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Principals were struggling with the interpretation of their roles in the implementation of the NCS in South African schools, partly due to the huge change and complexity of the NCS. It was found that principals did not understand their roles in the implementation of the NCS, and as a result did not develop staff, were not familiar with the roles of educators as specified by policy and shifted the burden of developing educators to the Department of Education. A qualitative research approach was employed. A reputational case sampling was conducted on three secondary school principals in the KZN Vryheid District. A semi structured interview and a semi-structured questionnaire were employed on these three principals to gather data. Theme analysis was used to determine how principals interpreted their roles in the implementation of the NCS. I found that principals did not have enough understanding of their roles in the implementation of the NCS. However, principals complained that the Department of Education was more concerned about expanding access to education than quality of education. They also lamented that teachers had a low self-esteem with the profession. I found that principals required detailed workshops on their roles in the implementation of the NCS, ongoing curriculum leadership training, and required LTSM resources and equipped laboratories.
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Principals’ interpretation of their role in implementing the National Curriculum Statement.
A study of three KZN Vryheid principals.

Section A
General Introduction

1. Background Information
The old FET apartheid school curriculum served the interests of a minority group which competed for limited spaces in the private sector and formal higher education institutions (Department of Education 1995:2). It is argued that Black Education and Training programmes offered by schools during apartheid era were constrained by narrow political concerns because these programmes failed to equip learners adequately for the social, economic and cultural challenges they faced in their daily lives (Department of Education 1998:10).

With the opening up of political and socio-economic space after the 1994 democratically-elected government, the scene was set for a non-sexist and democratic system of education and training. The government set up three national curriculum initiatives focused on schools (Jansen and Christie 1999:145). These initiatives were aimed at purging apartheid curriculum of racially offensive and outdated content, introducing continuous assessment in schools and further pave way for new curriculum that would be based on the principles of democracy (Jansen and Christie 1999:145). Therefore, in 1994, the Minister of Education determined national education policy for planning and provisioning such as curriculum frameworks, core syllabuses and educational programmes for the new curriculum. The Minister also established structures of co-operation between the national and the provincial departments. Then a Council for Education Ministers (CEM) was established as advisory body to promote the national policy and co-ordinate matters of mutual interest between the national and provincial departments. CEM approved the new curriculum framework based on 8 learning areas (Department of Education 1998:10). This new curriculum framework was later referred to as C2005. This curriculum would be based on the principles of access, redress, equity, credibility, equality and efficiency. It was believed that this curriculum would replace apartheid teaching and learning methods and empower learners to take responsibility of their own learning and destiny after learning grade 12 (Department of Education 1998:5). In 1995, the Heads of Education Departments Committee (HEDCOM), consisting of the national and provincial Director and Deputy Director Generals was established to facilitate the development of the national education system and co-ordinate administrative action on matters of mutual interest. In 1996, the Curriculum Management Committee (CMC), consisting of Heads of curriculum for all national and provincial departments was established to operrrationalise C2005 development.

In August 1995 a Consultative Forum on Curriculum (CFC) was established which worked to launch two reports on structures for the development of national education policy and a curriculum framework for general and further education and training (Department of Education 1998:3). By late 1995, the CFC was replaced by the National Curriculum Development Committee (NCDC) established to oversee all curriculum development for General and Further Education and Training and review public comments on the two reports of the CFC. These reports were
based on the *structures for the development of national policy regarding curriculum and related issues and curriculum framework for general and further education and training* In March 1996, the NCDC invited all interested parties to respond to the new curriculum framework for GET and FET bands. In August 1996, 8 Learning Area committees (LACs), consisting of curriculum theory experts, researchers, national and provincial subject advisors, business and professional subject organizations such as SADTU, NAPTOSA, HSBC and NGOs were established to write a rationale and specific outcomes for each learning area and cluster the formulated outcomes and to formulate cross-curricular outcomes (Department of Education 1998:13) By late 1996, a 5 Co-ordinating Committees were established to identify cross-curricular issues in the 8 learning areas and cluster the outcomes supplied by the 8 LACs into focus for the eventual development of learning programmes. In March 1997, a Technical Committee was established to take forward the work of the 5-co-ordinating committees since the work proved too much for the 5-co-ordinating committees. The Technical Committee ensured that the new learning programmes complied with the outcomes-based approach of the National Qualifications Framework. The duties of the Technical Committee comprised of investigating levels of achievement, writing specific outcomes and development of assessment criteria. The Technical Committee was assisted by a Canadian team of curriculum experts, a support group of subjects and phase experts and two South African Qualifications Authority facilitators to guide the development of the learning programme guidelines. Then a Co-ordinating Committee was set up to consider and evaluate the work of the Technical Committee and was found in order. The Technical Committee completed its task in March 1997. The proposals of the Technical Committee contained in the C2005 Discussion Document were passed by the Curriculum Management Committee, National Curriculum Development Committee and the Heads of Education Departments Committee. The document was then released for public scrutiny by the National Minister (Department of Education 1998; 14).

Then a Curriculum Review Committee was established to work public comments into a final document. The National Minister of Education released the final document as policy in October 1998 (Department of Education1998:10). However, Christie (2008:149) once argued that the contexts of policy implementation have greater influence on policy practice. He continued to say contexts vary greatly in South Africa shown by differences in tests performance in historical disadvantaged schools. As predicted, during the course of curriculum implementation it was realized that C2005 advantaged the previously privileged parts of the education system even more and disadvantaged the previously least privileged parts of the education system (Christie 2008:142). Christie (2008:142) says the disadvantaged schools without resources and quality staff could not successfully implement C2005. However, previously advantaged schools with resources and quality staff easily adapted to the new curriculum and were successful (Christie 2008:142). The new government argued that Curriculum 2005 was not a failure, but required minor modifications and adaptations (Department of Education 2003:8). However, Jansen and Christie (1999:149)) argued that the new curriculum shortcomings were also due to the fact that syllabuses were not developed to accommodate curriculum outcomes statements and C2005 was driven by political imperatives which have little to do with realities of classical life. The Department of Education (2003:10) agreed that C2005 had too many outcomes and hence could not be all achieved and that the implementation terminology was ambiguous for teachers. Therefore, C2005 was revised into Revised National Curriculum Statements (RNCS) for grades R-9 and the National curriculum Statements (NCS) for grades 10-12.
The NCS curriculum introduced learner centred teaching methods, opened several career paths and emphasises skills that learners must acquire after each learning programme. The National Curriculum Statements (NCS) thus emphasized seven critical outcomes and three developmental outcomes required of a learner who would pass grade 12 in 2008. The critical outcomes emphasized skills, knowledge, attitudes and values, and a foundation for life long learning, whereas the development outcomes would assist learners to achieve the critical outcomes, and further introduce the learner to the worlds of life and work. Poor performance in matric examination, poor numeracy skills and the failure by the South African school leavers to meet the job requirements in the labour market were of great concern to the government and the society at large (Department of Education 1998:12). There was a general government perception that the new curriculum would address the issues of skills and match school leavers with job requirements in the labour market (Department of Education 1998:15). However, the complexity of such a new curriculum was anticipated to pose and continues to pose huge challenges for the teaching and learning fraternity in South Africa (Jansen 1998:8). Of the many stakeholders in the education schooling context, this change also posed and continues to pose huge challenges for the principals of schools, as it is the principals of schools who are finally held accountable for the successful implementation of the NCS in their schools.

Principals are expected to create an environment conducive for the NCS implementation at their schools. This is because it is an ultimate goal that South Africa will produce grade12 learners who will face the worlds of life and work confidently. This curriculum policy states precisely the roles for all levels of school based educators. The seven roles of educators outlined in the Department of Education documents such as the National Education Policy Act 27 of 1996 and the Norms and Standards For Educators (2000) serve as a guide for implementation. The roles of both principals and educators are stated clearly in the Manual for School Management (2001 ) and the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000). The Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) outlines seven roles for educators. Principals as educators they are indirectly included in this document as educators, and directly in the Manual for School Management (2001 ). The Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) specifies seven roles for educators in general and the Manual for School Management (2001) outlines roles for principals specifically in the implementation of the NCS. Principals complained that they did not sufficiently comprehend their roles in the implementation of the NCS (Department of Education 2005:12).

