RESEARCH TITLE

Heads of Departments' understandings of and their preparedness for, their roles as curriculum managers: A case study of a rural primary school

Research report

Student : Sihle Daniel Mthokoziseni Mbhele

Student Number : 992235895

Degree : Masters in Education

Supervisor : Mrs Magesvari Govender

Submitted in the School of Education, University of KwaZulu-Natal, in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the Masters in Education (M.Ed.) in Curriculum Management Studies.

March 2008

ABSTRACT

This study investigates Heads of Department's (HoDs') understandings of their roles as curriculum managers and their level of preparedness for instructional support and supervision to educators in the implementation of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) in schools.

This is a qualitative case study focusing on one rural primary school in KwaZulu-Natal. There were nine participants comprising three HoDs and six randomly selected educators in the study. Data was collected by means of questionnaires, interviews, observation, and document analysis.

The study examines HoDs' understandings of their roles as curriculum managers and their perceptions about their levels of preparedness for curriculum management and supervision roles. In addition, an attempt is made to identify some of the professional development needs of HoDs in the context of OBE implementation in schools.

The key findings that emerged from the research were that HoDs did not fully understand their curriculum management and supervision roles and were not adequately trained and prepared to fulfil their management and supervisory responsibilities. It was found that HoDs required professional development in the form of workshops, in-service training, networking or information sharing meetings and seminars to prepare them for their role as curriculum managers.

DECLARATION

I, Sihle Daniel Mthokoziseni Mbhele, declare that this dissertation is my own work, submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of Masters in Education at the University of KwaZulu-Natal.

The research was conducted under the supervision of Mrs M.Govender. I further declare that this dissertation has never been submitted at any other university or institution for any purpose.

SIHLE DANIEL MTHOKOZISENI MBHELE

.....
SUPERVISOR

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Though this research is my personal activity, but its completion depended largely on the cooperation and assistance of the following people to whom I wish to pass my sincere gratitude for their untiring support:

Firstly, God the Almighty, who always gave me light and direction when things were dark and difficult.

My SMT members who always encouraged me to press on despite all work pressures.

My colleagues who agreed to participate in this research by answering questions.

My lecturers, especially Dr V. Chikoko, who inspired and motivated me by words and deeds.

My family whose quality time with me as their father was highly compromised.

Lastly, Mrs Magesvari Govender, my supervisor, for her guidance, support and tolerance throughout the period of this research.

THANK YOU.

ABBREVIATIONS

CNE : Christian National Education

DoE : Department of Education

HoD : Head of Department

NCS : National Curriculum Statement

OBE : Outcomes-Based Education

PAM : Personnel Administration Measures

SASA : South African Schools Act

SGB : School Governing Body

SMT : School Management Team

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the overview or outline of the whole study will be presented. This introductory chapter also provides the background and purpose of this study.

1.2 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Before 1994 South Africa followed a traditional system of education which was known as Christian National Education (CNE).According to Article 1 of the Christian National Education Policy (1948) 'Christian' in CNE meant that all white children were to be educated according to the view of life of their parents as enshrined in the creeds of the Afrikaner churches. The 'National' in the CNE means that Afrikaans-speaking children were to have a national education in order for the national spirit of the Afrikaner nation to be preserved and developed. This education was Christian in that it emphasized Christian values of the Afrikaner churches, and national in the sense that it stressed the national spirit of the Afrikaner nation.

In terms of Articles xiv and xv of the same policy neither Coloured nor Native (Black) education could be financed at the expense of White education. The Afrikaner's task was to "christianise" non-whites, and inculcate the philosophy of the Afrikaner nation in them. Under Christian National Education learners had no freedom of thought, but had to learn according to the Christian and nationalistic

values of the Afrikaner nation. Black children were not to be educated according to the life view of their parents. They were indoctrinated and their culture was ignored.

In this system of education educators were the main source of knowledge (information) and children (learners) were passive recipients of knowledge from educators. Schools were headed by Head-teachers (Principals) who wielded immense power and authority over every aspect of school management including management of physical and human resources, as well as of curriculum implementation.

In the CNE approach learners were passive participants in the learning activity. Assessment was norm-referenced and summative. Learning was teacher-centred and textbook-bound. The learning content was determined by a rigid syllabus that was a blue-print and a non-negotiable document. The content of learning was set in rigid time frames. The emphasis was on the learning content that the teacher hoped to cover.

However, with the introduction of political changes in South Africa in 1994, the country changed from the apartheid system of government into a democracy. These political changes also influenced transformation in the education system of South Africa. Among the changes introduced to the education system were the South African Qualifications Act, 58 (1995) and the National Education Policy Act, 27 (1996) in terms of which curriculum transformation was emphasized. This act stressed the need for a shift from the traditional aims-and-objectives approach to Outcomes-Based Education (OBE). In OBE the learning content involves knowledge, skills, values and attitudes (KSVA). Unlike in the traditional approach (CNE), OBE follows a different approach altogether. Learners are active participants in the learning activity. Assessment is criterion-referenced and not norm-referenced and not summative (i.e. done at the end of learning).It is also continuous in the sense that learners are assessed

on an ongoing basis. Learning is no longer teacher-centred nor textbook-bound, but is learner-centred, and the teacher facilitates learning. In OBE the syllabus is neither non-negotiable nor a cast-iron blue-print. Instead there are learning programmes that serve as guidelines to educators, and which allow for educators' innovativeness and creativeness. Learning takes place at a learner's own pace. The emphasis is on the outcomes.

Another main concomitant change in the education system was the promulgation of the South African Schools Act (SASA), 84 (1996).Under the new dispensation the governance of schools is vested in the hands of the School Governing Bodies (for non-professional matters), and the School Management Teams (SMTs) (for professional matters).The SMT comprises the Principal, Deputy Principal and Heads of Departments (HoDs).

The management of curriculum implementation is a key function of the HoDs. HODs are expected to help educators understand and implement curriculum policies such as Assessment policy, Learning Area policy, Language policy, etc. Curriculum implementation and effective teaching and learning are dependant on how HODs play their roles. In terms of the Personnel Administrative Measures (PAM) (2000) document as contained in the Policy Handbook for Educators (2000) as well as in the Education Law and Policy handbook (1999), HoDs, as curriculum managers in schools, are expected, among other things, to coordinate evaluation/assessment,

homework, written assignments, etc. of all the subjects in that department; provide guidance on the latest ideas on approaches to the subject, method, techniques, evaluation, aids, etc. in their field, and effectively convey these to staff members concerned; and participate in agreed school/educator appraisal process in order to

regularly review their professional practice with the aim of improving teaching, learning and management

The purpose of this study is to investigate how the Heads of Departments (HoDs) understand their roles as curriculum managers in schools and how they feel about their level of preparedness for instructional support and supervision of educators in their implementation of OBE in schools.

I have observed with growing concern laxity and a lack of direction with regards to the implementation of OBE at my school by educators. This lack of direction may be partly due to the incapacity of HoDs to manage and support educators in implementing OBE.

Heads of Departments (HODs) appear unable to perform their duties as outlined by the Department of Education (DoE) probably because they are not well prepared to support educators in implementing OBE in schools. Support can be taken to mean any activity by HoDs that includes motivating educators, interpreting curriculum policies such as Learning Area policies, Language policy, and assessment policy, and giving guidance to educators.

Research has been done into various aspects of OBE internationally (Spady, 1991) nationally (Jansen and Christie, 1999) and locally (Hlalele, 2001). However, there

does not appear to be a study that investigates HoDs' understandings of their roles and preparedness to support educators in implementing OBE in schools. This study hopes to contribute to addressing this gap. The study is small scale and whilst its findings are not generalisable, it is hoped that it can provide the impetus for further research on this topic.

1.3 THEORETICAL LOCATION OF THE STUDY

This study is located within the broad fields of Change, Change Management, Human Resource Development, and Human Resource Management. It draws, inter alia, on the works of Fullan (1992), Jansen (1999), Steyn and Van Niekerk (2002),and Ornstein and Hunkins (1993).

Change is a phenomenon that cannot be avoided in the human life. Morrison (1998) asserts that change is a dynamic and continuous process of development which is inescapable, and inbuilt into developing societies. Education is no exception because change also occurs there in the form of curriculum change (OBE). Theories of change are relevant to this study because HoDs, as leaders of change (curriculum change) need to understand and accept change themselves. Senge (1993, cited by Fullan, 1993) says people need to engage in a fundamental shift of mind when dealing with the concept of educational change.

For any change to be implemented successfully it needs to be managed properly. Change management also takes place in education, where curriculum change (OBE) requires to be managed. Therefore change management is relevant to this study because HoDs, who are in the forefront of curriculum change, need to understand that

in order for the effective implementation of curriculum change (OBE) to take place there has to be a proper change management (curriculum management)

This study also draws on Human Resource Development (HRD) theory in terms of which the human resource needs to be developed in order to acquire necessary experience and skills within a specific job. The Human Resource Development theory has relevance to this study because in order for HoDs to be able to support and manage educators in their implementation of curriculum change the HDs themselves need to be developed for this role: hence professional development which entail developmental opportunities in which educators or educational leaders participate in order to be better equipped for their roles.

This study also draws on Human Resource Management (HRM) theory. According to the HRM theory the personnel within an organization or institution have to be managed to ensure that they are doing their work properly. The HRM theory is relevant to this study because effective curriculum implementation by educators needs proper management and support by the HoDs who are curriculum managers.

1.4 KEY QUESTIONS

The following questions constitute the key questions of the study:-

1. How do HODs understand their roles as curriculum managers in the context of OBE?
2. What do HODs feel about their levels of preparedness for curriculum management and supervision roles in the OBE context?

3. What are the professional development needs of HODs in the context of OBE implementation in schools?

1.5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study, which is a case study, adopts a qualitative approach. It is located at a rural primary school. The study sample comprises three HoDs and a randomly selected sample of educators drawn from each learning phase at the school.

Data was collected through observation, questionnaires and interviews, and then triangulated. Ethical issues were considered so that respondents' identities remained confidential. This was explained to all respondents and also included in the covering letter given to them. Respondents signed letters of informed consent in which the right to withdraw from participation was guaranteed. Ethical clearance for the study was obtained from the University of KwaZulu-Natal.

1.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of this study include the fact that it is a single case study of three HODs in a single rural primary school. As such the results cannot be generalized to all HODs and to all schools. However, lessons can still be drawn from experiences of these three Heads of Departments. It is hoped that this could assist in paving the way for further research.

1.7 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

This study structured as follows:-

Chapter one is the overview of the study. It provides the background and purpose of the study.

Chapter two is a review of literature in which the conceptual and theoretical frameworks that the study draws upon will be presented. In addition there will be a critical review of national and international literature relevant to the research topic.

Chapter three describes the research methodology employed in this investigation. It focuses on the research strategies that were used and provides the rationale for their usage.

Chapter four presents the data collected an analysis of the data and a discussion of the findings that emerge from the data analysis.

Chapter five presents the summary of conclusions as well as recommendations.

1.8 SUMMARY

In this chapter the structure of the dissertation was outlined. The background and purpose of the study were presented, the theoretical framework was introduced, a brief outline of the research methodology was presented, and the structure of the study was outlined.

