

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adesina, O. Jimi (2003). NEPAD and the challenge of Africa's development: towards the political economy of a discourse. Unpublished paper. Department of Sociology, Rhodes University, Grahamstown.
- African National Congress (ANC) (1994/2004). *A policy framework for education and training*. Special 10th Anniversary Reprint. Johannesburg: Centre for Education Policy Development.
- Archer, M.S. (1979). *Social origins of education systems*. University edition. London: Sage.
- Ball, S.J. (1994). *Education reform: a critical and post- structural approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Behr, A.L. (1988). *Education in South Africa. origins, issues and trends:1652-1988*. South Africa : Academica.
- Biennen, H. *et al.* (1990). Decentralisation in Nepal. *World Development*, 18(1):61-75.
- Bjork, C. (2003). Local responses to decentralisation policy in Indonesia. *Comparative Education Review*, 47(2):184-216.
- Bollen, R. (1996). School effectiveness and school improvement: the intellectual and policy context. In *Making good schools: linking school effectiveness and school improvement*, edited by Reynolds, *et al.* London: Routledge.
- Bray, M (1985). Decentralisation and equality of educational opportunity in Papua New Guinea. In *The control of education: international perspectives on the centralisation-decentralisation debate*, edited by J. Lauglo and M. McLean. London. Heinemann Education Books.
- Broadfoot, P. (1985). Towards conformity: educational control and the growth of corporate management in England and France. In *The control of education: international perspectives on the centralisation-decentralisation debate*, edited by J. Lauglo and M. McLean.. London: Heinemann Education Books.
- Buckland, P. and De Wee, K. (1996). Education districts: the South African context. In *Local/district governance in education: lessons for South Africa*, edited by C. Coombe and J. Godden. Johannesburg: Centre for Education Policy Development.

- Buckland, P. and Hofmeyr, J. (1992). *The governance of education in South Africa; A working paper*. Version 13 of 2 April 1992. Johannesburg: EDUPOL.
- Buckland, P. and Hofmeyr, J. (1993). Education governance in South Africa. *EDUPOL Resource Document Series*, 1(1).
- Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. (1992). *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*. Vermont: Ashgate.
- Caldwell, B.J. and Spinks, M.J. (1992). *Leading the self-managing school*. London: Falmer.
- Carron, G. and De Grauwe, A. (1997). *Current issues in supervision: a literature review*. International Institute for Educational Planning. Paris. UNESCO.
- Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD) (2001). Evaluating the implementation of outcomes-based education in the Gauteng province: district support. Report commissioned by the Gauteng Institute for Education Development.
- Chau, T. (1985). Equity and the decentralisation question. In *The control of education: international perspectives on the centralisation-decentralisation debate*, edited by J. Lauglo and M. McLean. London. Heinemann Education Books.
- Cheema, G.S. and Rondinelli, D.A. (eds.) (1983). *Decentralisation and development*. United Nations Centre for Regional Development. California: Sage.
- Chinsamy, B. (1999). The education district in South Africa: A nexus for school improvement. Unpublished internal paper, District Development Support Programme.
- Chinsamy, B. (2000). Successful school improvement and the educational district office in South Africa: some emerging propositions. Unpublished internal paper, District Development Support Programme.
- Cohen, K.D. and Spillane, P.J. (1993). Policy and practice: the relations between governance and instruction. In *Designing coherent education policy: improving the system*, edited by H.S. Fuhrman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coleman, P. and Larocque, L. (1990). *Struggling to be good enough: administrative practices and school district ethos*. United States: Falmer.
- Conyers, D. (1984). Decentralisation and development: a review of the literature. *Public administration and development*, 4:187-97.
- Coombe, C. and Godden, J. (1996). *Local/district governance in education: lessons for South Africa*. Johannesburg: Centre for Education Policy Development.
- Creswell, J.W. and Miller, D.L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3).
- Dalin, P. et al. (1994). *How schools improve: an international report*. London. IMTEC.

- De Clerq, F. (2001). School development work in South African education: the strategic challenges of districts. Paper presented at the ICSEI Conference, Toronto, January.
- De Clerq, F. (2002a). Decentralisation of authority to districts: development and/or control? Unpublished paper, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- De Clerq, F. (2002b). Education policy implementation and the bureaucratic struggle for efficiency, equity, quality and democracy. *Journal of Education*, Vol. 27: 81 - 102
- De Grauwe, A. (2000). Supervision and support services in five Asian countries: a comparative analysis. In *Improving school efficiency: the Asian experience-Antriep report*. International Institute for Educational Planning. Paris: UNESCO.
- De Grauwe, A. and Varghese, N. (2000). Improving school efficiency: issues and priorities. In *Improving school efficiency: the Asian experience-Antriep report*. International Institute for Educational Planning. Paris: UNESCO.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1995a). *The white paper on education and training*. Notice 196 of 1995. Pretoria. Department of Education.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1995b). *Report of the committee to review the organisation, governance and funding of schools*. Pretoria. Department of Education.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1995c). *HEDCOM minutes 1995*. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1996). *Record of HEDCOM decisions*. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1997). *Collected minutes of HEDCOM meetings*. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1998). *Summary of HEDCOM decisions*. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1999a). *Minutes of the 56th meeting of heads of education departments held on 16 August 1999*. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1999b). *Minutes of the 58th meeting of heads of education departments held on 8 November 1999*. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1999c). *Minutes of the 59th meeting of heads of education departments held on 13 December 1999*. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1999d). *Quality assurance audit. phases 1 and 2*. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Department of Education (DoE) (1999e). *Quality assurance indicator project*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education (DoE) (2000). *Report of the national & provincial district development conferences, 1999/2000*. Directorate: Policy Support. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education (DoE) (2001a). National Education Policy Act (27/1996): Policy on Whole School Evaluation. Government Notice 695. *Government Gazette*, No. 22512.