It is within this context of implementation of the National Curriculum Statements (NCS) in South Africa that debates about emerging roles regarding the efficacy of principals are playing in the process. Jansen (1998: 203) for an example, argues that the changing roles of principals and their lack of knowledge and skills with regard to managing the implementation of the complex new curriculum, despite attempts of outlining clear policy prescription regarding these changed roles remains a problem in schools.

2. Aim of Study

The aim of this study is to determine how principals interpret their roles in the implementation of the NCS in three selected schools in KZN Vryheid, Pongola Circuit schools.

3 Rationale
Most principals in KZN Vryheid district schools have been principals for more than twenty-three years (KwaZulu-Natal Education 2004: 17), and still find it difficult to adapt to the implementation of the NCS. There is currently a lot of role uncertainty among principals in schools in KZN Vryheid District regarding the implementation of the NCS. As a result of this status quo, I have decided to investigate how principals interpret their roles in the implementation of the NCS. Some principals complain that they do not sufficiently comprehend their new roles, and lack even the eagerness and curiosity to explore what is in store for their schools in the NCS (Department of Education 2005:15). And also, from my own experience as a principal I have noted that many principals are struggling with interpreting their roles in the implementation of the NCS.

Therefore, I wish to contribute to the implementation of the NCS by assisting principals to assiduously interprete their roles in order to implement the NCS successfully.

4 Problem statement

The problem will be articulated through the following research problem statement as prescribed in the NCS key documents;

The degree to which principals address the duties outlined in the Manual for School Management (2001), when they manage the implementation of the NCS.

The following two sub questions will help to answer the main problem statement:

(1) how do principals interpret their roles as change agents in their schools in the implementation of the NCS as outlined in the Manual for School Management (2001) ?

(2) how do principals locate and extend themselves within the roles of educators as specified in the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) document?

5 Delineation of Study

The study looked at within the context of two specific NCS documents; the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) and the Manual for School Management (2001 (a)), how principals interprete their roles as change agents. A sample of three principals in the KZN Vryheid Pongola circuit schools was used. The GET band is excluded from this study because my focus is only on the FET band which is implementing the NCS.

6 Literature

There are several authors who write about the complexity and huge change that takes place during the implementation of a new curriculum (Jansen 1998: 202). These authors warn about new curricular failures due to poor implementation by school principals (Jansen 1998:202). This occurs because principals often misinterpret their roles in the implementation of the new curriculum (Fullan 2001:139). I reviewed literature on the roles of principals, and two NCS documents: the Manual for School Management (2001 ) and the Norms and Standards for
Educators (2000) to explore how should principals address or interprete their roles in the implementation of the NCS.

The Manual for School Management: education management and governance development (2001) outlines roles of school principals, and the roles are not limited to the following:

Curriculum leadership
Principals have to lead in the implementation of the NCS by example. The Manual for School Management (2001:10) states that principals must depict signals that a change has taken place by changing their behaviours, school cultures and beliefs to suit those of the new curriculum. The Manual for School Management (2001:10) says curriculum leaders should build school culture that is consistent with the NCS. A school culture is determined by what principals incalcate to educators and learners so that it is regularly done, and it is identified by strong principal leadership which compels teachers to share information (Boyd 1996:70). Principal’s have to develop culture through this information sharing (Miles1983:250). According to Miles (1983: 253), teachers’ interaction is a solution towards identifying and modifying learner cultures in schools. Teachers interact with learners on daily basis thus influencing the way learners behave in schools. The question to ask is how does the principal convince staff to interact and share learner information to determine cultures? The answer may lie in conducting regular class visits and observe what goes around (Fullan 2001:142). It is unfortunate that principals are not experts in the contents of a new curriculum, but can only provide curriculum leadership for change at school level, but with the culture in mind (Smith and Andrews (1989:23). It therefore becomes difficult to deal with educators who after attending workshops sort out the information to suit their comfortable styles of teaching, and these styles are in most cases a modification of the old teaching methods.

Principals have to support educators more than they did in the old curriculum because educators often feel lost and preoccupied with the everyday demands of the NCS and discipline in general (Smith etal.(1989::29). It is a further challenge to principals that they ensure the schools’ limited resources and funds cater for all subjects and educators because if not so, some educators would become more stubborn and not conform to the NCS class requirements (Locks and Hall 1979:188). But Murphy (1983:153) argues that even in the presence of resources, a curriculum still needs some coordination to ensure the content taught is consistent with learning outcomes and the assessment standards used to measure the attainment of the outcomes. He argues that coordination would ensure all educators conform to NCS requirements (Murphy 1983:153). Christie (2008:150) says principals and teachers tend to perform well in countries that hold teaching in high esteem and where there is public commitment to education emanating from strong political vision.

LTSM and Resources Allocators
Principals are identified as school resources’ allocators to ensure that all educators have teaching and learning resources (Loucks and Hall 1979:191 and Manual for School Management 2001:10). Principals must determine the requirements for each subject in the new curriculum, and allocate funds to procure the necessary teaching and learning material such as chemicals, textbooks and stationery (Smith etal (1989: 24). However, the huge changes
in content in all subjects at the same time will require huge investment in education which the DoE will not afford in the short-term. Howes and Quinn (1978:71) agree that State funding is a key to implementation of new curriculum, and warn principals to distribute these scarce funds equitably. Therefore, it is a challenge for principals to have the ability to raise funds from private sector and the public to supplement the government resource allocation to schools. The government’s basic and learning & teaching support materials’ funds to schools, will never satisfy school’s needs given the unique requirements of the NCS. These challenges compel principals to act in a manner they have never anticipated in the old curriculum such as developing sound financial management skills.

Visionaries
The Manual for School Management (2001:11) mentions that a successful implementation of the NCS will require input from parents, educators and learners to inform the vision and the mission of a school. The Manual for School Management (2001:11) says the vision and mission guide and give direction to the principal and the staff in execution of their duties. However, according to Hord principals must lead in the development of the vision and the mission of the schools (1995:91). Caldwell and Millikan (1989;155) who synthesised data on behaviours of principals that contributed to the schools’ successful reform, found that schools that communicated a shared vision and mission, and conducted meso-planning and provided resources were successful in implementing reforms. According to them this kind of support from the principals brought changes in the work-setting and there was success in the implementation of the new curriculum (Caldwell etal.1989:155). The vision and mission of schools instruct teachers and principals to follow particular ways and methods of doing things. These methods and ways are guided by knowing where the school is heading. It is then that the new curriculum can be properly implemented (Miller 2000:541). Miller (2000:542) also maintains that there must be a shift in the way principals manage and administrate schools. (Miller (2000:542) argues that school vision helps the principal to shift the staff from old set of assumptions, beliefs, norms and practices to a new set determined by vision in relation to the new curriculum. Miller asserts that the shift occurs only if there is a new guiding vision and mission in the school (2000:542).

Curriculum Manager
The Manual for School Management (2001:12)) states that school managers and administrators should oversee the smooth running of the schools, record events, take corrective actions and report to the ward and circuit managers. Fullan (2001:142) argues that the managing role of the principals should include attacking incoherence to a change by combining pressures of work with support and efficient management. He also maintains that attacking program incoherence implies identifying and carrying out new roles as laid down by the change so that once a program has begun it is working and will continue to help learners (2001:142). Christie (2008:149) says policies must be continuously monitored and evaluated to avoid policy dilution because policies tend to be diluted as implemented. It is clear that principals have to identify each educator’s role to clarify ambiguity and insist on performance (Fullan 2001:142). This would prevent the NCS policy from dilution during implementation in schools. Hall and Hord (1984::285) are of the view that proper change occurs when principals provide learning resources, reinforce change and disseminate information to all involved. It is true that for any educator to perform there must be resources, information on which change is based and some form of compelling force to change. Fullan (2001:140) argues that the principals must have administrative acumen to act as change agents by providing information on the new
curriculum policy issues and educators’ work related stress. Fullan (2001:139) argues that educators’ stress is a result of work overload, uncertainty about the roles, responsibilities and the new teaching methods. Principals needed to have a way of assisting educators to understand and assimilate the NCS as a way to deal with the educators’ stress; this could mean that the culture of the school would have to change completely. Bishop (1991:31) and Hord (1995:96) refer to school’s re-culturing when they say an educational change consists of a process of putting into practice an idea or program, activities and structures, changing attitudes, skills, values and relationships to implement a change. These, would, in most cases be the duty of the (school leader) principal to re-culture their schools. The State would only need to provide funds to schools to procure the required resources.