The next chapter will deal with a review of national and international literature as well as the presentation of the theoretical frameworks underpinning the study.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter will provide an overview of local and international literature on managing change, curriculum, change, curriculum implementation, middle management and supervision, and professional development. In addition the conceptual and theoretical framework employed in the study will be presented.

A brief overview of the educational developments in South Africa immediately before and after 1994 will also be presented.

2.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study draws on Change, Change Management, Human Resource Development, and Human Resource Management theories.

2.2.1 Change

Change is an unavoidable phenomenon in the human life. Morrison (1998) asserts that change is a dynamic and continuous process of development which is inescapable, and inbuilt into developing societies. He says since change is experienced in all walks of life, such as in society, in science, in politics, economic practices, etc. education is no exception for it is part of these broader currents of society. Change is a transformational process either caused by internal factors or external forces that involve individuals, groups or institutions, leading to a realignment of existing values, practices and outcomes.

In order for change to be effective it is important that all people involved are made to understand and accept change. Senge (1993, cited by Fullan, 1993) says people need to engage in a fundamental shift of mind when dealing with the concept of educational change. Rudduck (1991) says change involves adaptation and abandonment of familiar and comfortable practices. He advocates that teachers must feel as individuals and members of a working group that they own and are in control of the problem of change. Since this study is on the HoDs' understandings of their roles as curriculum managers and their levels of preparedness to support educators in implementing curriculum change (OBE) is important that HoDs understand and embrace change.

2.2.2 Change Management

In order for change to take place effectively change has to be properly managed (change management). In addition for curriculum change (OBE) to be successfully implemented there needs to be proper curriculum management. According to Fullan (1992) the processes of curriculum management are the result of recognition from both experience and research literature that curriculum implementation does not happen without careful planning.

Change management is relevant to this study because since HoDs are in the forefront of curriculum change they need to be empowered for this role of managing curriculum change (OBE). Herman and Herman (1994) express the view that an educational leader (HoD) must lead change and not merely be subjected to change.

2.2.3 Human Resource Development

In terms of Human Resource Development (HRD) theory, human resource (personnel) needs to be developed in order to acquire necessary skills and experience within a specific job. According to Human Resource Development theory development can be seen as a process by which managers obtain the necessary experience, skills, and attitudes to become or remain successful leaders in their organization. Van Dyk et al. (2001) state that development is aimed at employees serving in a managerial capacity or preparing for managerial posts within the organization. They go on to say that Human Resource Development is essentially directed towards preparing supervisory and managerial personnel for subsequent levels of management. Nel et al. (1999 cited by Van Dyk et al. 2001) concur by arguing that development refers to development possibilities within a specific job or position for a specific employee, with reference to the employee's personal growth and personal goals.

Virgilio and Virgilio (1984) argue that no change in a school will be successful without the positive and active support of educators. In support of this argument Jansen and Christie (1999) say that the success of the new curriculum depends on the training and support that educators receive to implement the new curriculum.

HRD theory has relevance to this study because in order for HoDs to be able to support and manage educators to effectively implement curriculum change (OBE) HoDs themselves need to be developed for this role. Hargreaves (1994) says significant change in curriculum is unlikely to be successful unless serious attention is paid to professional development. Steyn and Van Niekerk (2002) define professional as the participation of educational leaders in development opportunities in order to be

better equipped as educational leaders. Harris (1989) defines professional development as any organized effort to improve the performance of educators. Therefore professional development is not only for HoDs, but also educators are subject to professional development. HoDs need to be professionally developed so that they are empowered to develop educators as well. Cawood and Gibbon (1985) view professional development as the promotion of professional growth of educators so that they may be exposed and respond to educational change and innovations.

2.2.4 Human Resource Management

This study also draws on Human Resource Management theory (Bush and Middlewood, 1997, and Lumby et al. 2003).In terms of Human Resource Management (HRM) theory the personnel within an organization or institution have to be managed in order to ensure that they are doing their work, and that they are doing it properly too. The HRM theory acknowledges that human beings are the most important part of getting things done in an organization.

According to Bush and Middlewood (1997) Human Resource Management is all about performance improvement through effective use of human resource. In terms of the HRM theory the management of human beings is not centrally established but the manager(s) in the classroom has/have a freedom to take action. According to Lumby et al. (2003) HRM assumes that compliance with the centrally established standards and regulations is unlikely to lead to a sufficiently motivated personnel and emphasizes the need for commitment rather than mere compliance. HRM theory informs this study because effective curriculum implementation by educators in the classrooms depends on management and support by HoDs. Hence Coleman et al. (2003) say there is a need to provide leadership in developing and implementing the new national curriculum.

Bush and West-Burnham (1994) say it is the management task to promote an optimum level of performance among educators.

2.3 A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTH AFRICA BEFORE AND AFTER 1994

Changes in the political dispensation of South Africa dictated a transformation of the education system of this country. The transformation of the education system saw the introduction of the Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) as education policy and the establishment of School Management Teams (SMTs), including the Heads of Departments (HoDs) who would lead and manage this process of curriculum change at school level.

During the years immediately before and after 1994 South Africa experienced an intensive period of policy development in education. During this period the state of education and training policy was one of great confusion and controversy (Kraak, 1998). This was due to a wide set of competing policy discourses that emerged in the mid 1980s with divergent propositions on policy. These policy discourses were:-

- 'Peoples' education' discourse which was part of the struggle against *apartheid*.
- 'Systemic' discourse that focused on structural changes within the system.
- 'Outcomes-based education and training (OBET)' discourse which gained an overwhelming influence after the first democratic elections in 1994.

The national Department of Education prepared two discussion documents entitled 'Curriculum Framework for General and Further Education and Training', and 'Lifelong Learning Through A National Qualifications Framework'. These were released in 1995 and 1996 respectively.

These two discussion documents constituted a foundation for an outcomes - based approach to General and Further Education and Training. The revision of these discussion documents resulted in the publishing, by the national Department of Education, of its first official statement on outcomes-based education in March 1997, entitled Curriculum 2005: Lifelong Learning for the Twenty-first Century.

At the same time as this publication the new national curriculum, Curriculum 2005, was launched by the then Minister of Education, Professor S. Bengu.

There are many reasons why the education and training system in South Africa had to change to one that is based on the principles of Outcomes-Based education. According to Jansen and Christie (1999) South Africa's reforms were motivated mainly by the need to produce a lifelong learner who would be a responsible and productive member of the society. Capper and Jamison (1993 cited by Jansen and Christie, 1999) state that OBE in South Africa and internationally has the potential to meet the needs of all students regardless of their environment, ethnicity, economic status or disabling condition. They further argue that OBE enables educators to have more focus on the curriculum and develop better instructional procedures, and assess learners' achievement with clarity and validity; hence the principle that all learners can learn and succeed.

Another reason for changing to OBE in South Africa was an attempt to address the mismatch between requirements of the changing job market and what the schooled person could offer, as a product of the traditional education system. Jansen and Christie (1999) say OBE has as its roots two educational reforms, namely competency education and mastery learning. Competency education will produce a person who will be competent enough to meet the requirements of the job market. Mastery learning has as its assumption "that all learners are able to master the desired outcomes if educators reconstruct the time and instructional parameters in which learning is set" (Jansen and Christie, 1999:133). Therefore the relevance of OBE to the South African context was that this new education system would shape and model learners/students around set outcomes so that by the end of their schooling years they would be useful end-products.

According to Sayed and Jansen (2001) the social argument for OBE was to improve equity and distribution of opportunities in a multicultural and an economically diverse nation, and build democratic participation, cultural expression and a national identity.

They go on to give an economic argument for the introduction of OBE saying that as South Africa's economic base shifts from primary production to value-added production, new outcomes of education were required that stressed on, for instance, competence, creativity, self-management and teamwork rather than the acquisition of knowledge that dominated the past. Another reason that they advance is that OBE was introduced in part to loosen up a system that was seen to be too rigid (with syllabuses, textbooks, examinations and inspectors) and too divided (legacy of apartheid).

In OBE educators will have to draw learning programmes which will help learners develop skills and attitudes, taking into account the environment and community values. Educators will have to teach so that learners achieve pre-determined outcomes in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values. HoDs will have to guide educators in designing learning programmes and monitoring all educators' activities with regard to the implementation of the curriculum. HoDs should play a vital role in leading and supporting educators in implementing OBE.

2.4 THE ROLE OF THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT (HoD)

2.4.1 Providing Leadership

According to Bush and Middlewood (1997) managers need to accept change as the norm and to develop strategies to harness the best features of imposed change for the benefit of children and students. This, in turn, requires a higher-order of management of staff so that they are stimulated rather than demoralized by the frequent shifts in education policy.

Bush and West-Burnham (1994) state that it is a management task to promote an optimum level of performance, and issues associated with this task include leadership style, motivation strategies, the creative use of teams, and approaches to professional development.

Leadership styles of HoDs are important. Also important is the need for HoDs to be empowered with knowledge of various styles of leadership which he or she will practice in various contexts.

In terms of the theory proposed by Douglas McGregor, known as McGregor's Theory X and Y humans inherently dislike working, and will try to avoid it if they can. Therefore people have to be coerced or controlled by management through motivation and incentives so that they may work hard enough.

The optimal organization / leadership / decision-making styles depend upon various internal and external constraints (factors). According to Fiedler's Contingency Theory of leadership there is no simple way of leadership or management that is always right. Therefore the success of the leader is a function of various factors in the form of subordinates, task, and /or group variables. The effectiveness of a given pattern of a leader is contingent upon the demands imposed by the situation. And the performance is therefore the result of interaction of two factors: the leadership style and situational favourableness .This theory stresses the use of different styles of leadership appropriate to the needs created by different organizational situations.

Hanson (1996) identifies four styles of leadership, namely supportive leadership, directive leadership, achievement-oriented leadership, and participative leadership. Supportive leadership or management style shows concern for the well-being of personal needs of subordinates. Managers/leaders who demonstrate this leadership style strive to develop satisfactory interpersonal relations and to create a friendly climate in the groups that they lead. Managers who use directive leadership style provide specific guidance for subordinates by setting standards of performance, scheduling and coordinating work efforts, and asking subordinates to follow rules and regulations. They let subordinates know what is expected of them.

Achievement-oriented managers /leaders set challenging goals with an aim of improving performance. Participative leaders invite suggestions and opinions of their subordinates and consider these when making decisions.

An effective manager /leader is dictated to by the situation in which he/she finds him/herself. His/her style of management should be such that it is a combination of all. Each leadership style is relevant and relative to a particular situation, and none is absolute. For example, an HoD should adopt supportive leadership in order to develop some interpersonal skills for good relations with the human factor that he /she works with as a curriculum leader.

At the same time an HoD should practice directive leadership by which he/she gives direction and guidance to educators in implementing the curriculum. The HoD should set standards of performance and let educators know precisely what is expected of them.

Also to ascertain that teaching and learning take place in an effective manner an HoD should adopt the achievement-oriented leadership style by which he/she strives for improvement in performance.

A well-rounded manager does not practice absolute dictatorship to subordinates, but he/she also follows a participative style of management. An HoD has to solicit suggestions and advices from subordinates and consider their inputs in decision-making processes.

However, if the implementation of the curriculum is to take place effectively the task of management should never be left in the hands of the few; this should be a collective task in which all members of an educational organization engage since the extent to

which learning is achieved becomes the criterion against which the quality of management is to be judged.

