deal with resistance to change. Leading is significantly positively related to organisational effectiveness and therefore more emphasis should be placed by the SMT on this management task. An effective control system should be in place to ensure that the staff development programme is effectively implemented. Even if these staff development programmes are planned, but without effective leadership and effective control, they will not improve the organisational performance of schools.

Shared leadership by the SMT is also one of the findings of this study. Shared leadership is a core component within the school community (Lindstrom and Speck, 2004: 8). Although it was mentioned before, teamwork cannot be emphasised enough. An SMT member needs to be able to work in a team. The findings also indicate that SMT members need to be people with integrity and moral purpose. According to Harris and Lambert (2003: 1), good leaders have integrity, charisma, strong values, emotional intelligence and moral purpose. Seeing that SMT members need to lead, they need to have these personal attributes of integrity and moral purpose. Leaders should lead in an ethical way. If SMT members lead with integrity and have moral purpose, this will, in turn, rub off on their colleagues and the learners, which will increase the effectiveness in the school environment. Another finding of the study is that SMT members must have energy, drive and enthusiasm. The principal needs to create space for the SMT members to be innovative, to come up with new ideas and be given the opportunity to lead their teams with enthusiasm. This enthusiasm and energy can flow to
colleagues and encourages teamwork, which can also have a positive impact on the organisational performance of the school.

The SMT members need to be emotionally intelligent. It is expected of SMT members to have the psychological maturity to deal with any problem or circumstance that faces them. This means that according to Pather (2010: 74-75), schools can no longer rely only on rational skills, but also need interpersonal behaviour and emotional stability. According to Heystek et al. (2008: 76), emotionally intelligent people are able to understand and express themselves, to understand and relate well to others and to cope successfully with the demands of daily life.

The school management team needs to create opportunities for all educators to develop as leaders. These development opportunities should be part of the staff development programme. The SMT members can also create other opportunities within their respective departments for other staff members to lead. Educators can be given the opportunity to chair meetings, to be a subject head, to take the lead in moderating assessment tasks, to be the head of sub-committees, etc. These opportunities also facilitate the development of the other staff members in order to liberate their best qualities in pursuing the school’s vision and mission.

The SMT also has the critical role to motivate staff members and to ensure that the staff members perform to the best of their ability. This constant motivation needs to start with the principal who should have regular motivation sessions with the SMT. A motivated employee should perform better and this will improve the effectiveness of the school management team. SMT members need to make sure that they effectively match employees and their job characteristics so that the work is done by teachers who are well suited to do it. When the allocation of the workload and other duties is done by the SMT, the SMT should focus on the strength of each individual teacher and do the allocation of work accordingly. When teachers are
satisfied with their allocated duties and responsibilities, it will simplify the leading aspect of the SMT member and reduce the frustration and stress to manage. It is also good to always consult with the colleagues concerned before these tasks and duties are allocated. If the leading is more effective, it should then improve the organisational performance of the school.

The school management team needs to emphasise the leadership aspects within the SMT as this study indicates that leadership plays a significant role towards the organisational performance of schools.

5.2.4 Control

In this study, the relationship between control and the organisational performance of schools was also investigated. The average mean score for control was 3.71 and the average standard deviation was 0.883 as indicated in Table 4.7. This suggests that the SMT members rate the control processes at their respective schools as above average.

The empirical results reveal that control exerts a significantly positive influence ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$) on the organisational performance of a school. In the context of this study, it means that SMT members should implement a systematic process to regulate whether the school's activities are consistent with their expectations which they established in plans, targets and standards of performance; effectively monitor ongoing educator activities to ensure that they are consistent with the performance standards of the school; emphasise the effective achieving of outcomes; emphasise the achieving of quality academic results; implement a large number of small incremental activities to achieve school improvement; and initiate corrective action whenever there is a deviation from a required performance standard.
Control is a very critical issue in all schools today. The plans, targets and performance standards, which are set, need to be monitored and controlled to ensure that they are achieved. The SMT needs to regulate the organisational activities within the school. These organisational activities should be consistent with the established plans, targets and standards. Control is also about effectively monitoring ongoing educator activities to ensure that they are consistent with the performance standards of the school (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 552). According to Robinson et al. (2011: 729), as teachers develop capability, they develop a better understanding of the norms and practices that are required if school improvement goals are to be met. The SMT needs to ensure that a control mechanism is in place to continuously monitor the educator’s work and should not be limited to the annual appraisal approach.