Fullan (1999:60, 81) refers to re-culturing of schools from another angle by emphasising the importance of educators gaining moral meaning of a new curriculum. He argues that if educators have an understanding of the moral meaning of a new curriculum, it would reduce their concerns and work-related stress, and elevate their level of commitment to the level of making a difference to the lives of learners. Fullan (1999:66 and 2000: 226) maintains that the moral meaning of the change would re-culture schools; would transform old habits, skills, and practices of educators towards the curriculum’s desired behavior. According to him, the moral meaning based on proper planning would result in no need for principals to monitor educators as the new curriculum is implemented.

**Strategic Planning**

Accordingly, the Manual for School Management (2001:12) states that principals must plan and draw action plans, assign duties to all staff and research for new ways of resolving school problems and means to develop their schools. The Manual for School Management (2001:12) clearly states that principals are also educators by profession, so have to perform the duties of educators as well to a certain degree, depending on the school enrolment. According to Pearce and Robinson (2003:5), strategic planning is defined as a set of decisions and actions that result in the formulation and implementation of plans designed to achieve organizational goals. They say strategic planning comprises several critical tasks, including formulating a mission and selecting a set of long-term objectives and action plans that will achieve the most desirable goals (2003:5). In the school situation, it involves conducting and assessing internal conditions and capabilities of the school and its personnel, and drawing plans to achieve the new curriculum strategic goals (Fullan 2001:128). Strategic goals are future-oriented, multifunctional (all school departments) and require top management decisions (Pearce and Robinson 2003:5). This is the role of the school principal who has to focus on the future and take shared decisions with all his HoDs and Deputies. However, formalities in strategic planning may differ from school to school depending on the size of the school, the principal’s predominant management style, school problems, and the purpose of the planning (Pearce and Robinson 2003:8). Pearce and Robinson (2003:10) and Fullan (2001:119) summarise benefits of school strategic planning as follows:

- Strategic planning enhances the school’s ability to prevent problems and all teachers become aware of the plans.
- Group-based strategic decisions are likely to be drawn from the best available alternatives.
• The involvement of teachers in strategy formulation improves their understanding of their action plans, and heightens their motivation.
• Gaps and overlaps in activities among individuals and groups are reduced as participation in strategy formulation clarifies differences in roles.
• Resistance to change is reduced, especially in the new curriculum which is complex for most practising teachers

According to Hord (1995:95), planning begins with the determination of the appropriate needs of individual educators by school leaders (principals) who should then deliver a set of strategies with pressure and support. He argues that there must be a needs’ analysis to provides clarity of what must be planned and managed, to point to key players, to give time lines and brings to the fore processes and structures as well as resources and relationships required to effect a change (1995:95).

Teacher Skills and Relationships
Teaching skills such as preparing and using audio-visual aids, conducting sound and purposeful group work and effective questioning are among the pre-requisite of being good teachers (Kriek 2007;39). Most teachers in public schools cannot use audio-visual material. This is a direct result of the kind of training which some Black teachers received during the apartheid era which was inferior compared to what was offered to Whites’ training colleges. Some of the Black teachers’ inability to use audio-visual aids causes slow learning and covering of the syllabi (Kriek 2007:39). Moreover, learners take time to comprehend the learning content. Audio-visual aids would make it relatively easier for learners to see and hear for themselves from another source the learning content. It is said that what a learner sees is not easily forgotten than what the learner hears (Fullan 2001:122). Some group works organized by teachers lacking group work skills achieve nothing. Some teachers often fail to prepare credible group work lessons because they have not been trained to conduct purposeful group work lessons. These teachers run group work only because they have heard that OBE approach encourages group work, but these teachers have not been taught to administer good group work classes. The other skill which seems to be lacking in the teaching fraternity is the effective questioning. The power of effective questioning lies mostly in preparing probing questions and then follow-ups based on the students’ responses. The teacher should have possible student’ responses in mind during the lesson preparation in order to devise probing questions before hand (Kriek 2007:39). Hord (1996:100) suggests ways that can help teachers to become better in using probing questions. These are; training courses on effective questioning and daily reflection on how each lesson progressed as well as looking at alternative methods of making the lesson better the following day. Moreover, teachers should not forget that there are proper relationships that add value to learning in schools.

Proper relationships in the school often foster fertile learning environment for learners. Hoyle (1980:31) says proper relationships lie in developing a professional community in the school. He says professional community will only exist where there is professionalism. Hoyle (1980:34) says professionalism describes the quality of practice of the teachers; it describes the manner of conduct within an occupation, how members integrate their obligations with their knowledge and skill in both a context of collegiality and their contractual and ethical relations with learners. Teachers must be collegial to form teaching teams to improve the skills of one another. However, this
can never happen unless relationships are smooth and blended together. It is the principal’s role to ensure that this happens. The teachers’ behavior towards learners must exhibit respect for life and human dignity. For an example corporal punishment was abolished by the South African Schools’ Act 84 of 1996 section 10(4). This was meant to eradicate hatred and slavery in schools. Therefore, teachers must behave in a manner that is consistent with their profession towards learners. For an example the Educators’ Employment Act 1997, section 17 and 18 state that a teacher must not have a sexual relationship with a learner in the school where he or she is employed. This is direct monitoring of relationships between learners and teachers in schools.

**In-Service Training and Staff development**

The Manual for School Management (2001) states that principals must develop their educators through the DoE workshops and in the schools; on-site training, working as a team and information sharing meetings in schools do provide professional and personal growth to educators. Loucks and Hall (1979:191) argue that even the most teacher-proof package of resources would fail in the absence of teacher training in schools. Fullan(2002: LSR1-6) maintains that for educators to utilise and enjoy the use of the resources educators need collegiality; the spirit of sharing information, caring and respect for each other. For collegiality to occur, in-service centres are necessary. These are benefits of staff development that principals must tap into in their schools. Hord (1995:95) maintains that investing in continuous staff development programmes is imperative to impart skills and create an atmosphere for change to implement a new curriculum. Hord suggests that there should be ongoing assistance, and progress assessment to measure if staff development programmes yield results. The in-service training programmes should create educators’ readiness for implementing the NCS successfully in schools (Christie 2008:150). According to Cummings and Worley (2001:1,2,.3), motivating change includes creating readiness for change among organisation members and addressing resistance to change. Cumming and Worley argue that motivation is a key element in change leadership. While Fullan (2001:125) adds that rewards and encouragement to use vertical and horizontal communication channels promote flow of ideas, better human relations and staff motivation. The rewards and relationships of this nature could make it easier for principals to implement change.

Hall and Hord (1984:285) qualitatively applied a semi-structured questionnaire to schools that were operating a new programme for the gifted child. They identified the following types of assistance that could be provided to educators and schools by their principals in order to effect a meaningful change. These are; developing supportive arrangements and providing teaching and learning resources, training, consulting and reinforcing, monitoring and evaluating, external communication and dissemination of information to all involved. Loucks and Hall (1979:191) by observation on some educators and principals revealed that innovation development, information dissemination and implementing activities that received attention and funding from the state to promote school new curriculum implementation brought little or no change unless teacher training became the bottom line. They also said even the most teacher proof package was doomed to failure in the absence of teacher training.

**Disciplinarian**

The Manual for School Management (2001) sets out structures that principals must employ in maintaining order and discipline in schools. These are the SMT, Parents and the Representative Council of Learners. The South
African Schools Act no.84 of 1996 section 8(1-3) makes provision for School Governing Bodies to adopt a code of conduct for learners and elect Disciplinary Committees. Principals are accountable to the DoE on how these committees perform their tasks, and this means the DCs are assisting the principals to serve as disciplinarians. Miller (2000:542) argues, however that principals need to move away from control to accountability by establishing standards of behaviors and learning for which all learners and educators will be held accountable. He mentions that the maintenance of order and discipline to keep the lid on was out of place and time, but schools must press for student performance. Moreover, the Act that governs SA schools, the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 section 10(1) prohibits corporal punishment in schools. Most principals had applied corporal punishment for years to keep learners under control. The SASA 84 of 1996 section 10(2) says any person who contravenes section 10(1) is guilty of an assault offence. The Act requires principals to be creative to arrive at suitable methods of dealing with deviants in schools. In all, principals must be exemplary to foster discipline (Hall and Hord 1984:302).