According to job specification or description, middle managers are to perform duties that include a wide range of elements that specifically pertain to the area of curriculum where the individual(s) has / have expertise. Early and Fletcher (1999 cited by Coleman et al. 2003) analyze the role of middle managers as based on the following:-

1. Two general themes: leadership and communication;
2. Four main areas of responsibility: pupils, staff, curriculum and resources;
3. Three contexts: the department, the school, and beyond the school;
4. Two dimensions: routine and developmental activities.

Bennett (1995) says a Senior Manager/ leader in the school, such as a principal, needs an assistant who can transmit the vision on through the organization, articulate it in practical terms, and work with their colleagues to turn it into reality. This is the key role of an assistant manager commonly referred to as a 'middle manager', better known as an HoD in the South African context. According to Coleman et al. (2003) middle management is concerned with spreading the vision and delivering it in practice in the wide range of classroom and other activities which make up the daily work of schools. They go on to define middle managers as those teachers having the responsibility for planning, organizing, directing and controlling the work of other teachers.

2.4.2 Curriculum Management and Leadership

The curriculum middle managers therefore are teachers whose responsibilities extend beyond their own classrooms to include supervision and/or advice to a group of

classroom teachers, probably within a specific subject area or phase. According to Sergiovanni (1988) the general roles of an HoD include all other functions such as financial management, human resource management, school administration and governance.

Curriculum implementation and management are core duties of the heads of departments in schools. In terms of the Employment of Educators Act, 76 (1998) (Terms and Conditions of Employment of Educators) as well as Section 4: Personnel measures (PAM) document, contained in the Education Law and Policy Handbook (1999), and also in the Policy Handbook For Educators (2003) the aim of the job of the Head of Department (HoD) is to engage in class teaching, be responsible for effective functioning of the department and to organize relevant/related extra-curricular activities so as to ensure that the subject, learning area or phase and the education of the learners is promoted in a proper manner. According to these documents the core duties and responsibilities of the HoDs are, inter alia, to be in charge of a subject, learning area, or phase, to provide and coordinate guidance on the latest ideas on approaches to the subject, method, technique, evaluation, aids, etc., in their field, and effectively conveying these to the staff members concerned, and to control work of educators and learners in the department. The HoD has to participate in agreed school/educator appraisal processes in order to regularly review their professional practice with the aim of improving teaching, learning and management. The HoD therefore plays a key role in the management of curriculum implementation.

Specifically, according to Coleman et al (2003) curriculum managers are those educators who have the responsibility for planning, directing and controlling work of other educators.

In the South African context curriculum managers are referred to as HoDs whose responsibility extend beyond their own classrooms to include supervision and/or advice to a group of classroom educators, probably within a specific subject area.

Coleman et al (2003) say the main areas of responsibility of curriculum managers are:- teaching the subject through the school; developing the curriculum including teaching and learning strategies; implementing school policy; supervising/ monitoring colleagues' work to ensure that policies are followed through; devising and monitoring pupil records; collaborating in whole school planning; devising and leading in-service training with departmental staff; and coordinating and overseeing marking in line with school policies.

While Fullan (1991) maintains that almost all educational changes of value require new skills, behaviour, and beliefs or understanding, Marris (1975, cited by Fullan, 1991) however, warns that people cannot be made to change nor can they be forced to think differently or be compelled to develop new skills. It is therefore important that change be managed in order for it to be effectively implemented. People who have to implement change need guidance, support and supervision, and if they do not receive this they will not be in a position to implement. The implementation of the new policy, i.e. OBE, needs well developed curriculum managers, that is, HoDs, who will manage the process of change and support educators in their implementation of the curriculum. "…the level of management that is likely to have the greatest impact on learning and teaching in the classroom is actually that of the curriculum middle managers" (Coleman et al. 2003:83). Curriculum managers are in many instances best placed to influence the sharp end of teaching and learning.

Thurlow (1997) argues that in this new schooling dispensation there are compounded problems that relate to management, and as a result schools need, more than ever before, to confront these management issues such as radically changed curricula, new conceptions of and arrangements for teaching and learning. According to Coleman et al (2003) the need to provide leadership in developing and implementing the new national curriculum at a range of different levels in the education system is one of the implicit issues in the curriculum changes in South Africa. Therefore, in order for effective implementation of the curriculum to take place there is a need for curriculum support, curriculum management and supervision. This is the responsibility of those members of the School Management Team (SMT) who are often referred to as curriculum managers.

2.4.3 Professional Development to Lead and Manage Curriculum Change

Previously the roles and responsibilities of HoDs were merely to see that the curriculum was implemented in accordance with the prescripts of the Department of Education. In other words HoDs had to see to it that the syllabus was being taught following a prescribed plan so that certain parts of it were covered within a specified time-frame. With the introduction of OBE HoDs had to undergo a paradigm shift: HoDs were unprepared to support educators and this necessitated a need for their professional development.

Professional development is a formal, systematic programme designed to promote personal and professional growth. “Professional development therefore refers to the participation of … educational leaders in developing opportunities in order to be better

equipped as …educational leaders" (Steyn and Van Niekerk, 2002:251). They go on to state that the purpose of professional development entails personal development, career development, and organizational development. Tomlinson (1997) says that professional/staff development is determined by the need to develop staff to implement externally imposed changes and to implement internal school improvement initiatives chosen by the school.

2.4.4 Professional Development Needs

OBE is a policy, and for it to be successfully managed and implemented it needs certain conditions to be met. Professional development to manage policy change is one of these. This means that those who will be managing implementation of OBE as a policy need to be professionally developed or empowered. Sayed and Jansen (2001) argue that policy failures arise out of a variety of factors, intrinsic and extrinsic. They say failure of policy implementation is largely on account of the fact that the policy in question was poorly conceived and developed, and an absence of (human) resources to supports policy implementation is an example of extrinsic causative factors of policy failure. In so far as the implementation of OBE is concerned HoDs should be conversant with not only a new approach to teaching and learning, but also with policies involved, for example, learning area policy, language policy as well as assessment policy.

HoDs as curriculum managers need to be professionally prepared /developed in order to be able to support educators in implementing the curriculum in the classrooms. This means that for HoDs to perform their roles as curriculum managers they need to undergo professional development. "…education management development is the key to transformation in education, and …management is not an end in itself but an

essential part of achieving the central goal of promoting effective teaching and learning" (Sayed and Jansen, 2001: 175).

In order to meet the need of subject heads (HoDs) to assume a stronger role as actual instructional (curriculum) leaders, there has to be change of emphasis towards professional leadership of instruction, especially with regards to planning and renewal in subject teaching, as well as professional growth. Hargreaves (1994) stresses this notion by saying that significant change in curriculum or any other domain is likely to be successful unless professional development is given attention.

Therefore, HoDs' professional development should be such that it leads towards greater professional autonomy whereby HoDs will be empowered with management strategies to increase control and accountability. If the HoDs, as curriculum managers, are not professionally developed teachers will in turn remain less or not professionally developed.

In order to play their role effectively as curriculum managers HODS need to possess specific skills and knowledge. Campbell (2001, cited by Coleman et al. 2003) suggests a combination of curriculum and interpersonal skills entail knowledge of subjects, professional skills, and professional judgments. As curriculum managers HoDs should be empowered with curriculum skills and qualities that are involved in the knowledge about the curriculum area for which he or she is responsible. The HoD should be knowledgeable in the subject or learning area, should know its conceptual structure, and must be up to date with new approaches and methodologies. Interpersonal skills (i.e. skills and qualities that arise from the relationship with colleagues and other adults) would involve social skills for external representation.

Curriculum skills need to be complemented with interpersonal skills. These are the skills and qualities that an HoD has to possess and demonstrate in his or her relationship with other colleagues and other people. In order to effectively support and manage educators HoDs need to be empowered with these interpersonal skills required for external representation. Social skills are important because the HoD "…must work with colleagues, leading discussion groups, teaching alongside colleagues, helping develop their confidence in their subjects, advising probationers, etc" (Coleman et al. 2003 : 86). The HoD must represent his or her phase or department or learning area well. Therefore he or she needs to be empowered with such skills that are required for external representation, i.e. representation to other educators outside of the school, to subject advisors, officials of the department and parents.

In addition to curriculum and interpersonal skills, HoDs should possess professional skills to perform their roles in an orderly manner in order to be able to manage and support educators in implementing OBE. Coleman et al. (2003) says that an HoD must be able to draw up a programme of work, manage its implementation, maintain it and assess its effectiveness. It is through this work programme that the HoD will effectively support and manage educators in implementing the curriculum in the classroom.

2.5 CONCLUSION

In this chapter an overview was provided of local and international literature on change, change management, curriculum change, curriculum implementation, middle management and supervision, and professional development. Also the conceptual and theoretical framework employed in this study was presented.

In the following chapter the key research questions will be presented, and the approach and technique used in this study will be described, and the rationale for the methodology used given.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter an overview was provided of local and international literature on change, change management, curriculum change, curriculum implementation, middle management and supervision, and professional development. The conceptual and theoretical framework employed in this study was also presented.

This chapter describes the research methodology that has been employed in this study. It also explains the rationale for the research design, procedural steps that were followed in: gaining access to the research site, the sample that was used, the data collection procedures, how the data will be analyzed, and the instruments of research that were used.

3.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions of this study are:-

- How do HoDs understand their roles as curriculum managers?
- How do HoDs feel about their levels of preparedness for curriculum management and supervision roles?
- What are the professional development needs of HoDs in the context of OBE implementation in schools?

3.3 RESEARCH SITE

This study was conducted at the rural primary school where the researcher is working as a principal. This school caters for Grade R to Grade 7. It consists of three phases, namely the Foundation, Intermediate, and Senior Phases. Each phase is led by a Head of Department (HoD). The school has a staff establishment of twenty six educators including the principal, the deputy principal and three Heads of Department (HoDs). This school was chosen as a research site due to it being convenient for the researcher to gain access to in order to conduct his research.

3.4 RESEARCH SAMPLE

3.4.1 Sample Selection

Because there was only one HoD per phase in the school there was no wide choice and as a result all three of the HoDs in the school were asked to participate.

The educators who were requested to participate were randomly selected from each phase.

3.4.2 Sample Size

This research was conducted among nine participants, i.e. all three HoDs and two educators under the supervision of each HoD. Two educators per phase constitute a sufficiently representative sample of each phase. In addition it is a manageable figure to work with.

3.5 RESEARCH METHODS

3.5.1 Research Design and Methods

Methods refer to a "… range of approaches used in educational research to gather data which are to be used as a basis for inference and interpretation, for explanation and prediction" (Cohen and Manion, 1994: 38).

A case study design, focusing on a single rural primary school in KwaZulu-Natal was followed. Best and Kahn (2003) state that a case study is a way of organizing social data for the purpose of viewing social reality. It examines a social unit as a whole. According to Creswell (1968, cited by De Vos, 2002) a case study design is useful because it is an in-depth exploration of a bounded system. The researcher chose to follow a case study design because it would help probe deep into the understandings of the HoDs as curriculum managers and their levels of preparedness to support educators in implementing OBE. The researcher would be able to establish generalizations about the understandings of the HoDs included in the sample.