The empirical results indicate that strong emphasis is placed on effectively achieving outcomes. The SMT needs to ensure that the outcomes that need to be achieved are clearly formulated. The SMT should also have a clear strategy on how to drive the process to achieve these outcomes. The necessary control measures should be in place to ensure that these outcomes are achieved. The empirical results indicate that control is significantly positively related to the organisational performance of schools. Therefore, the SMT should focus more on control as a management task to ensure that organisational performance is improved.

The achievement of quality academic results is also a finding of the study. One of the yardsticks of performance in schools is academic results. The SMT needs to focus on the leading and control of curriculum implementation to ensure that quality academic results are obtained. Planning and organising of the curriculum is important, but without effective leadership and effective control over the curriculum, the school will not be able to secure quality academic results.
Continuous improvement is the implementation of a large number of small, incremental improvements in all areas of the organisation on an ongoing basis (Daft and Marcic, 2004: 564). SMT members according to this study do the initiation of corrective action whenever there is a deviation from a required performance standard. The SMT should correct any deviation from the required performance standard on a continuous basis. This means that the necessary control mechanisms should be put in place by the SMT so that effective control can be implemented at different stages of the process. This regular effective implementation of control measures should have a positive effect on the organisational performance of the school.

Control measures should provide a red alert to school management teams as this study indicates that control is one of the management functions that play a significant role towards the better organisational performance of schools.

5.2.5 Organisational performance of schools

The average mean score for the organisational performance of schools was 3.67 and the average standard deviation was 0.943 as indicated in Table 4.8. This suggests that the SMT members are reasonably satisfied with the organisational performance of schools in terms of effectively achieving curriculum development, leadership development, teaching and learning, sound professional relationships among staff, learner absenteeism management, learner discipline, learner rights and responsibilities, conflict handling and overall excellence.

5.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

There are some limitations to this study and recommendations can therefore be made for future researchers. These limitations include the following:
- It should be remembered that the findings are based on the respondents’ perceptions. School performance is therefore not assessed on actual numerical results such as pass percentages and budgets.

- The findings from the small sample of only 26 schools in the Uitenhage Education District with only 100 respondents may not be representative enough and cannot be generalised to all schools in the Uitenhage Education District as a whole or even the Eastern Cape Province for that matter. The reliability and validity of the measuring instruments however provide a useful basis to recommend initiatives to improve the organisational performance of schools in the Eastern Cape.

- To improve the validity of this study for future researchers, it is recommended that a larger sample size be used. This would lead to the data obtained being more valid and representative, and then being more capable of being generalised to the whole population. Due to the small sample size, factor analysis and the test for discriminant validity could not be done. A bigger pilot group than the six used in this study can also improve the validity of the questionnaire.

- Hopefully findings of this study can contribute to future research and improving the organisational performance of schools in the Uitenhage Education District and to the Eastern Cape Department of Education as a whole.

- The respondents consisted only of SMT members, i.e. principals, deputy principals and heads of departments. It would be interesting to investigate what the results would be if the same measuring instrument is used but with only post level one educators as respondents.
The respondents returned the questionnaires to either the secretary or the principal at the different schools. This might have had an influence on how respondents answered the questions seeing that the principal is in a position of power at the school. A suggestion could be to give each respondent a stamped, self-addressed envelope to mail the questionnaires back to the researcher.

5.4 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to improve the organisational performance of schools. The study investigated the relationships between each of the independent variables, i.e. planning, organising, leading and control and what impact these variables have on the dependent variable, i.e. the organisational performance of schools.

A pilot group consisting of six experts from the education field was used to refine the self-constructed questionnaire. The respondents consisted of one hundred school management team members, which included principals, deputy principals and heads of departments.

The empirical results indicate that the management tasks, leading and control, are significantly positively related to the organisational performance of schools. The empirical results also indicate that planning and organising do not have a significant influence on the organisational performance of schools. The empirical results further indicate that all four independent variables, planning, organising, leading and control play a role in the organisational performance of schools. Although they are all important, the study shows that controlling and leading are playing a more significant role in improving the organisational performance of schools. Controlling and leading are therefore the more important management tasks that school management teams should focus on. This means that SMT
members should continue with planning and organising, but should put much more emphasis on *leading* and *control* to improve the organisational performance of schools.
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ANNEXURE A: THE QUESTIONNAIRE COVERING LETTER

18 August 2011

Dear Respondent

I am studying for the MBA (Masters in Business Administration) degree at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University Business School. This degree requires that I conduct a study in my preferred field of interest, which is education management. I have decided to investigate how the performance of Senior Management Teams (SMTs) of schools could be improved and believe my study will make an important contribution to improving teaching and learning in our schools. The results of my study will be made available to participants on request.