The behavior of principals as heads of schools is easily imitated at schools by educators and learners (Kingdon (1996: 104)). He says good behavior of principals is rewarded while bad one is punished. Therefore, principals must mind their actions when dealing with educators and learners, and people in general because what they do is perceived by his followers as acceptable. According to Raywind (1990:153), democratization of decision making usually brought about discipline at a school because educators and learners took ownership of decisions taken. This would hold truth if codes of conduct for both teachers and learners were drafted in consultation with the corresponding structures. Moreover, codes of conduct often guide and inform what constitutes good and bad behavior at schools. Let me extract some roles of principals as educators from the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000).

The Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) outlines the seven roles of educators. Principals as educators also have to play these roles, and assist educators to fulfill these seven roles, but below I will discuss some which according to the Manual for School Management (2001 ) relate most to the principals. These are the following:

**Mediators of learning**

Smith and Andrews (1989:30) say a mediator of learning brings information together while the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) instructs teachers to ascertain that all learners learn, taking into account barriers to learning and their diverse needs, and Dekker, Lemmer & Eleanor (1996:230) mention that in the old curriculum learners had to memorise the learning content. The huge differences between the old curriculum and the NCS teaching methods required principals to accept that there would be peculiar challenges for them in the NCS. As mediators of learning in the NCS, principals should have played an active role in bringing educators together for the purpose of sharing information on how to ensure learners learn.

**Interpreters, and designer of learning content**

Hall, George and Rutherford (1979:110) say principals must analyse subject frameworks of their educators and determine what equipment and resources are required. The Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) and National Education Policy Act 27of 2002:A-47) state that teachers must interpret their teachers’ subject guides
and design their own learning programmes, identify the requirements for a specific context and content of learning and prepare suitable visual resources for learning, while Dekker et al. (1996:232) say educators had to follow the right syllabi in the old curriculum. The principals’ role in the old curriculum was to ensure the correct syllabi were adhered to at all times (Fullan 1999:72). Fullan (2001;148) says educators have low morale during change, as a result educators do not design interesting learning programmes. But the Manual for School Management (2001), does mention that principals as curriculum managers have the task to monitor that learning programmes meet the NCS requirements.

**Community, citizenship and pastoral care**

Principals and teachers are expected to uphold the Constitution of SA, and develop an environment which empowers learners to be responsible citizens themselves (Norms and Standards for Educators (2000: A47). The old curriculum did attempt to teach good citizenship, referred to as UBUNTU-BOTHO in the former homeland of Zululand in the early 80s. In the old curriculum UBUNTU as a non-examinable subject was introduced to foster loyalty of learners to the community chief and to the king (Educamus 1987:10). Principals must show that they care for all learners, use conciliatory language to learners and in the school at large (KZN Newsletter2004:18). The behaviour of the principal as the head is easily imitated by all at school. His good behaviour is rewarded while bad one is punished (Kingdon 1996:104). Principals are custodians of the Constitution of SA so they would need to guard against discrimination of one by another, deal with xenophobia, verbal abuse and inspire the micro-nation to love the country and its people (Department of Education 1998:14). Xenophobia is a direct result of poverty in some communities (Sunday Times pp 1-2; 29 November 2009). Some schools have elected and adopted welfare committees consisting of teachers and parents to look at issues of poverty among school children (Educamus 1987:23). Businesses are persuaded to donate money or goods or clothes for these needy children (The Teacher, 14 August, 2005). Some learners come to school on empty stomachs. They have no parents who would buy food and provide other necessities of life. Hiv/Aids is bred quite easily in communities that are so wanting because young girls have to set out to look for someone to provide for the family (Sunday Times, pp1-2; 29 November 2009). Schools are increasingly becoming Christmas –schools due to issues of poverty as a result of high rates of unemployment and deaths of bread-winners in some households.

**Assessor**

Ornstein and Hunkins (1998:216) noted that the first important consideration in achieving a wider range of learning outcomes is the fact that the learning experiences and not the content as such, are the means for achieving all policy goals besides those of knowledge and understanding. The Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) states that principals have to assess if their teachers have practical competences to assess learners appropriately. In doing this, teachers must ensure the assessment matches the phase level and learning area., while Dekker etal. (1996:231) mentions that in the old curriculum educators had to be fair in evaluating student work. In the NCS principals have to check educators work programmes to ascertain if there is evidence that educators have foundational competences to understand the range of assessment approaches and methods appropriate for the phase and learning area, and also have reflexive competences to justify assessment design decisions and choice about the assessment tasks and approaches (Norms and Standards for Educators (2000:A47). However, Fullan
(2001:149) complains that teachers during the new curriculum implementation apply short term assessment strategies that do not get to the heart of learning, and Fullan (2001:151) suggests that principals should ensure that teachers examine student work together in a phase and decide on how to make improvement if student assessment strategies chosen fail to yield positive results. Principals should be critical in assessing the schools situations and classrooms’ performance of their educators so that if major classrooms and school goals are not achieved, immediate corrective measures are taken.

Learning area, subject specialist
Teachers must have the practical competence to adapt education principles to the learning area and teach concepts in a manner that allows learners to transfer knowledge and use it in different contexts (Norms and Standards for Educators (2000:A48). The teachers are also expected to have foundational competences to allow learners to have content knowledge and reflexive competences to enable learners to reflect on the relations between subjects and make judgments to integrate them where necessary (Norms and Standards for Educators (2000: A47). In the old curriculum (Dekker etal 1996:231) educators were the source of the learning content. Learners memorised the content as the educator did most of the talking using a method commonly known as chalk and talk. In the NCS, principals have to realize that educators require curriculum support material like charts, models and sufficient stationery to provide for active learning (Fullan 2001: 151). Principals must also ensure classrooms are tidy and have enough desks to create a conducive context for learning. From the foregoing, it shows that when the old curriculum and NCS roles of educators are compared, there are huge differences, which indicate that the NCS poses uniquely huge challenges and a different kind of leadership for the principals.

7. Research Methodology
The research approach selected for this study is a qualitative approach. Qualitative research is naturalistic enquiry, which involves the use of non-interfering data collection strategies to discover the natural flow of events and processes and how participants interpret them (Kruger etal 2002:178). The qualitative research provides in-depth, rich data because it describes and analyses peoples’ individual and collective social actions, interpretations, beliefs, thoughts and perceptions (Kruger etal.2002:178). A qualitative research approach would enable an in-depth exploration of how principals interpret their roles in the implementation of the NCS. It allows the researcher to collect data by interacting with selected persons in their settings. The researcher can also observe actions of persons and note those actions of persons that are recurring but in different settings (schools) and deduce certain themes (Kruger etal.2002:178). The qualitative research approach is appropriate for this study because it offers several advantages such as:

- Allows the researcher to discover the natural flow of information to add on the existing knowledge
- Allows interaction with respondents in their own setting; respondents are free to state their opinions
- Avoids threats to data reliability and validity as some evidence can be asked for and observed
- It does not generalize issues because data interpretation is based on evidence
- Allows the researcher to take note of the situation by action observation
- It is flexible and adaptable to the respondents’ situation (Mcmillan etal. 1993:394).
Qualitative research approach allows use of research instruments such as semi-structured interview and semi-structured questionnaire. In the semi-structured interview, the researcher asks open questions while he takes field notes (data) in the form of words or tape records the responses. The researcher looks for meaning in these spoken words in order to ask further questions and record responses in written words. These open questions are structured to guide and elicit responses from the respondents, but flexible enough to give respondents wide latitude in answering these open questions. There is no Yes or No. The data may take many forms such as field notes, documents, interview notes or tapes (Mcmillan 1993:41). In the semi-structured questionnaire, the researcher constructs a set of questions and asks respondents to respond to the questions in writing. Data responses are in written words in semi-structured questionnaire. The researcher analyses this data which is in words to make meaning.