A qualitative approach to research was chosen because it involves an interaction with (talking to) participants and observation of events as they occur. The researcher wanted to interact with HoDs and educators, and observe events as they took place. Gerber (1996) says that qualitative methodology is warm because it concerns itself with human beings, interpersonal relations, personal values, meanings, beliefs, thoughts and feelings. Qualitative research "… is multi-method in its focus, involving an interpretative naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them" (Gall et al.1996: 28).

3.5.2 Data Collection Methods and Instruments

Firstly, questionnaires (cf. Appendices 4 and 5) were used as one of the research instruments. According to Marlow (1993) questionnaires are relatively objective because there is no interviewer bias. The researcher therefore chose to use questionnaires because they are used when factual information is desired (Best and Kahn, 2003). Questionnaires were found to be very useful because respondents answered them independently giving their opinions in a relaxed atmosphere. The researcher also got the opportunity to establish rapport, explain the purpose of the study and explain the meaning of items that might need clarification. This method was also found to be time-saving because the respondents were at one place at the same time. These questionnaires were intended to elicit responses from educators as well as HoDs with regards to HoDs' understandings of their roles as curriculum managers to support educators in implementing OBE in school.

The questionnaires were distributed to HoDs and educators at school. Each questionnaire was divided into the following sections:-

- Section One contained questions aimed at collecting biographic details from participants.
- Section Two was aimed at establishing the views of educators on the preparedness of HoDs regarding their roles as curriculum managers to support educators in implementing OBE.
- Section Three was aimed at determining HoDs' own understandings of their roles and of the level of their preparedness to manage the implementation of OBE.

The second research instrument employed was the semi-structured interview (cf. Appendices C and D). Cannel and Kahn (1968, cited by Cohen and Manion, 1994) define a research interview as a two-person conversation initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research-relevant information, and focused by him/her on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction or explanation.

According to Best and Kahn (2003) the purpose of the interview is finding out what is in or on someone else's mind. The advantage of an interview "… is that it allows for greater depth than is the case with other methods of data collection" (Cohen and Manion, 1994: 272). This person to person situation allowed the researcher to get deep into what the individual interviewees had in their minds.

However, the disadvantage of interviews was when the interviewees provided the information that they thought the researcher wanted to hear. This was possibly due to the fact that the researcher is the principal of the school which was the research site. This disadvantage is confirmed by Best and Kahn (2003) when they state that too often interviewees provide information based on what they assume the interviewer wants to hear. It is for this reason and in order to ensure triangulation that the interviewer adopted a multi-mode approach to data collection.

Separate interviews were conducted with individuals. The aim of the interviews was similar that of the questionnaire. The direct source of data in this study was HoDs' understandings of their roles as curriculum managers and their levels of preparedness

to support educators implement OBE as curriculum managers. Data was collected from the three HoDs and nine educators. These interviews were conducted in a relaxed atmosphere. The length of the interview depended on the pace of the interviewee in responding to the questions.

Newman (1997) states that the interviews involve asking questions, listening, expressing interest and recording what was said. Even though the researcher had heeded the advice by Gall et al. (1996) that the interviewer needs to explain the purpose of recording carefully and to gain the confidence of the respondents, the researcher decided to abandon the intended tape-recording exercise realizing that it would cause uneasiness amongst the interviewees who might feel that that information might be used negatively elsewhere. Responses from interviewees were thus only noted down on paper.

The third research method was observation and document analysis. This method was chosen for its advantage as stated by Cohen and Manion (1994) namely that: since case study observations take place over an extended period of time, researchers can develop more intimate and informal relationships with those they are observing, generally in more natural environments than those in which experiments and surveys are conducted. Observation was conducted from June to August 2005.

The researcher analyzed documents used by HoDs and educators in the school pertaining to OBE implementation. Documents such as policy documents, learning programmes, lesson plans as well as learner assessment records were examined.

Observation of interactions between HoDs and educators during Phase and Learning Area meetings was conducted. This method proved to be useful because the researcher wanted to observe HoDs' behavior and interaction between them and educators**.**

3.6 DESIGN OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

3.6.1 Questionnaires

The questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section 1 elicited biographic details such as gender, teaching phase, the post level, age, and teaching experience of respondents.

Section 2 was subdivided into two subsections. Subsection 2.1 had questions for educators, while subsection 2.2 had questions for HoDs.

Subsection 2.1 (Questions for educators) comprised five semi-structured, open-ended questions as follows:-

- Question 2.1.1 was about the educators expectations of HoDs regarding OBE management.
- Question 2.1.2 was on the frequency of support by HoDs, and forms of support they gave.
- Question 2.1.3 was on how educators rated the extent of support from HoDs.
- Question 2.1.4 required educators' opinions on the level of preparedness of HoDs to manage and support educators in implementing OBE.
- Question 2.1.5. required educators' suggestions on professional support needed by HoDs in order to be better empowered as curriculum managers.

Subsection 2.2 (Questions for HoDs) also consisted of the following semi-structured questions :-

- Question 2.2.1 was intended to uncover HoDs' understanding/s of what constituted being prepared to manage OBE implementation.
- Question 2.2.2 required to know what the HoD does to enhance his / her level of preparedness to manage curriculum implementation.
- Question 2.2.3 was used to determine what the Department did to prepare HoDs to support educators in managing OBE implementation.
- Question 2.2.4 attempted to establish what difficulties the HoDs experienced in supporting educators and managing curriculum implementation.
- Question 2.2.5 attempted to find out from the HoDs what needed to be done to prepare HoDs to support educators better in implementing OBE.

In order to test if the questions contained in the questionnaires were suitable for eliciting the data that the researcher required, pilot questionnaires were administered to educators and HoDs who were not participants in the study, and the necessary adjustments were made accordingly.

3.6.2 Interviews

There were two sets of interview questions. The first covered interview questions for educators. These questions comprised open-ended questions. These questions were meant to probe into whether HoDs:-

- Understood their roles as curriculum managers,
- Received training exclusively for curriculum managers,

- Help educators in planning,
- Manage the implementation of OBE,
- Give feedback and support to educators,
- Are adequately empowered for their duty as curriculum managers, and
- if not, what kind of support do they need

The second set of interview questions consisted of open-ended questions for HoDs. By asking these questions it was hoped to obtain the following information:-

- what HoDs understood their roles as curriculum managers to be,
- whether HoDs were trained in OBE,
- the extent of training received by HoDs to manage OBE implementation,
- if HoDs confidently supported educators and managed OBE implementation,
- what problems the HoDs experienced as curriculum managers, and
- professional development needs of the HoDs.

3.7 DATA ANALYSIS METHODS

All data collected through questionnaires, interviews and observation was noted down in writing. The data was coded, categorized, sorted into themes and analyzed.

3.8 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

According to Babbie (1989) reliability is a matter of whether a particular technique applied repeatedly to the same object would yield the same results each time. Marlow (1998) confirms this by saying that reliability is determined by obtaining two or more measures of the same thing and seen how closely they agree. Marlow (1998) goes on

to define validity as the extent a measuring instrument measures what it is supposed to be measuring.

In order to ensure reliability and validity of the data collected, pilot questionnaires and interviews were conducted with educators and HoDs who were not part of the school that was used in this study. Triangulation occurred through the use of a variety of data collection methods such as observation, questionnaires, and interviews.

3.9 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The following are some of the possible limitations of this study:-

- The fact that it is a case study in a single rural primary school,
- The size of the sample might have been a limiting factor in this study,
- The fact that the researcher is a principal of the school where the research was conducted might have somehow affected the responses to some questions,
- The fact that the study was conducted within a specific short timeframe might have limited the depth of the researcher's observation.

In the light of these limitations the results of this study cannot be generalized to all schools. However, lessons can still be drawn from experiences of these three Heads of Departments and could assist in paving the way for further research.

3.10 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical issues were taken into account. A permission letter was obtained from the Department of Education in order for the researcher to gain access to the school.

The fact that the researcher was the principal of the school which was the research site obviated the need to write a letter requesting access from the senior management of the school.

HoDs and educators selected for participating were requested in writing to participate in this study. In the letter used, reasons for choosing them as respondents were given. It was also explained that respondents' identities would remain confidential.

Upon agreeing respondents signed letters of informed consent in which the right to withdraw from participation was guaranteed. Ethical clearance for the project was sought from and granted by the University of KwaZulu-Natal.

3.11 CONCLUSION

In this chapter the key research questions of the study were presented, and the approach and technique employed in the study was described. The rationale for the methodology used was given.

The rationale for the choice of research site was presented. It was also explained how a sample of participants was selected. The selection of the research sample was also explained. Data collection and data analysis methods and research instruments used in the study were presented. An explanation was provided on how the study had attempted to ensure the validity and reliability of data. The possible limitations of this study were also presented.

The following chapter will present the data collected through observation, questionnaires and interviews as well the data analysis and interpretation.

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to analyze and interpret the qualitative data collected through observations, questionnaires and interviews. The findings that emanate from the data analysis will then be discussed. I will analyse and summarise the data emanating from each research instrument. Each summary will be followed by a discussion of the findings that emerge.

4.2 ANALYSIS OF DOCUMENTS AND OBSERVATION

From June to August 2005 the researcher was engaged in the observation of interactions between three HoDs and six educators during phase and learning area meetings. The activities of, and interactions between the HoDs and the educators as well as documents that were used by both were observed and analysed.

4.2.1 Analysis of Observation

The purpose of the observation was to obtain information and clarity about policies, meetings, planning, recording, material resource management, management of work, contact time with learners, and the use of resources to support teaching with a view to establishing whether the HoDs understood their roles as curriculum managers as well as their level of preparedness to support educators in implementing OBE.

i. Policies

It was found that educators did not possess individual copies of the policy documents, the National Curriculum Statements, for the learning areas that they taught. Despite the fact that these policy documents were supplied by the Department for all educators in all schools, the grade educators shared one copy. The rest of the documents were neatly packed away in the HoDs' cupboards.

A uniform assessment policy did not exist. Each educator followed his/her own way of assessing the performance of learners.

ii. Planning

It was observed that most of the educators (4) did not design their own learning programmes but used handouts that they had received from their HoDs. Lesson plans including assessment standards and lesson outcomes were drawn from these handouts. It was also observed that educators sometimes came to school without having prepared lesson plans.

The last hour of the school day was set aside for planning. 4 of the 6 grade educators were observed sitting alone in their classrooms doing planning.

iii. Professional development programmes

A minority (1) of the HoDs conducted professional development programmes for educators on an on-going basis. The remaining 2 HoDs conducted professional development solely during the times featured on the school management plan.

It was observed that in the majority of cases, across the phases, educators spent up to five minutes either taking or finishing tea after the bell had sounded ending the break and before they got into their classrooms.

4.2.2 Summary and Discussion of Findings on Observation

i. Contact time with learners

As curriculum managers, it is part of the HoD's role to supervise and manage the implementation of the curriculum by educators. One of the key aspects of curriculum implementation as determined in the curriculum and/or learning area policy is contact time. Each learning area has its own non-negotiable contact time.