You are part of our selected sample of respondents whose views we seek on the above-mentioned matter. We would therefore appreciate it if you could answer a few questions in this regard. It should not take more than fifteen minutes of your time and we want to thank you in advance for your co-operation.

There are no correct or incorrect answers. Please answer the questions as accurately as possible. For each statement, tick the number which best describes your experience or perception. For example, if you strongly agree with the statement, tick the number 5. If you strongly disagree with the statement, tick the number 1. **Tick only one answer for each statement and answer all questions please.** PLEASE NOTE THAT YOUR CONFIDENTIALITY AND ANONYMITY ARE STRICTLY GUARANTEED.

Thank you very much.

Isaac Balie

To verify the authenticity of the study, please contact Prof CA Arnolds, the supervisor of the study, at 041-504 3825.
ANNEXURE B: THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

SECTION A

ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOLS

Our school is effective in achieving curriculum development.

Our school is effective in achieving leadership development at all levels of our school.

Our school is effective in achieving the development of teaching.

Our school is effective in improving professional relationships among staff members at the school.

Our school is effective in managing learner absenteeism.

Our school is effective in maintaining learner discipline.

Our school is effective in promoting excellence in our school.

At our school, every educator performs to the best of his/her ability.

At our school, effective teaching and learning take place.

At our school, learner rights are effectively promoted.

At our school, learner self-esteem is effectively developed.
The SMT members at our school have the necessary skills to effectively deal with crisis situations at school.

At our school, learner responsibilities are effectively promoted.

**PLANNING**

Our Principal shows a great deal of commitment to and support for the planning process of our school.

At our school, better staff development is facilitated by effective planning.

At our school, individual professional development and school improvement are effectively linked by planning.

The planning process leads to a growing commitment to improving the quality of teaching and learning at our school.

The planning process transforms the whole climate of our school by promoting a shared vision for its future.

At our school, the planning process provides every teacher with opportunities for leadership.

At our school, the planning process helps us to manage change.

The planning at our school helps the staff to work together in realising the aims of the school.
ORGANISING

Our school’s resources are effectively deployed to achieve our strategic goals.

An effective organisational structure is created to distribute and co-ordinate the work of people in the pursuit of our school’s goals and objectives.

At our school, clearly defined tasks, duties, roles and responsibilities are allocated to all SMT members.

Our school’s resources reach the right places at the right time.

At our school, effective management teams are used to achieve the school's objectives.

At our school, efficient accountable management structures are developed to achieve the school's objectives.

At our school, every staff member feels part of the team.

Educators are effectively involved in designing policies for the improvement in our school environment.

Educators at our school are actively involved in decision-making of the school.

Educators at our school accept full responsibility for the use of resources to improve the school environment.

At our school, SMT members are selected based on their skills and their ability to work with others.
At our school, SMT members are selected on their ability to work independently.

**LEADING**

The SMT members have the ability to influence educators toward the attainment of our school's goals.

The principal and SMT effectively drive change at our school.

Shared leadership by the SMT is a core component within our school.

SMT members at our school are emotionally intelligent.

The SMT members at our school have energy, drive and enthusiasm.

The SMT members play a critical role in ensuring motivation and performance of staff at our school.

The SMT members at our school effectively provide opportunities to educators to develop them as leaders.

The SMT members at our school have the ability to effectively handle frustration and stress.

The SMT makes sure that they effectively match employees and job characteristics so that work is done by people who are well suited to do it.

The SMT at our school facilitates the growth, goals and development of others in order to liberate their best qualities in pursuing the school's mission.
CONTROL

At our school, a systematic process is used to regulate whether the school’s activities are consistent with expectations established in plans, targets and standards of performance.

The SMT effectively monitors ongoing educator activities to ensure they are consistent with performance standards at our school.

At our school, strong emphasis is placed on effectively achieving outcomes.

At our school, strong emphasis is placed on achieving quality academic results.

The SMT at our school is effectively implementing a large number of small incremental activities to achieve school improvement.

SMT members at our school initiate corrective action whenever there is a deviation from a required performance standard.

SECTION B
CLASSIFICATION DATA

Type of school
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