**Research Instruments**

Some NCS prescripts such as the Manual for School Management (2001) and the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) used by principals when performing their duties were perused to compare their contents with the way principals interpreted their roles in the study. According to Mcmillan and Schumarcher (1993:373), participants’ interpretations include their feelings, beliefs, ideals, thoughts and actions. The principals’ feelings, beliefs, actions and thoughts about their NCS roles formed part of the principals’ interpretations. These feelings, beliefs and thoughts could be determined only if there was interaction between me and principals. A semi-structured interview and a semi-structured questionnaire allowed this kind of interaction between me and the principals. These two research instruments allowed data to be gathered in the field where participants performed their duties.

**Sampling**

I chose the Pongola circuit schools in Vryheid district for time and traveling cost convenience, as I live in Pongola. The selection of schools was based on the best matriculation results over the past three years. According to Mcmillan and Schumarcher (1993:380), in reputational case sampling, knowledgeable experts, competent principals, and identification of effective schools are used to obtain credible information. A reputational case sampling technique was used to select three secondary school principals from these schools. Therefore three principals of the most effective secondary schools in the KZN Vryheid Pongola circuit were selected.

**Data collection**

I visited three selected principals in the KZN Vryheid district schools to conduct the semi-structured interviews and administer the semi-structured questionnaires. The two research instruments were applied as follows: the semi-structured interview was applied to gather data that could help to answer the first sub-question which is “how do principals interpret their roles as change agents in their schools in the implementation of the NCS as specified in the Manual for School Management (2001). According to (McMillan etal 1993: 251), the semi-structured interview questions are phrased to allow for individual responses. The question is open-ended but is fairly specific in its intent, this results in rich, in-depth data. The semi-structured interview questions were focused on how principals interpret their roles as change agents in their schools in the implementation of the NCS. The questions were open-
ended, but specific in their intent and based on interpreting the roles of principals in resolving the challenges that face principals in the implementation of the NCS.

The semi-structured questionnaire was designed to answer the second sub-question, “how do principals locate and extend themselves within the seven roles of educators as specified in the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) in the implementation of the NCS? “ The semi-structured questionnaire is well suited for investigating how principals locate and extend themselves within the seven roles of educators as specified in the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000). It does not restrict respondents to particular responses that may not provide for their unique situation (Kruger et al. 2002: 168). Respondents may prefer the freedom to express themselves which the semi-structured questionnaire allows to the fullest (Kruger et al. 2002:168). The reason for allowing the freedom to express themselves is because I am interested in how principals locate and extend themselves within the seven roles of educators as specified in the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000). The semi-structured questionnaire is structured in such a way that it is flexible enough to provide the principals an opportunity to state how they locate and extend themselves within the seven roles of educators.

Literature review, in particular the Manual for School Management (2001) provided this study with roles of principals in the implementation of the NCS. These roles of principals constituted themes for the purpose of categorizing and analyzing the responses of the principals. The responses from principals to answer the first sub-question how do principals interpret their roles as change agents in the implementation of the NCS were in the form of spoken words. These spoken words were jotted down and then analysed qualitatively. The Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) seven roles of educators constituted themes for the second sub-question, “how do principals locate and extend themselves within the seven roles of educators as specified in the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) in the implementation of the NCS? “ In the same manner, the responses from the principals were categorized under these seven roles as themes. The responses appeared in form of words. These responses were analysed and interpreted for what they meant to answer the second sub-question, “how do principals locate and extend themselves within the seven roles of educators.

**Data Analysis.**

The data was analysed qualitatively. Qualitative data analysis is primarily an inductive process of organizing the data into categories or themes (MacMillan et al 1993: 479). Inductive analysis was employed only for those themes that emerged during data interpretation. Inductive analysis means the interpretations and patterns emerge from the data (Kruger et al 2002:267). In this study, most themes were adopted from the literature review, especially mainly from the Manual for School Management (2001). Therefore, theme analysis was employed to elucidate data to derive meaning. Interpretation of data words or patterns or phrases from principals and logical reasoning led to how principals interpret their roles in the implementation of the NCS. According to McMillan (1993: 508), inductive analysis may reveal specific and distinctive recurring themes or qualities, subjects of discourse or concerns expressed. I selectively analysed these themes and aspects of human actions and events that were illustrated by recurring data words. The principals’ actions, interpretations of roles, and milestones covered along the year during implementation expressed in the semi-structured interviews and in semi-structured questionnaire
that were illustrated by recurring data words were selectively analysed to determine how did principals address their roles in NCS implementation. And also, the relative incidence of data or words or phrases, and of the ways these data or words or phrases were portrayed assisted in identifying how school principals interpreted their roles in the implementation of the NCS.
Section B
Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion

The duties of principals adapted from the Manual for School Management (2001), and the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) provided this study with main themes. However, some themes emerged from the data obtained from the principals during the semi-structured interview and semi-structured questionnaire. Therefore, the main themes discussed below are the following: curriculum leadership, professional development, LTSM allocation, motivation and strategic planning. These main themes provided answers to the main problem statement below;

The degree to which principals address the duties outlined in the Manual for School Management (2001) when they manage the implementation of the NCS.

Curriculum Leadership
Data revealed that principals had many different interpretations of what curriculum leadership entailed. They interpreted their roles as curriculum leaders in terms of managers, administrative duties and allocators of resources.

Managers
Most principals interpreted their roles as curriculum leaders in terms of monitoring that teachers were actually teaching the new curriculum. This was administered by making frequent class visits. In these class visits they simply checked to see if teachers were implementing the NCS. For example, Principal A commented, “Curriculum leadership is to ensure that all learners learn by visiting classrooms and check learners’ books to see how teachers deliver the NCS”. I observed that principal C was standing with two learners next to a class where lessons were in progress. I asked whether he was always outside during lessons. Principal C explained that, “I want to hear if teachers are actually teaching my children”. Principals did not focus on identifying implementation problems that teachers have in the classrooms such as experience and teacher skills. They saw this strictly in terms of monitoring teachers such as checking learners books. (Fullan 2001:142) argues that curriculum leadership begins when the teachers state of mind has become compatible with the new program being implemented. This implies that monitoring teachers is not a resolution to implementation problems, but the state of mind of the teachers must change to suit the new curriculum.

Administrative Duties
Principals also interpreted their role as curriculum leaders in terms of administrative duties such as updating and filing records. These records pertained to learners’ class lists, learners reports cards, admission and transfers, and teachers files which contain leave application, qualifications and salary slips. They had to ensure that all learners who were in the class lists had admission numbers, and the teachers salaries were paid in accordance with their qualifications. Principal B commented that, “curriculum leadership is the administrative task of the principal, where by he updates and keeps records. To make sure all learners have their admission numbers, and that teachers are paid correctly and they do receive pay slips”. I also observed there were teachers’ files on principal B’s table and
he was completing leave of absence forms. The three principals were computer illiterate. When asked why teachers did not complete their leave of absence forms, principal B said, “Some teachers do not count all their days of absence”. I asked why computerized system was not used to make entries. Principal B remarked that, “I have never used a computer in my life”. Principals did not consider stream-lining school systems such as teaching loads, subject time allocation (notional time), subject meetings minute books, teaching time tables, homework and testing programmes as part of their role as curriculum leaders. It was clear that principals focused on the administrative role.

Resource Allocation
Most principals interpreted their role as curriculum leaders in terms of allocating teaching resources to teachers in order for the teachers to have teaching and learning aids. This was done by procuring learner stationery, textbooks and other resources. Principals were not pleased about their textbooks’ allocation. They said the number of textbooks procured was always not adequate for all learners taking a particular subject. Principals also complained that the Department of Education was concerned with expanding access to education to all learners at the expense of quality education since resources were inadequate. Principal C remarked that, “We buy and give exercise books and books to learners and also buy other things, but there is always a shortfall on books, and the Department of Education wants all learners to attend school while they say resources are scarce”. There was also a perception that some teachers did not utilize these textbooks and other resources. For example, Principal A commented that, “teachers do not use all these books and chemicals”. It transpired that principals never identified their teachers and subject needs. When asked on what basis books were procured, Principal B said, “As a principal I know my subjects in this school”. It is likely that some teachers would never use some of the allocated resources because they did not find these useful. In principal B’s office I saw some piles of textbooks. I asked if the textbooks were for subjects he taught. Principal B commented that, “These books were returned by teachers because they do not have information required by the syllabus”. Loucks and Hall (1979:191) says principals must allow teachers to determine the requirement for each subject in the new curriculum, and allocate funds to procure according to the subject requirements. These subject requirements become classroom-teacher needs for the purpose of instruction delivery.