It was observed that in the majority of cases, across the phases, educators spent up to five minutes either taking or finishing tea after the bell had sounded ending the break and before they got into their classrooms. This practice negatively affected contact time with learners in that the contact period became shorter than that prescribed by the learning area policy. Since HoDs did not stop this practice it appeared that HoDs were not fulfilling their roles as curriculum managers.

ii. The use of resources to support teaching

It was observed that educators did not construct teaching aids or use teaching/learning aids that had been provided by the school. The reasons advanced for this included large learner numbers, Heads of Department not providing those teaching aids to educators, it was a waste of time using aids, and there were insufficient resources available for use by all the educators at the same time

iii. Meetings

During the three months of observation it appeared that some HoDs did not hold regular meetings with their teams. In this period, 2 of the 3 HoDs held meetings twice with educators. During those two meetings it was observed that educators were passive participants and HoDs dictated what was to be done, when it had to be done, and how. There was no discussion about designing learning programmes, lesson plans, and assessment.

1 of the HODs did not hold any meetings with his/her team.

The observation revealed that HoDs appeared not to understand their roles as curriculum managers as they did not supervise educators in implementing curriculum policies such as contact time nor did they appear to create sufficient professional development opportunities for educators. When meetings were held they were prescriptive, rather than empowering and developmental in nature.

4.2.3 Document Analysis

The documents that the researcher analysed were policy documents, Learning Area policies, learning programmes, lesson plans, assessment policies, assessment records, and minutes of phase and learning area meetings. The document analysis revealed the following:

i. Recording of Learner Assessment

The analysis of assessment records revealed that the majority (5) of the educators did not assess learners' performance on a continuous basis. The records were scanty and

the dates on which the assessments were conducted were far apart. 40% of the learner assessments that had been conducted were not recorded as formal assessments.

ii. Recording of Phase and Learning Area Meetings

It was observed that during certain phase and learning area meetings minutes were not taken. An analysis of the minute books revealed that there were occasions when discussions and resolutions of meetings were not recorded.

iii. Material Resource Management

Accurate school records were not maintained. An examination of the Resources Distribution and Reconciliation Registers kept by HoDs revealed that resources issued and distributed at the beginning of the year to educators were not reconciled at the end of the year. When questioned about this, the HoDs were unable to account for books that had been lost or destroyed during the year. Updated records did not exist.

Most of the other resource materials were stored in classroom corners and on top of classroom cupboards.

iv. Supervision and management of work

The educators' learning programmes, lesson plans, and assessment records did not reflect evidence of HoDs' supervision and guidance. Educators' working documents did not display evidence of written comments from HoDs, and the work was neither dated nor signed by the HoDs. It appeared that the educators perpetuated the same mistakes throughout the year.

4.2.4 Summary and Discussion of Findings on Document Analysis

The examination of the minute books revealed that HoDs did not hold regular phase or learning area meetings with their teams. This suggested that HoDs did not regularly meet with educators to give them support and feedback.

Part of an HoD's responsibility is to guide, supervise and support educators in implementing curriculum policies (Policy Handbook Document (2003). However, it appeared here that the policy document, namely the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) document was not considered by either the educators or the HoDs when planning at various levels.

Learning programmes are records of work planned for a short, medium or long term. They inform daily lesson plans. These are supposed to be designed by educators at phase meetings presided by HoDs who are supposed to lead and guide educators in this.

The analysis of educators' record books revealed that planning and recording were not done regularly and properly. Most educators, including HoDs, did not have learning programmes that they personally had designed. In addition, it appeared that educators and HoDs sometimes went to teach lessons without having prepared lesson plans.

There appeared to be an absence of educator professional development by HODs. Educators had not been workshopped by HODs about the various policies that are applicable to the phase and learning areas.

There were no learning area policies that had been drawn up by educators possibly because HoDs had not guided and led educators in this.

In addition, there was no uniform assessment policy for each phase as determined in the NCS document. Furthermore, not all educators and HoDs kept updated, accurate assessment records of learners' performances. Whilst educators ought to be guided by HoDs in this, it appeared that HoDs were not playing this role.

Material resources are very important in the implementation of OBE. For them to be readily available, proper management is required. Unavailability of material resources inhibits the implementation of the curriculum. It appeared that material resources distributed to educators were not properly managed. This was evident from an analysis of Resources distribution, and Resources' reconciliation registers. Failure by HoDs to manage material resources could be construed as part of their ill-preparedness for curriculum implementation and supervision roles and/or not understanding their roles as curriculum managers.

4.3 ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRES

The questionnaires covered biographic details of the respondents (educators and HoDs), and looked at the HoDs' understandings of their role as curriculum managers and their levels of preparedness to support educators in implementing OBE in the classrooms as well as the educators' perceptions of this.

4.3.1 Educators

4.3.1.1 Personal / biographic Details

Table 1: Gender: Educators

GENDER	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Male	1	17
Female	5	83

Analysis

Of the 6 educators selected to participate 1 was a male and 5 were females.

Table 2: Age : Educators

AGE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
31-40 years	2	33
41-50 years	3	50
51-60 years	1	17

Analysis

2 of these participants fell within the age range of 31 to 40 years. 3 educators had ages ranging from 41 to 50 years. 1 educator fell within the 51 to 60 years range.

Table 3: Teaching Experience : Educators

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
30 +	1	17
21-25 years	2	33
16-20 years	1	17
11-15 years	2	33

Analysis

These educators' teaching experiences ranged from 11 to above 30 years. 2 of them had from 11 to 15 years' experience. 1 of them had a teaching experience falling into the category of between 16 and 20 years. Another 2 fell within the 21 and 25 years' range. Another had teaching experience of 30 years and above.

4.3.1.2 Questions

Table 4: Educators' expectations of HoDs regarding the implementation of OBE.

What are your expectations of an HoD regarding the management of OBE?	No.	%
(1).Be well informed/knowledgeable	8	61
(2).Be supportive	4	31
(3).Explain new OBE structures	1	8

Analysis

8 of the respondents expected the HoD to be well informed or knowledgeable regarding the management of OBE. 4 suggested that educators expected the HoD to be supportive. 1 of the respondents suggested that educators expected the HoD to explain new OBE structures (i.e. concepts and terminology).

Table 5: Frequency of meetings and support

How often does your HoD meet with you as a team to give you support?	**No.**	**%**
(1). Once a week	1	17
(2). Once a month	1	17
(3). Twice a month	1	17
(4). Rarely	3	50

Analysis

Educators were asked this question in order to determine whether the HoDs did meet with their teams to give them support. Their responses differed markedly in that 1 said their HoDs met with them once a week. Another said that they met once a month, while yet another said they met twice a month. 3 said that they rarely met.

Table 6: Forms of Support

List the form(s) of support it takes	**No.**	**%**
(1). Guiding educators	2	33
(2). Discussion	2	33
(3).None	2	33

Analysis

Educators were asked this question in order to find out how the HoDs supported educators in their implementation of Outcomes-Based Education. 2 of the respondents said support took the form of guidance. Another 2 said that their HoDs supported them through discussion. Yet another 2 denied any kind of support from their HoDs and said that there was none.

Table 7: The extent of support received from the HoD

How would you rate the extent of support that you received from your HoD?	**No.**	**%**
(1).Very Good	1	17
(2). Good	4	66
(4).Poor	1	17

Analysis

This question was asked to determine how the educators rated the extent of support that they received from their HoDs. 1 respondent rated his/her HoDs' support as very good. 4 of the respondents, (the majority), rated their HoDs' support as good, while another 1 rated the extent of support as poor.

Table 8a: Reasons for rating the support as Very Good

Reasons	**No.**	**%**
Helpful	1	17

Analysis

1 of the respondents rated the support as very good because HoDs were helpful.

Table 8b: Reasons for rating the support as Good

Reasons	No.	%
Supportive	3	43
Approachable	3	43
Open-minded	1	14

Analysis

The majority (4) of the respondents rated the extent of support offered by the HoDs as good because HoDs were supportive, approachable and open-minded.

Table 8c: Reasons for rating the support as Poor

Reasons	No.	%
Offers no help	1	17

Analysis

1 of the respondents rated the HoDs' extent of support as poor because they offered no help.

Table 9: Preparedness of HoDs for their roles as curriculum managers

In terms of your understanding, how well were HoDs prepared for their roles as curriculum managers?	No.	%
(1).Well prepared	2	33
(2).Not well prepared	1	17
(3).Partly prepared	1	17
(4).Not prepared at all	2	33

Analysis

Educators were asked this question to establish how they felt about HoDs' level of preparedness for their roles as curriculum managers. 2 of the respondents felt that HoDs were well prepared for their roles. 1 respondent felt that HoDs were not well prepared and another stated that HoDs were partly prepared. Yet another 2 said that HoDs were not prepared at all for their roles as curriculum managers.

Table 10a: Reasons for rating of HoDs' preparedness as well prepared

Provide reasons for your answer	**No.**	**%**
Able to answer questions	2	33
Able to develop educators	2	33
Solve problems	2	33

Analysis

2 of the respondents said that HoDs were well prepared and gave as reasons the fact that they were able to answer questions, to develop educators, and that they solved educators' problems.

Table 10b: Reasons for rating of HoDs' preparedness as Not well prepared

Provide reasons for your answer	**No.**	**%**
Their training was very short	1	17

Analysis

1 of the respondents who held that his/her HoD was not well prepared cited the fact that their training was very short as a reason.

Table 10c: Reasons for rating of HoDs' preparedness as partly prepared

Provide reasons for your answer	No.	%
She is also learning with educators	1	17

Analysis

1 of the respondents claimed that HoDs were partly prepared for their roles as curriculum managers. She motivated her statement by saying that her HoD was learning and a learner alongside them.

Table 10d: Reasons for rating of HoDs' preparedness as not prepared at all

Provide reasons for your answer	No.	%
HoDs were workshopped after they were appointed	2	33
Some HoDs are against change	2	33
Others wish to maintain friendship with educators	2	33

Analysis

6 of the respondents felt that HoDs were not at all prepared for their roles as curriculum managers. They advanced the following reasons: HoDs were workshopped only after they were appointed (2), some HoDs did not accept change (2), and others did not supervise educators because they wished to maintain friendly relations with educators (2).

Table 11: Professional support required by HoDs

What professional support, do you think, your HoD requires in order to be well-prepared to support educators in implementing OBE?	No.	%
(1).Workshops/In-service training/Seminars	4	66
(2).Search for knowledge	1	17
(3).Teaching-learning support materials	1	17

Analysis

Educators were asked to give suggestions about professional support that would enable the HoDs to be well prepared to support educators in implementing OBE. 4 felt that HoDs needed to be workshopped through in-service training or seminars. 1 suggested that HoDs had to search for knowledge and yet another felt that HoDs needed to be provided with teaching-learning support materials.

Table 12: Reasons for professional support

Reasons for your answer in 2.5.1	No.	%
(1). To develop managerial skills	2	33
(2).To be resourceful	3	50
(3).To share ideas	1	17

Analysis

Educators advanced various reasons for the types of professional support that they suggested in order for HoDs to be well prepared to support them in implementing OBE. 2 cited developing managerial skills, 3 said support was required in order for them to become resourceful, and 1 advanced the sharing of ideas.

4.3.2 Summary and Discussion of Findings on Educators Questionnaires

From the biographic data it emerged that this school had a majority of female educators (5). The educators ranged in age from 31 to 40 years (2), 41 to 50 years (3) and 51 to 60 years (1). Educators possessed a mixture of teaching experience ranging from 11 to 30 years. The bulk of educators were those in the category ranging from 41 to 60 years. This meant that HoDs would have to understand that these educators, probably due to their ages and the length of service, might not easily accept curriculum change. HoDs would therefore have to work hard to motivate these senior educators. In addition, the younger educators (2) would possibly also need professional development to understand what OBE was about and what was expected in order for them to effectively implement OBE.

It appeared that educators had some expectations of HoDs. They expected an HoD to be well informed or knowledgeable, and also to be in a position to give explanations on matters pertaining to the implementation of OBE.

It appeared that HoDs rarely met with educators as teams to give them professional support. This was evident from educators' responses where 3 of the educators said HoDs rarely met with them. The remaining 3 said that they met infrequently. 1 said that they met once a week, another said once a month and yet another said twice a month. From this it appeared that HoDs did not understand that as curriculum managers they were expected to meet regularly with their staff.

The support that HoDs provided to educators was in the form of guidance, discussion, and assistance and being approachable and open-minded. It appeared that this form of support was considered good by the educators.

The educators' responses to the question about HoDs preparation for their roles as curriculum managers indicated that they felt that HoDs needed thorough training in order to better equip them for their roles as curriculum managers. Educators felt that their short period of training did not fully prepare HoDs for their roles as curriculum managers resulting in their lacking confidence about their levels of preparedness for curriculum implementation and supervisory roles. It also appeared that despite their being trained after assuming positions as curriculum managers HoDs were not adequately skilled for their roles.

HoDs' reluctance to accept change, and their wanting to maintain friendly relations with educators suggested that HoDs needed additional professional development so that they could fully understand their managerial roles and responsibilities. Educators suggested that this professional development should take the form of workshops, in-service training and seminars.

4.3.3 Heads of Departments

4.3.3.1 Personal Details

Table 13: Gender: HoDs

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Male	**1**	**33**
Female	**2**	**67**

Analysis

1 of the Heads of Department was a male, and the majority, 5 were females.

Table 14 : Age : HoDs

AGE RANGE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
31-40 years	1	33
41-50 years	1	33
51-60 years	1	33

Analysis

The Heads of Departments' ages ranged between 31 and 60 years. 1 of them fell in the 31 to 40 years range. 1 was in the 41 to 50 years category and, yet another fell into the 51 to 60 years bracket.

Table 15 : Teaching Experience : HoDs

EXPERIENCE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
26-30 years	1	33
21-25 years	1	33
6 -10 years	1	33

Analysis

The teaching experience of the Heads of Department ranged from 6 to 30 years. 1 had teaching experience of 6 to 10 years; another had teaching experience from 21 to 25 years while another's teaching experience ranged from 26 to 30 years.

4.3.3.2 Questions

Table 16: HoDs' understanding of being prepared/skilled to manage OBE implementation

What do you understand being prepared/skilled to manage OBE implementation means?	No.	%
To support educators	3	38
To develop educators	3	38
To be professionally developed	2	24

Analysis

HoDs were asked this question to elicit from them how they understood being prepared to manage OBE implementation. All the 3 HoDs understood this as meaning to support educators, and develop educators. 2 of the respondents also understood this as being professionally developed.

Table 17: Personal efforts to enhance the level of preparedness

What did you personally do to enhance the level of your preparedness ?	No.	%
Studied further	2	28
Sought information	3	44
Accepted change	2	28

Analysis

This question was asked to establish if HoDs had made any efforts to enhance their level of preparedness, and if so, what efforts had been made. 2 of them said that they

had improved themselves by studying further. 3 said that they sought information in order to enhance their level of preparedness. Another 2 said that they accepted change.

Table 18: Professional development by the Department

Did the Department prepare/skill you for supporting educators and managing OBE implementation? Explain your answer.	**No.**	**%**
Yes	2	67
No	1	33

Analysis

HoDs were asked this question to determine whether the Department did prepare/skill them to support educators and manage OBE. This question was also aimed at finding out whether or not all HoDs were subjected to the same preparation/skilling. 2 responded in the affirmative, while 1said they were not prepared by the Department.

Table 19 a: Reasons for your answer in Table 9 above

Reasons for saying "Yes"	**No.**	**%**
Attended workshops before implementing OBE	2	67
Attended management workshops	2	67

Analysis

The 2 who had replied in the affirmative said they were pre-skilled because they had attended workshops before the implementation of OBE.

Table 19 b: Reasons for your answer in Table 9 above

Reasons for saying "No"	No.	%
The Department did not prepare the Intermediate/Senior Phase HoDs	1	33

Analysis

1 of the respondents stated that they were not prepared because the Department had not trained HoDs for the Intermediate and Senior phases.

Table 20: Difficulties experienced by HoDs

List the difficulties that you experience in supporting educators and managing curriculum implementation.	No.	%
No difficulties	1	20
Educators' reluctance to accept change	3	60
Educators' complaints about learner numbers and ill-discipline	1	20

Analysis

HoDs were asked this question in order to ascertain the kinds of challenges they faced when performing their duties of supporting educators and managing the implementation of the curriculum.

1 of the HODs said that he/she found no difficulties in doing his/her work, 3 said they faced a problem with educators who were reluctant to accept change, and 1 said that he/she had to deal with complaints from educators about learner numbers and learner misconduct.

Table 21: HoDs suggestions about their professional requirements

List what you think needs to be done to prepare/skill you to support educators better in implementing OBE.	No.	%
More workshops	3	60
Support through visits by officials of the Department	2	40

Analysis

HoDs were asked to suggest what they felt would enable them to better support educators in implementing OBE. All 3 of them felt that more workshops would help them, and 2 of them further suggested that professional support by the department would improve their skills.

4.3.3.3 Summary and Discussion of Findings on HoD's Questionnaires

The biographic details revealed that there were more female than male HoDs. Their ages ranged between 30 and 60 years, and their teaching experience ranged from 6 to 30 years which meant that there was a good mix of inexperienced and experienced HoDs.

It appeared that HoDs understood being prepared /skilled to manage OBE implementation to mean being able to support and develop educators, and as being professionally developed.

HoDs engaged in personal self-development such as engaging in further studies, seeking information, and accepting change in order to enhance the level of their preparedness to fulfil their roles.

HoDs experienced problems in supporting educators and managing curriculum implementation. These problems ranged from educators' reluctance to accept change to educators complaining about high numbers of learners and learner misconduct. It also emerged that HoDs needed professional assistance in the form of more workshops and professional support by the Department.

4.3.3.4 Summary and Discussion of Findings Emerging From Questionnaires

The findings emerging from both sets of questionnaires have been summarised in terms of categories as follows:-

1 Expectations of HoDs regarding OBE implementation

While educators expected HoDs to be well informed or knowledgeable, and to be conversant in matters regarding the implementation of OBE, HoDs understood their role as being able to support and develop educators and being professionally developed.

2 Support provided by HoDs

HoDs did provide support to educators was in the form of discussion, assistance and being approachable and open-minded. However, it appeared that HoDs rarely held meetings with educators to provide professional support and guidance. This appeared to indicate that HoDs did not understand their roles as curriculum managers who were expected to meet regularly with their staff to provide professional support and guidance.

3 HoDs' levels of preparedness to be curriculum managers

Educators felt that HoDs were not well prepared for their role as curriculum managers. They attributed this ill-preparedness to the HoDs' training being of short duration.

It also emerged that HoDs themselves did not feel well prepared for curriculum management and supervision roles. They said that the Intermediate and Senior Phase HoDs had not received extensive training in OBE implementation and management and therefore experienced difficulty in dealing with educators who did not want to accept curriculum change.

4 Professional development and support required by HoDs

It appeared from the educators' responses that in order for HoDs to be suitably prepared for curriculum management and supervision they needed professional development and support in the form of in-service training workshops and seminars conducted by the Education Department.

Simalarly, HoDs felt that they required professional development in the form of more workshops and professional support being provided by the Department.

4.4 INTERVIEWS

Interviews were conducted with both educators and HoDs.

4.4.1 Analysis of Responses to Interviews

4.4.1.1 Educators' Interviews

Question: Does your HoD understand his/her role as a curriculum manager? Explain.

This question was asked to ascertain how the educators felt about their HoDs' understanding of their roles as curriculum managers. 6 of the respondents stated that HoDs understood their roles as curriculum managers. The reasons furnished for this view were that the HoDs were informative, supportive and professional. 3 felt that HoDs did not understand their roles because they offered no guidance and no support, and they were less professionally developed and less knowledgeable than the educators.

Question: Did your HoD attend separate training workshops from you? If yes, explain.

This question was asked to determine whether the HoDs had received the same training as educators or whether there had been separate workshops specifically designed for HoDs. 3 stated that their HoDs had attended separate workshops. 6 answered in the negative.

Question: Does your HoD help you in your phase planning? If yes, explain.

This question was aimed at finding out if the HoDs, as leaders and curriculum managers really performed their duties by leading, guiding and supporting their subordinates in their teams. 3 of them answered in the negative but did not explain their answer. 6 responded in the affirmative with the reasons that HoDs helped them in the phase planning meetings, and they (HoDs) also gave guidance and support when required to do so.

Question: Does your HoD manage your work regularly? If yes, explain how.

Educators were asked this question in order to detect if the HODs followed up to establish whether the educators implemented OBE in the expected way. 6 said yes, their HoD supervised their work regularly. 3 said that their HoDs did not supervise their work on a regular basis.

Question : Does your HoD regularly give you feedback and support. Explain.

This question was asked to establish whether HoDs went back or met with the educators in order to discuss their findings on the educators' work, and to provide guidance and support. 3 said that their HoDs never gave them feedback and support because in the first place they did not manage their work. 6 held that their HoDs do gave them feedback and support because they called educators to meetings to discuss their findings and provide solutions to problems which confronted educators.

Question : Do you think your HoD is well empowered to manage curriculum implementation? Explain your answer.

This question was asked in order to understand how the educators felt about the empowerment of the HoDs. 6 of the responses said that their HoD was well empowered to manage curriculum implementation. They cited the following reasons:- their HoD led planning, controlled and managed their work, gave feedback and

support, and was passionate about curriculum implementation. 3 of them stated that their HoDs were not well empowered because the HoDs, in terms of information, were just as good as educators because if the educators did not know, the HoDs too, did not know.

Question : What do you think needs to be done to empower your HoD to be able to support you in implementation?

Educators were asked this question in order to find out what they suggestions they had for the empowerment of the HoDs. There was a marked difference in their responses in that 2 said their HoD was self-sufficient and needed no further empowerment, another 2 suggested offering their HoD a more senior position, and yet another 2 said that their HoD still needed professional development. 3 said that their HoDs' empowerment might be enhanced if there were networking opportunities with other HoDs from other schools.

4.4.1.2 Summary and Discussion of Findings on Educators' Interviews

From the educators' responses it appeared that HoDs did not fully understand their roles as curriculum managers. It was revealed that HoDs did not manage or supervise educators' work regularly and did not give regular feedback and support to educators.

HoDs had not attended workshops specifically designed for curriculum managers but had attended those designed for educators. As a result HoDs were not confident about their levels of preparedness for curriculum implementation. According to educators this was evident from the fact that HoDs were less knowledgeable and less professional and hence did not and were unable to guide educators in their implementation of OBE.