Professional Development
There was a general consensus among principals on the issue and problems in professional development. Data revealed that principals interpreted their role in professional development in terms of in-service training, school based workshops, DoE workshops and curriculum development.

In-Service Training and Scholar
The data revealed that principals had different interpretations of what professional development entailed. They interpreted their role as professional developers in terms of training teachers to meet standards of implementation of the NCS. They felt this was done by asking teachers to enroll at varsities to further their studies. Teachers were requested to further studies in subjects they taught in schools. Principal A commented that, “I ask teachers to register at universities to upgrade their teaching subjects in order to be more knowledgeable”. Principals did not
focus on identifying subjects where their schools had skill shortages. They assumed that the NCS would pose
challenges in all subjects and as a result they became general. Principals did not know the subjects where
implementation would tend to be difficult due to lack of teacher skills. Principal C explained that, “I asked all
teachers to do something about this OBE. All these subjects have become new”. It would seem that principals
understood that the NCS required some form of training. Principals did not have the desire and will to identify
subjects where their teachers lacked skills and knowledge. However, principals requested teachers to further
studies. Principals also mentioned that some teachers were not happy with teaching as profession and hence
registered for courses outside teaching. For example Principal C commented that, “Last year I asked teachers to
enroll for further studies, but they registered for law and commerce…………. it seems our profession is inferior”.

Curriculum Development
Data also revealed that principals interpreted their role in professional development as curriculum developers.
They interpreted this in terms of adding new subjects packages known as transformation subjects in their schools
such as Information Technology and Computer Applications Technology. They said they asked some teachers to
do three months computer courses before introducing these new subjects. Principal B commented that, “Two
years ago I asked three teachers to do three months computer courses in town so that we could introduce it here,
now we are doing it”. And Principal A remarked that, “The DoE has ear-marked Information Technology and
Computer Applications Technology as transformation subjects”. Principals did not consider the subject depth
required before the teacher could teach a specific subject in a particular grade. The Norms and Standards
(2000:20) specifies that the teacher may only teach the subject if his or her qualification in the subject is three
levels above the grade in which the subject is taught.

School Based Workshops
Principals interpreted the role of professional development in terms of organizing school based workshops on the
NCS principles and methods (but principals also concurred that they also did not understand the new curriculum).
According to them this was done by organizing regular staff meetings to discuss teaching methods and principles.
In these meetings the principals would open and read the seven roles of educators as outlined in the Norms and
Standards (2000). The Heads of Department would then attempt to explain to the meeting what each role implied
in practice. The workshops did not focus on a particular subject but remained general in nature. For example
Principal A commented, “We hold regular meetings to train teachers to understand the NCS teaching methods”. He
went on to explain that, “I read the seven roles and my HoDs explain what each role means to teachers”. Principals
did not focus on subject-specific teaching methods. Generic teaching methods have to be adapted to suit individual subjects (Cummings and Worley 2001:3). These subject-specific teaching methods would only be discussed in subject meetings. Principals did not instruct their HoDs to hold regular subject meetings in order to discuss these subject-specific teaching methods. Principal A commented that, “Staff meetings are enough, HoDs must see if teachers follow the curriculum”. Principals did not realize that the role of HoDs includes conducting subject meetings. Loucks and Hall (1979:191) maintain that subject specific teaching methods are only effective when discussed in subject meetings. They continue to say even a teacher proof package of a new curriculum would fail to yield results in absence of teacher training.
The Manual for School Management (2001: 10) encourages principals to develop teachers using various ways. These ways include on-site training by inviting external subject experts to schools (school based workshops), encouraging working as teams to share information to provide professional and personal growth. Principals would invite to their schools external subject experts to bridge teachers’ skills gap if only the skills gaps were identified beforehand. Principals did not invite the cost- free DoE subject experts partly because they did not know there was a skills’ gap in some of their teachers.

**DoE Workshops**

For most principals professional development meant encouraging their teachers to attend the DoE workshops. They did this by ensuring that all teachers received invitation for DoE organized workshops and there was transport for teachers to reach the workshop venues in time. Principal B remarked that, “Teachers must attend the State workshops because they (teachers) do not know the new curriculum................we give them circulars and money for transport to them so they can’t be late”. However, principals lamented that the DoE workshops were not enough. They lamented that the DoE workshops were always less than three –days long and that teachers did not understand the NCS due to insufficient training. For example Principal C commented that, “The State workshops are not 100%........always less than three days. What do teachers learn in such a short time?” And principal B said, “The Department must have workshops over holidays ........may be two weeks will be right”. I noticed that there was DoE workshop’s programme on the office notice board behind principal B. It revealed that each subject workshop was two days long. However, principals did not take time to identify their teachers skills gap.

**LTSM Allocator and Interpreter of Learning Content**

There was a lack of consensus in terms of how principals interpreted what the LTSM role entailed. This lack of consensus became evident when some interpreted this role in terms of infrastructure development and procuring textbooks and stationery, while others interpreted this role in terms purchasing laboratory chemicals. Principals did not mention anything to do with interpreting the learning content with a view to procure the appropriate LTSM.

**Infrastructure development**

Most principals interpreted their role as LTSM allocators in terms of providing classrooms for learners to accommodate all subject packages. Fullan (2001:142) says the availability of seating space and teaching and learning material such as stationery and textbooks does not necessarily translate into effective classroom delivery, but the class context like noisy, dirty or dull rooms may affect teaching. Principals built classrooms to provide for all their subject packages. Principals said they performed this role by asking School Governing Bodies (SGBs) to build classes to cater for all learners and subject package streams in the schools. The SGBs would provide funds either from the State funds allocated to schools or convene parents’ meetings to discuss classrooms shortages with a view to then ask for contributions for building the required classes. For example Principal A explained that, “Classes support learning and teaching...............we build them if some subject offerings do not have classes......... and there is overcrowding, ....and classes are not enough”. This implies that principals also realized that overcrowded classes are not conducive for teaching and learning. I observed that the average class size was
90 learners in Principal A's school. There was over-crowding because the normal class size is 35 in secondary schools (Norma and Standards for Educators (2000:10). Principal B complained about the LTSM funding to schools, "The LTSM funds are not enough every year. The SGB tries to obtain money from the insufficient State allocation or ask parents to pay the money............, the SGB meets them and they discuss and build classes. The Department takes time to build classes because they say they have budget constraints". These principals did not see fund raising as part of their roles. Principals did not seem to know that they had the authority and right to fund-raise to resolve some of the problems such as shortage of classes and textbooks.

Procurement of Textbooks and Stationery
Most principals interpreted the LTSM allocator role in terms of procuring stationery and textbooks. They felt they did this by placing orders for textbooks and stationery from authorized book and stationery suppliers. However, they lamented that the funds were always insufficient to buy adequate textbooks and stationery for their schools. They also felt unsatisfied that some teachers could not utilize the textbooks even if the textbooks were made available. For example Principal A commented, “As LTSM allocator, I sit with the SGB to award a supplier to give us stationery or textbooks and pay from the LTSM funds. But teachers do not use the textbooks at times, though so expensive”. Principals B remarked, “The State funding for books and stationery is not enough, but parents can easily top-up on stationery because it is cheaper than textbooks”. However, principals did not identify the kind of learning and teaching support-support material (LTSM), required by the curriculum for their teachers. Principals assumed they knew the subject-offerings in their schools. For example Principal A said, “I order material for all my school subjects.............if you ask teachers to tell you, they mention many things.............they do not know that there is no money”.

Principal C interpreted the LTSM allocator role in terms of school laboratory chemicals acquisitions by making sure the school had science laboratory chemicals. He did this by placing orders with State approved suppliers. This principal emphasised chemicals as if textbooks were not necessary. For example Principal B said, “I make sure my school has chemicals equipment for the laboratory .....................I order from science material suppliers like STA (Science Teaching Aids) in Durban”. He continued to say science subject advisers compel all schools to have science chemicals, but teachers do not use these chemicals. Principal C said that, “Advisers want all schools to have science chemicals but teachers are not skilled to use them. Teachers need training by the subject advisers”. The principal did not see skilling teachers to use the science chemicals and apparatus as his role. He could have organised subject advisers to come to school to train the teachers on the chemicals and apparatus use.
Teacher training to use chemicals and apparatus is part of the duties of subject advisers (Manual for School Management 2001:20). It was disturbing to learn that some qualified science teachers could not handle science chemicals and apparatus. The NCS has created a wide teaching skills’ gap particularly in science subjects. Moreover, I observed that there were no science laboratories in the three secondary schools visited.

Motivation

Principals had consensus in the way they interpreted their role in motivation. Data revealed that principals generally interpreted motivation in terms of teacher encouragement and teacher awards.

Teacher Encouragement

Principals interpreted their role in motivating in terms of encouraging and inspiring teachers to work harder for the benefit of learners. They did this by asking teachers in staff meetings to love their work and to do team teaching where possible. Principals explained that team teaching would allow teachers to gain teaching content from others who were familiar with the content. They believed that teachers would with time grasp the content through these team teaching methods. Principals did not identify other methods to motivate staff and did not know of any motivation theory. For example Principal A commented that, “In our staff meetings, we ask teachers to love their work and work harder for the benefit of their learners”. Principal B concurred and remarked that, “Team teaching affords the opportunity to those who are not clear with content to know it, and it helps develop love for one another”. I asked Principal C if he had applied any motivation theory to inspire staff. Principal C replied, “I have no knowledge of motivation theories”. The other principals also agreed that they had never used motivation theories. However, principals did encourage team teaching. They realized that team teaching also fosters unity among teachers. However, Principal A commented that, “When you praise one teacher others feel unhappy”. Principals sensed that some teachers would envy a teacher who is praised and recognized for good work.

Hord (1995 :95) concurs that staff motivation programmes such as team teaching and collegiality reinforce staff cohesion in schools. It would seem some principals did identify some factors that foster staff cohesion. He further maintains that there must be a culture of sharing and loving among team members. He says where this culture exists teachers become more willing to do more in their work (1995:95). It allows a teacher to invite colleagues to his class for the purpose of team teaching.

Teacher Awards

Principals also interpreted their motivating role in terms of offering awards to teachers who excelled in their work. Principals provided excellence awards to deserving teachers. They considered matriculation results of the previous year to give the awards to teachers. Teachers whose subjects obtained As and Bs received awards in the form of trophies and certificates of excellence. They felt that teachers would work harder in the year in order to receive the awards the following year. For example Principal C said, “I consider last year’s results to awards teachers who got As and Bs in matriculation”. Principal B commented that, “I give trophies and certificates to deserving teachers”. Principal A also remarked that, “Trophies are affordable but they serve the purpose of motivating teachers especially if done in public”. Fullan (2001:125) identifies intrinsic rewards such praise and recognition for
those teachers who excel and freely help others. However, Fullan does not mention extrinsic rewards such as promotion and salary increment. This could be due to the fact that principals are not in a position to award salary increment and promotion to teachers.

**Strategic Planning**

Data revealed that principals had varying interpretations on what strategic planning entailed. They interpreted their roles in strategic planning in terms of formulating a vision and mission and drawing up school policies.

**Vision and Mission**

Most principals interpreted their roles in strategic planning in terms of ensuring their schools had shared vision and mission. They did this by organizing staff meetings to brainstorm a proper vision and mission for their schools. These visions and missions' role were to guide and give directions to schools. For example Principal A commented that, "In our staff meeting we formulated a shared vision and mission to give direction to the school". Principal B said, "When we do it together it becomes owned by all of us". Principals did not know that it was the function of the School Governing Bodies to devise visions and missions for schools (SASA 84 of 1996 section 20(b-d). However, some schools do have visions and missions, and Principal B quoted his school's vision which read as follows, "We will produce learners of high caliber". However, Principals did not identify and outline strategies to take in order to satisfy their visions and missions, like saying they would employ quality teachers in their schools or any other strategies.

Fullan (2001:146) concurs with principals that shared visions and missions provide schools with a sense of alertness. He further says these visions missions give direction to schools to get there. Unfortunately, these visions and missions did not have strategic plans to make schools get there. These visions and missions would identify what needed to be done, by whom and by when, and it would also identify resources required to perform all the activities in the strategic plans (Lawn and Prescott 1975:234). Hall and Hord (1984:285) concur with Fullan by saying good action plans reveal what would be done, by whom and by when. Hall and Hord further say action plans eliminate role ambiguity because each teacher knows his role in achieving the schools' goals.

**Drawing up School Policies**

Principal C interpreted his role in school’s strategic planning in terms of ensuring the school had school policies to shape the direction of the school. He said schools without policies operate directionless. He did this by convening staff meetings in order to draw up these school policies. I saw class policies on the class walls of principal C’s school. In principal C’s office there were school policies in a particular file marked, "school policies". These school policies included codes of conduct for learners, subjects policies and testing programmes. For example the principal said, "We set a meeting each year to revise…………….. learners’ code of conduct, subject policies and testing dates". He continued to comment that, “Schools without policies run with no direction”. He did not mention code of conduct for teachers, staff policies, extra mural activities’ policies and some others. According to him, a testing programme is a policy but according to Lawn and Prescott (1975:187), it remains an action plan to implement strategic plans. In this case the testing programme is an action plan to give tests in order to assess
learners. Galton (1980:37) maintains that staff policy and code of conduct are key determinants in re-culturing schools to deliver on a new program. He did not mention any policy to do with teachers. He, however, contravene d the SASA 84 of 1996 section 8 (1) by drafting the code of conduct for learners. The SASA 84 (1) explicitly rules that the formulation of codes of conduct for learners and teachers are functions of the School Governing Body.

Cummings and Worley (2001:23), however warn even those schools that have good policies and visions but which lock them in safety rooms and do not apply them in practice. He says devising these policies and visions is a waste of time and resources of the schools.
Section C
General Discussion and Recommendations

In this section I will discuss and summarise the main findings of the study and make recommendations. The summary and recommendations will be based on the preceding discussion in section B.

General Discussion
This small qualitative study revealed a number of shortcomings in the implementation of the NCS as interpreted by principals. However, literature study indicated that the NCS documents such as the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000) and the Manual for School Management (2001) were well formulated to guide principals and educators on the implementation of the NCS (Department of Education 2005:6). These documents provided all guidelines, roles and responsibilities of principals in the implementation of the NCS. Educators, roles, responsibilities, learning content, learning outcomes, methods of teaching and assessment strategies were also exposed to guide educators. However, this study revealed that principals had several implementation problems arising due to lack of NCS knowledge and expertise.

Principals' lack of curriculum leadership became clear when they described curriculum leadership in terms of resource allocation than in terms of curriculum development so that their schools became better implementers of the NCS. Principals also saw their role strictly in terms of ensuring teachers attended their classes. Principals did not attend to implementation challenges such as developing teachers skills and create experience through training teachers. Fullan (2001:142) and Hord (1995:95) concur with principals that they must conduct class visits to see if there is teaching. Murphy (1983:141) says a curriculum leader's role is to ensure the learning content, learning outcomes and assessment standards are all consistent with each other and with the curriculum being implemented. Principals had no idea of what Murphy (1983:141) and NCS documents prescribed. Hord (1995:95) says principals must identify key educators to assist him / her drive and influence curriculum development at the school. However, principals took this task alone and did not identify key educators but instead interpreted curriculum leadership role in terms of resources. Though, principals interpreted this role in terms of the resources, but even the resources procured could not be utilized by some educators because these educators lacked the skills to use such resources.