4.4.1.3 HoDs' Interviews

Question : What do you understand your role as a curriculum manager to be?

This question was asked in order to find out from the HoDs themselves how they understood their roles as people who managed implementation of the curriculum. 2 of the three respondents stated that HoDs understood their role as being the professional development of educators, and as interpreting the various curriculum policies. 1 said their role was to motivate educators.

Question : Did you receive training in OBE? Explain.

HoDs were asked this question in order to ascertain whether all of them had received training in OBE. All the respondents indicated that they had received training in OBE. 2 of them said they had received this training only after the educators had already been trained and had begun implementing OBE. 1 HoD said she was trained before the rest of the HODs and educators because she had been selected as a departmental OBE facilitator.

Question : How extensive was your training in OBE? Explain.

This question was asked to find out how the HoDs felt about the duration and content of their training in OBE. All the HoDs felt that their training was too short. They said insufficient training resulted in confusion because a lot had to be done in a short span of time and at the time when they were still grappling with the problem of paradigm shift.

Question : Do you confidently support educators and manage the implementation of OBE? How do you do this?

HoDs were asked this question in order to determine whether they had confidence as managers of the curriculum. All the responses revealed that the HoDs were not confident.

Furthermore, they managed implementation of OBE differently. 1said that they managed OBE by answering educators' questions and by engaging in the professional development of educators and 2 said that they managed by controlling and supervising educators' work.

Question : Do you experience some problems in performing your role as a curriculum manager? Explain.

This question had to be asked in order to find out what were the challenges that the HoDs encountered when performing their roles as curriculum managers. All the responses indicated that HoDs did experience some difficulties performing their managerial functions. Some of the difficulties that they cited were that educators needed close control and supervision, some educators perceived Curriculum 2005 or RNCS as a replacement to OBE, some educators had a problem with paradigm shift, and there was confusion among educators as result of the cascading model of training.

Question : Suggest what you think needs to be done to professionally develop HoDs to support educators in the implementation of OBE?

This question was asked to get to know what forms of professional development the HoDs themselves identified as being necessary. 2 of the respondents felt that HoDs had to be offered opportunities to attend more training workshops, and 1 suggested that HoDs should be motivated through incentives.

4.4.1.4 Summary and Discussion of Findings on HoDs' Interviews

From the interviews with HoDs it appeared that HODs understood their role to be managing implementation of the curriculum, developing educators professionally, interpreting policies, and motivating educators.

It was also revealed that the training that the HoDs received was considered inadequate and of too short a duration. This had caused confusion amongst HoDs because much work was to be covered within a short span of time. As a result they did not fully understand their roles as curriculum managers, were not confident about supporting educators and managing curriculum implementation and they experienced difficulties performing their duties as curriculum managers.

4.4.1.5 Summary and Discussion of Findings Emerging From Interviews

The following is a summary of findings that emerged from both the educators' and HoDs' interviews. The findings have been clustered into categories.

- **HODs' understanding of their roles as curriculum managers**

Although the majority of educators felt that HoDs understood their roles as curriculum managers because they were informative, supportive and professional, others felt that HoDs did not understand their roles because they did not provide guidance and support, and were not adequately professionally developed and knowledgeable.

- **HoDs' level of empowerment and preparedness**

It was found that HoDs were not sufficiently empowered or prepared for managing curriculum implementation. Both educators and HODs shared the view that HODs were insufficiently professionally developed and less knowledgeable because inadequate training of short duration.

- **Support provided by HoDs**

While educators stated that HoDs did support them, the HoDs reported that they were not confident in the providing of support to educators and managing curriculum change.

- **HoDs' professional development needs**

Both the educators and HoDs suggested that professional development in the form of more workshops, in-service training and seminars would enhance the HoDs' level of preparedness for their roles as curriculum managers.

4.5 CONCLUSION

In this chapter the data analysis and summaries and discussion of the various findings that emerged were presented.

The key findings of the study will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter which is also the concluding chapter.

CHAPTER 5 : SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter qualitative data collected through observations, questionnaires and interviews was analyzed and interpreted. The findings that emanated from the data analysis were discussed. In this chapter the key findings will be discussed in relation to the literature review and the key research questions of the study. This will be followed by a conclusion.

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following is a summary of the findings that have emerged from the data analysis. The findings are summarised in terms of the 3 key research questions of this study.

The first research question was: How do HoDs understand their roles as curriculum managers in the context of OBE?

Although HoDs said that they understood their curriculum and supervision roles, it was found that they did not fully understand their roles as curriculum managers with regards to the implementation of OBE. Observation and document analysis revealed that policies were not developed nor properly implemented, for example HoDs did not manage the implementation of curriculum policies such as the minimum contact time,

The educators' documents did not reveal evidence of supervision and guidance from HODs. Planning was neither managed nor properly done, educators were poorly

supervised, recording of learner assessments was not done on a regular basis, minutes of meetings were not accurately recorded and material resources were poorly managed.

Educators' responses to the questionnaires and interviews revealed that they expected HoDs to be knowledgeable and supportive. However, HoDs rarely met with educators as teams to give support. While the majority of educators (4) stated that HoDs understood their roles. This view was based on the educators' perceptions of what the HOD's role was supposed to be viz. that HODs should be understanding and provide support. It did not appear to place importance on the primary role of the HOD which is to be a curriculum manager. 2 felt that HoDs did not understand their curriculum management and supervision roles.

The second research question covered HoDs' feelings about their levels of preparedness for curriculum management and supervision roles in the OBE context.

It was found that the HoDs did not consider themselves well prepared for curriculum management and supervision roles.

The majority of educators (4) expressed views that HoDs were not well prepared, partly prepared, or not prepared at all for their role. It appeared that HoDs had not attended specific workshops designed to equip curriculum managers to fulfil their responsibilities but had attended general workshops designed for educators. As a result all the HoDs interviewed expressed a lack of confidence about their levels of preparedness as curriculum managers. According to educators this was evident from the fact that HoDs were less knowledgeable and less professional and hence did not, and were unable to guide educators in their implementation of OBE.

The third research question examined the professional development needs of HoDs in the context of OBE implementation in schools.

The data revealed that HoDs required professional development in order to prepare them for their roles as curriculum managers.

Observation and data analysis revealed that HoDs needed skilling on policy issues, handling of meetings, leading and supervising planning, and material resource management.

The questionnaires and interviews revealed that educators and HODs were of the view that HoDs needed professional development including workshops, in-service training, networking or information sharing meetings and seminars. HoDs also suggested incentives as a form of motivation.

The key findings that emerged were that HoDs did not fully understand their curriculum management and supervision roles. Furthermore HODs had not undergone adequate or sufficient training to prepare them to fulfill their management and supervisory responsibilities as HODs. There was broad agreement that HoDs required professional development in the form of workshops, in-service training, networking or information sharing meetings and seminars to prepare them for their role as curriculum managers.

5.3 COMMENTS ON THE FINDINGS

As discussed in the literature review chapter, according to Human Resource Development theory, development can be seen as a process by which managers obtain

the necessary experience, skills, and attitudes to become or remain successful leaders in their organization.

HoDs, as curriculum leaders, need to be developed and empowered with the knowledge of curriculum policies so that they will be in a better position to lead and guide educators in implementing these policies.

In addition, planning is a crucial aspect of curriculum implementation. HoDs should be capacitated to manage and supervise all planning with regards to curriculum implementation.

Since the main role of HoDs is curriculum management and supervision, HoDs should be empowered with management and supervision skills. For curriculum change to take place effectively educators who implement OBE in the classrooms need to be managed and implemented.

Hargreaves (1994) says significant change in curriculum is unlikely to be successful unless serious attention is paid to professional development. For HoDs to be successful in managing the implementation of curriculum change, i.e. the implementation of OBE, they need professional development. Workshops, in-service training and seminars would enhance the HoDs' level of preparedness for their roles as curriculum managers.

5.4 CONCLUSION

This study looked at HoDs' understandings of their roles as curriculum managers and their level of preparedness to support educators in implementing OBE in the classrooms. An overview of local and international literature on managing change, curriculum,

change, curriculum implementation, middle management and supervision, and professional development. The conceptual and theoretical framework employed in the study was presented. In addition, a brief overview of the educational developments in South Africa immediately before and after 1994 was presented.

Chapter 3 described the research methodology employed in investigating the topic and in gathering and interpreting data. It presented the rationale for the research design given the purpose of the study. It also discussed procedural steps that were followed in gaining access to the research site, deciding on the participants of the study, how data was gathered and analyzed and describing the instruments of research that were used.

Chapter 4 presented the analysis and interpretation of qualitative data collected through observations, questionnaires and interviews. The findings that emanated from the data analysis were discussed. A summary of the analysis of documents and observation was presented. This was followed by a summary and discussion of analysis of findings on the questionnaires and interviews.

Chapter 5 presented a summary and discussion of the key findings of the study as well as a conclusion.

From the findings of this study it has emerged that HoDs do not understand their roles as curriculum managers and that they are not well prepared to support educators in implementing OBE in the classrooms. However, since this is a case study of one rural primary school the findings cannot be generalized to all schools. It is, however, hoped that the study has made some contribution to the general body of knowledge on this topic and can serve to provide the impetus for further research on this topic.

REFERENCES

Babbie, E.R. 1989. The Practice of Social Research. (5th edition) Belmont. Wordsworth Incorporation.

Bennet, N. 1995. Managing Professional Teachers: Middle Management in Primary and Secondary Schools. The Open University, Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Best, J.W. & Kahn, J.V. 2003. (9th edition) Research in Education.USA. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.

Bush, T. & Middlewood, D. (eds) 1997. Managing People in Education. London. PCP Ltd.

Bush, T. & Saran, R. (eds) 1996. Managing Teachers as Professionals in Schools. London. Kogan Page.

Bush,T. & West-Burnham, J. (eds) 1994. The Principles of Educational Management. University of Leicester. Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Cawood, J. & Gibbon, J. 1981. Educational Leadership: Staff Development. Pretoria. Nasou Limited.

Cohen, L. & Manion, L. 1994. (4th edition) Research Methods in Education. London and New York. Routledge.

Coleman, M., Graham-Jolly, M. & Middlewood D, (eds) 2003. Managing the Curriculum in South African Schools. London. The Commonwealth Secretariat.

Craig, H., Kraft, R.J., & Du Plessis, J. 1998. Teacher Development Making An Impact. Washington DC, ABEL.

Department of Education. 1995 (a). South African Qualifications Act. Pretoria. DoE.

Department of Education. 1995 (b). Curriculum Framework For General and Further education and training. Pretoria. DoE.

Department of Education. 1996 (a). Lifelong Learning Through A National Qualifications Framework. Pretoria. DoE.

Department of Education. 1996 (b). National Education Policy Act. Pretoria. DoE.

Department of Education. 1996 (c). South African Schools Act. Pretoria. DoE.

Department of Education. 1996 (d). Changing Management to Manage Change in Education. Pretoria. DoE.

Department of Education. 1997. Curriculum 2005: Lifelong Learning for the Twenty-first Century. Pretoria. DoE.

Department of Education.1998. Employment of Educators Act, Pretoria. DoE.