Principals could not realize this shortcoming on the part of teachers because they also saw curriculum leadership in terms of administration. And as administrators, principals became administrative clerks so overloaded with office work that they did not have time to realize the shortcomings in order to work on them. Fullan (2001:140) says administrative tasks of principals are purely providing information to educators on curriculum matters and policy prescripts. Principals lacked self-knowledge in terms of own abilities to lead. They acted like clerks and as a result there was no streamlining of the whole school systems for change. These three principals did not properly interprete the curriculum leadership role which would suggest that there was lack of curriculum leadership in their schools.
Since there was no proper planning for the implementation of the NCS, principals never conducted subject teachers’ needs analysis as a result teachers found that some of the resources procured were irrelevant. Principals of these three schools did not play their role of curriculum leadership to the best of their abilities. This was evidenced by the fact that most principals in the study did not understand the NCS guiding principles and rationale. For example, principals thought OBE was just another name for the NCS.

Principals concurred that professional development was to do with teacher training and introducing new subject packages. Teachers did not have skills to teach these new subjects, but nonetheless some principals introduced the new subjects. Bishop (1991:31) and Fullan (1999:81) emphasise the role of professional development in elevating the level of teachers’ understanding of a new curriculum in terms of acquiring skills and knowledge. However, lack of curricular knowledge and content depth by some principals created room for the introduction of subjects for which there would be lack of teacher skills to teach the subjects. Unfortunately, principals did not seem to have the will and desire to identify their lacking teacher skills. This would help principals to decide whether to recruit skilled teachers or to stop offering subjects for which there would be unqualified teachers.

The LTSM resources posed some threats to the principals at schools. Principals mentioned a crucial point that the LTSM allocated to their schools was not adequate and further stated that there was lack of curriculum equipment and science laboratories in schools. Principals felt that these were among reasons for failure to properly implement the NCS. However, principals could have fund-raised through private and public sectors because schools are allowed to do so (South African Schools’ Act 84 of 1996: sub-section 37(4). Smith and Andrews (1989:24) argue that a huge change in a curriculum requires huge initial investment in education. Therefore, while LTSM funds are inadequate, fund raising in schools is necessary. According to Hall et al (1979:110), another problem was the failure by principals to ask educators to analyse subject-frameworks to determine equipment and resources. Teachers could not produce and submit a subject list of resources because principals never requested for these lists to be drawn up. However, Howes and Quinn (1978:71) and Hall and Hord (1984:285) state that the State is obliged to provide LTSM to public schools, but principals must allocate the existing resources equitably to get the curriculum running. Some of the principals never allocated the funds equitably because they did not know their teachers’ subjects’ needs. However, principals did have the desire and will to allocate resources in a just manner. I concluded that principals interpreted the role of resource allocator quite well but lacked knowledge on procedures. Even in abundance of LTSM resources, principals complained about the unqualified educators in their schools, and as a result there was a need to develop staff. However, principals did not have the expertise to train educators on the NCS. Principals also neglected the HoDs role in developing teachers. According to Loucks and Hall (1979:191), any well resourced curriculum would fail in the absence of educators’ workshops to develop the educators on the skills required to implement the new curriculum.

Principals encouraged and inspired teachers to work harder and to teach as subject teams. However, principals did not apply motivating factors like intrinsic rewards recognition or extrinsic rewards such as promotion. Principals did not apply their right to recommend deserving teachers for promotion (SASA 84 of 1996). They felt some teachers would hate those who would be awarded. Cummings and Worley (2001::2,3) and Fullan (2001:125) encourage
rewards for good performance. They say developing staff runs together with motivating readiness for change among educators by addressing concerns, giving praise and recognition for super performance. The Department of Education gives teachers’ awards once a year to encourage and forge good performance. These teacher awards would count to nothing in schools that have no visions because the evidence produced to earn an award would be a mere forgery (Caldwell et al. 1989:155). Hall and Hord (1984::285), Fullan (2002: LSR 1-6) and Miller (2000:542) add that staff development programmes responded swiftly in schools that had visions and missions to provide the direction towards which the schools were heading. Hall and Hord (1984::285) and Fullan (2002 :LSR1-6) further concurred with principals that visions also eliminate teacher role ambiguity. Pearson et al. (2003:8) and Fullan (2001:119) summarise the benefits of strategic planning. Some of these benefits are providing vision, reduction of teacher role ambiguity and that every teacher becomes aware of his or her role in the action plans. Having done this survey, I would like to make recommendations based on my findings in this small study.

**Recommendations**

I make recommendations to the DoE to improve implementation of the NCS. This is because my research is focused on how principals interpret and address their roles in the implementation of the NCS. I have found that the implementation of the NCS would be achieved with little effort had the principals interpreted their NCS roles in a manner consistent with this curriculum. Therefore, I make the following recommendations:

- The Department of Education should provide school principals with workshops in order for principals to conceptualise the NCS terminology, rationale and their duties that fall within the scope of the NCS implementation. The DoE should provide sufficient support for principals, lack of support is usually the main cause of fear and lack of self-knowledge in terms of own abilities. It is possible that some principals find it difficult to manage and lead the implementation of the NCS.

- The Department of Education should encourage principals to upgrade their own management and leadership skills by offering bursaries to further studies at universities. I cannot state precisely whether all or most principals are suitably qualified for the post of principal. Since I have learned that principals visited could hardly apply motivation theories to lead and motivate staff.

- Principals would also operate optimally if were provided with some workshop on prioritisation and financial management skills of the DoE scarce resources. The DoE is not likely to have ample LTSM allocation for schools in the near future. Therefore, principals cannot keep on lamenting about funding, but must prioritise what is available.

- Principals would have to conduct subject requirements and consult teachers before purchasing school LTSM so that the DoE does not have textbooks lying in store rooms while learners do not have textbooks. According to South African Schools Act 84 of 1996, the non-consultation of teachers in LTSM acquisition may amount to misconduct by principals.
• The DoE must provide all principals with administrative clerks to deal with clerical and office administrative duties. However, principals also need training on basic computer literacy in order to apply computerized management systems.

• Principals have been found in dilemma whereby they have to balance access to education to all SA learners with quality education they offer in schools. The DoE should be aware that quality education is also important, but requires state funding.

• The DoE should raise the status of principals to ensure they do not take their duties lightly. This could be implemented by simply recognizing and praising principals where and when necessary.
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THE SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW AND QUESTIONNAIRE

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

How do you see your role as a principal in your school with regard to the following?

1. Curriculum leadership, coordinator and monitoring

2. LTSM and resources allocation

3. Support, guidance and vision

4. Manager, decision maker and administrator

5. Planner, researcher and teacher

6. Staff development and motivation

7. Discipline in the school

How do you see your role in the effective implementation of the new curriculum (NCS) in your school?

What are the kinds of challenges that you have been faced with, in the roles that have been described above?

SEMI-STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE

According to the Norms and Standards for Educator (2000) teachers need to fulfill the following roles in the implementation of the NCS: mediators of learning; interpreter and designer of learning programmes; leader; administrator and manager; scholar; researcher and life long learner; community; citizenship and pastoral role; assessor and learning are/ subject/ phase specialist.

How familiar are you with these seven roles of educators?

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

To what extent do you think your role as a principal includes ensuring that your teachers are familiar with and are well developed in these roles?
Do you develop your teachers to become better leaders, administrators and managers?

What do you think being a scholar, researcher and life long learner means?

Do you develop your teachers to become good scholars, researchers and life long learners?

If yes, how? Please elaborate (provide details)
If no, why not?

What do you think pastoral care means?

Do you develop your teachers to be able to demonstrate (show) pastoral care in your school and school community?

If yes, how? Please elaborate (provide details)
If no, why not?

How familiar are you with Outcomes Based Assessment?

What do you think a mediator of learning means?

Do you develop your teachers to become good mediators of learning?

If yes, how? Please elaborate (provide details)
If no, why not?
What do you think being an interpreter and designer of learning content means?

Do you think being an interpreter and designer of learning content?
If yes, how? Please elaborate (provide details)
If no, why not?

What do you think being a leader, administrator and manager means?

Do you develop your teachers to become better OBE assessors?
If yes, how? Please elaborate (provide details)
If no, why not?

Do you develop your teachers to become better learning and subject specialists?
If yes, how? Please elaborate (provide details)
If no, why not?

Thank you for participating in this research.

Msane S.G