Department of Education. 1999. Education Law and. Policy Handbook. Pretoria. DoE.

Department of Education. 2000. Personnel Administration Measures. Pretoria. DoE.

Department of Education. 2003. Policy Handbook for Educators. Pretoria. DoE.

De Vos, A.S. (Ed.) 2002. Research at Grass Roots, 2nd Edition. Pretoria. Van Schaik Publishers.

Duke, D.L. 1987. School Leadership and Institutional Improvement. New York. Random House.

Eye, G.G. & Netzer, A.A.1965. Supervision of Instruction. New York. Harper and Row.

Fullan, M. 1991. Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reforms. London. The Falmer Press.

Fullan, M.G. 1992. Successful School Improvement: The Implementation Perspective and Beyond. Buckingham. Open University Press.

Fullan, M.G. 1993.Change Forces: Probing the Death of Educational Reform. London.The Falmer Press.

Gall, J.P. & Gall, M.D. 2005. Applying educational research: a practice guide. New York. Longman.

Gerber, P.D., Nel, P.S. &Van Dyk, P.S. 1992. Human Resource Management. 2nd edition. Johannesburg. Southern Book Publishers.

Gorton, R.A. 1976. School Administration: Challenge and Opportunity for Leadership. Dubuque. Brown.

Hanson, E.M. 1996. Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.

Hargreaves, A. 1994. Changing Teachers, Changing Times: Teachers' Work and Culture in the Postmodern Age. London. Cassell.

Harris, B.M. 1989. In-Service Education for Staff Development. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.

Herman, N. and Herman, W. 1994. The process of management: concepts, behavior, and practice. University of Leicester. Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Hewton, E. 1988. School Focused Staff Development. London. The Falmer Press.

Hlalele, L.R. 2001. The attitudes of township educators towards Curriculum 2005: implication for school management. (Unpublished M Ed Dissertation). Rand Afrikaans University.

Meiring, J.G. (1959). This is Christian National Education. The Black Sash, 3(21), 2-3. Retrieved August 17, 2006, from http://disa.nu.ac.za/articledisplaypage.asp/filename=BSSep59&articletitle=Christian+...
Jansen, J. & Christie, P. (eds.) 1999. Changing curriculum : Studies on Outcomes-based Education in South Africa. Kenwyn. Juta and Co. Ltd.

Kraak, A.1998. Competing education and training policies: a systematic versus unit standards approach. Pretoria. Human Science Research Council.

Lumby, J., Middlewood, D. & Kaabwe, E. (eds.) 2003. Managing Human Resources in South African Schools. London. Commonwealth Secretariat.

Makhanya, M.M. 2003. The role of the members of the school management team in the management of curriculum change. (Unpublished M Ed Dissertation). University of Zululand.

Marlow, C. 1993. Research Methods for Generalist Social Work: 2nd Ed. Pacific Grove. Brooks/Cole Publishers.

Marlow, C. 1998. Research Methods for Generalist Social Work: 3rd Ed. Pacific Grove. Brooks/Cole Publishers.

Mathula, K.M. 2002. School district management of the implementation of curriculum change. (Unpublished M Phil Dissertation). University of Pretoria.

Morrison, K. 1998. Management Theories for Educational Change. London. Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Ornstein, A.C. & Hunkins, F.P. 1988. Implementing Curriculum Changes-Guidelines for Principals. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.

Ornstein, A.C. & Hunkins, F. 1993. Curriculum Foundations, Principles and Theory. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.

Riches, C. & Morgan, C. 1989. Human Resource Management in Education. Philadelphia. Open University Press.

Rudduck, J. 1991. Innovation and Change: Developing Involvement and Understanding. Philadelphia. Open University Press.

Sayed, Y. & Jansen, J. 2001. Implementing Educational Policies: The South African Experience. Cape Town. Juta Academic.

Senge, P. 1993. The Fifth Discipline. London. Century Business.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Starratt, R.T. 1988. Supervision: Human Perspective 4th edition. New York. McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Spady, W.G. & Marshall, K.J. 1991. Beyond Traditional Outcomes-Based Education. New York. Longman.

Steyn, G.M. & Van Niekerk, E.J. 2002. Human Resource Management in Education. Pretoria. Unisa Press.

Thurlow, M. 1997. Evaluation for Development: The potentiality of school development planning in Journal of educational evaluation, Vol 5, pp 49-55.

Tomlinson, H.(ed) 1997. Managing Continuing Professional development in Schools. London.Paul Chapman.

Van Dyk, P.S., Nel, P.S., Van Z. Loedlff & Haasbroek, G.D. 2001. Training Management: A multidisciplinary approach to human resource development in Southern Africa. Cape Town. Oxford University Press.

Virgilio, S.J. & Virgilio, I.R. 1984. The Role of the Principal in Curriculum Implementation. Education, 104(4): 346-350. Summer.

APPENDIX 1

INFORMED CONSENT AND APPROVAL FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION (MANAGEMENT)

Dear Sir

I am currently engaged in research towards a Masters in Education dissertation at the University of KwaZulu-Natal under the supervision of Mrs Maggie Govender. My research is a case study investigating Heads of Departments' understanding of their roles and preparedness to support educators in implementing Outcomes-based education at a rural primary school. Ethical clearance for the research project has been obtained from the University of KwaZulu-Natal.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All information obtained in the course of the research will be treated as confidential and no personal details of any respondent will be mentioned in the findings of the research.

SUPERVISOR'S DETAILS

Ms M. Govender

School of Education and Development

Faculty of Education

Edgewood Campus

University of KwaZulu-Natal

Govenderm44@ukzn.ac.za

031-2603461

Yours sincerely

Sihle Daniel Mthokoziseni Mbhele

Tel. No. : 0824437699

sdmbh@telkomsa.net

APPENDIX 2

Dear Colleague

I am currently engaged in a research for my Masters in Education dissertation at the University of KwaZulu-Natal under the supervision of Mrs Maggie Govender. My research is a case study of three Heads of Departments' understandings of their roles and preparedness to support educators in implementing Outcomes-based education at a rural primary school.

CONFIDENTIALITY

I would appreciate your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire.

All information will be treated as confidential and no personal details of any respondent will be mentioned in the findings of the research.

Yours sincerely

Sihle Daniel Mthokoziseni Mbhele

Tel. No. 0824437699

APPENDIX 3

INFORMED CONSENT FORM SIGNED BY PARTICIPANT

I……..... (full names of participant) hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participating in the research project.

I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time, should I so desire.

SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT DATE

……..……

APPENDIX 4

EDUCATORS' QUESTIONNAIRES

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE RESPONDENTS

Kindly take your time reading each question before answering.

Please answer all questions.

Please give your honest opinion.

Please do not discuss your responses with anyone.

Please return the questionnaire after completion.

PLEASE, ANSWER THE QUESTIONS BY INSERTING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BLOCK WHERE APPLICABLE.

1 BIOGRAPHIC DETAILS

1.1 GENDER

1.1.1	Male	
1.1.2	Female	

1.2 PHASE

1.2.1	FOUNDATION	
1.2.2	INTERMEDIATE	
1.2.3	SENIOR	

1.3 POST LEVEL

1.3.1	EDUCATOR	
1.3.2	HOD	

1.4 AGE

1.4.1	21-30 years	
1.4.2	31-40 years	
1.4.3	41-50 years	
1.4.4	51-60 years	
1.4.5	60 years +	

1. 5 The total number of years of teaching experience as at 01 January 2005

7	30+	
6	26-30	
5	21-25	
4	16-20	
3	11-15	
2	6-10	
1	0-5	

2 QUESTIONS

2.1 What are your expectations of an HOD regarding the management of OBE?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.2 How often does your HOD meet with you as a team to give you support?

2.2.1	Daily	
2.2.2	Once a week	
2.2.3	Once a month	
2.2.4	Twice a month	
2.2.5	Rarely	
2.2.6	Never	

2.2.7 List the form/s that the support takes.

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.3 How would you rate the extent of support that you receive from your HOD?

2.3.1	Very Good	
2.3.2	Good	
2.3.3	Satisfactory	
2.3.4	Poor	
2.3.5	Other	

2.3.6 Give reasons for your choice

_____
_____
_____
_____

2.4.1 In terms of your understanding, how well were HODs prepared for their roles as curriculum managers?

2.4.1.1	Well prepared	
2.4.1.2	Not well prepared	
2.4.1.3	Partly prepared	
2.4.1.4	Not prepared at all	

2.4.2 Provide reasons for your answer.

_____
_____
_____
_____

2.5.1 What professional support, do you think, your HOD requires in order to be well-prepared to support educators in implementing OBE?

_____
_____
_____

2.5.2 Provide reasons for your answer in 2.5.1

_____
_____
_____
_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

APPENDIX 5

HODs' QUESTIONNAIRES

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE RESPONDENTS

Kindly take your time reading each question before answering.

Please answer all questions.

Please give your honest opinion.

Please do not discuss your responses with anyone.

Please return the questionnaire after completion.

PLEASE, ANSWER THE QUESTIONS BY INSERTING A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BLOCK WHERE APPLICABLE.

1 BIOGRAPHIC DETAILS

1.1 GENDER

1.1.1	Male	
1.1.2	Female	

1.2 PHASE

1.2.1	FOUNDATION	
1.2.2	INTERMEDIATE	
1.2.3	SENIOR	

1.3 POST LEVEL

1.3.1	EDUCATOR	
1.3.2	HOD	

1.4 AGE

1.4.1	21-30 years	
1.4.2	31-40 years	
1.4.3	41-50 years	
1.4.4	51-60 years	
1.4.5	60 years +	

1.5 The total number of years of teaching experience as at 01 January 2005

7	30+	
6	26-30	
5	21-25	
4	16-20	
3	11-15	
2	6-10	
1	0-5	

2 QUESTIONS

2.1 What do you understand being prepared / skilled to manage OBE implementation means?

_____
_____
_____

2.2 What did you personally do to enhance the level of your preparedness?

_____
_____
_____
_____

2.3.1 Did the Department prepare/skill you for supporting educators and managing OBE implementation? Explain your answer.

YES	
NO	

_____
_____
_____

2.3.2 Explain your answer in 2.3.1

_____
_____
_____

2.4 List the difficulties that you experience in supporting educators and managing curriculum implementation?

_____
_____
_____
_____

2.5 List what you think needs to be done to prepare/skill you to support educators better in implementing OBE?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

APPENDIX 6

EDUCATORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Does your HoD understand his /her role as a curriculum manager? Explain.
2. Did your HoD receive separate re-training workshops from those that you received? If yes, explain.
3. Does your HoD help you in your phase planning? If yes, explain how.
4. Does your HoD manage your work regularly? If yes, explain how.
5. Does your HoD regularly give you feedback and support? Explain.
6. Do you think your HoD is well empowered to manage curriculum implementation? Expain your answer.
7. What do you think needs to be done to empower your HoD to be able to support you in curriculum implementation?

APPENDIX 7

HODS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What do you understand your role as a curriculum manager to be?
2. How extensive was your re-training workshop in OBE?
3. Do you confidently support educators in their implementation of OBE? How do you do this?
4. Do you experience some problems in performing your role as a curriculum manager? Explain.
5. Suggest what you think needs to be done to professionally develop HODs to support educators in implementing OBE.