Department of Education (DoE) (2001b). National Education Policy Act (27/1996): Education White Paper 5 on Early Childhood Development. Government Notice 1043. *Government Gazette*, No. 22756.

Department of Education (DoE) (2001c). *National Education Policy Act (27/1996): Education White Paper 6, Policy on Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive Education*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Department of Education (DoE) 3(2003a). Education districts at a glance: a report of the current status of education districts. Draft paper. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education (DoE) (2003b). *The role, power and function of districts in the education system. volume 1: literature case studies*. Report prepared by Palmer Development Consulting and the Catholic Institute of Education. Pretoria. Department of Education.

Department of Education (DoE) (2004). *Review of school governance: South African public schools. report of the Ministerial Review Committee on School Governance*. Pretoria. Department of Education.

Department of Education (DoE) (2005). *Strategic plan - statement of policy and commitment by the Minister of Education*. Pretoria. Department of Education.

Department of Health (DoH) (1997). *White paper for the transformation of the health system in South Africa*. Pretoria. Department of Health.

Department of Health (DoH) (2001). *The district health system in South Africa: progress made and next steps*. Pretoria: Department of Health.

Department of National Education (DNE) (1992). *Education renewal strategy*. Pretoria. Department of National Education.

Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG) (2003). *Framework for the assignment of powers and functions. Discussion document: towards the development of a policy framework for the assignment of powers and functions to local government*. Pretoria: DPLG.

Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) (2001). Public service regulations. *Regulations Gazette*, 427(21951).

Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA) (1993). *Centralised and decentralised models of education: comparative studies*. Centre for Policy Analysis. Policy Working Paper Number 1. Johannesburg: DBSA.

District Development Support Programme (DDSP). (2003). *Improving the quality of primary education: good practices and emerging models of district development*. Pretoria. USAID.

Dittmar, F., Mendelsohn, J. and Ward, V. (2002). *The school cluster system in Namibia: framework for quality education*. Windhoek: Research and Information Services of Namibia.

Dyer, C. (1999). Researching the implementation of educational policy: a backward mapping approach. *Comparative Education*, 35(1):45-62.

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) (2005a). Investigation to address post provisioning challenges for the Education Labour Relations Council. Draft report.

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) (2005b). Educator workload in South Africa. Draft report.

Elmore, R.F. (1993a). School decentralisation: who gains? who loses? In *Decentralisation and school improvement: can we fulfil the promise?*, edited by J. Hannaway and M. Carnoy. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.

Elmore, R.F. (1993b). The role of local school districts in instructional improvement. In *Designing coherent education policy: improving the system*, edited by H.S. Fuhrman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elmore, R.F., Abelman, C.H. and Fuhrman, S.H. (1996). The new accountability in state education reform: from process to performance. In *Holding schools accountable: performance-based reform in education*, edited by H.F. Ladd. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution

Fiske, E.B. (1996). *Decentralisation in education: politics and consensus*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Fiske, E.B. and Ladd, H.F. (2004). *Elusive equity: education reform in post-apartheid South Africa*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.

Fleisch, B.D. (2002a). *Managing educational change: the state and school reform in South Africa*. Sandown: Heinemann.

Fleisch, B.D. (2002b). What works in education district development: lessons from the field. Discussion paper presented at the District Development Seminar, Johannesburg, 25 July.

Fuhrman, H.S. (1993a). The politics of coherence. In *Designing coherent education policy: improving the system*, edited by H.S. Fuhrman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fuhrman, H.S. (ed.) (1993b). *Designing coherent education policy: improving the system*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (1998). The meaning of educational change: a quarter of a century of learning. *International handbook of educational change: part 1* (Pages 281-294). The Hague: Kluwer Academic.

Fullan, M. and Watson, N. (2000). School-based management: reconceptualising to improve learning outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11(4):453-73.

Gauteng Department of Education (GDE) (2001). *Regulations on the Gauteng Education and Training Council, Specialist Advisory Councils and Local Education and Training Units*. Regulation Number 4430 of 2001. Johannesburg: Gauteng Department of Education.

Gauteng Department of Education (GDE) (2005). *Approved macro organisation for the GDE*. Johannesburg. Gauteng Department of Education.

Gauteng Provincial Government (GPG) (1995). *School Education Act (Gauteng) of 1995. Act Number 6 of 1995*. Johannesburg. Gauteng Provincial Government.

Gauteng Provincial Government (GPG) (2003). *Gauteng Provincial Government. Education Department. Annual Report 2002/2003*. Johannesburg. Gauteng Provincial Government.

Gauteng Provincial Government (GPG) (2004). *Gauteng Provincial Government. Education Department. Annual Report 2003/2004*. Johannesburg. Gauteng Provincial Government.

Godden, J. (1996). Issues in devolving responsibility for education to local/district level. In *Local/district governance in education: lessons for South Africa*, edited by C. Coombe and J. Godden. Johannesburg: Centre for Education Policy Development.

Godden, J. and Maurice, C. (2000). Challenges facing districts in the Eastern Cape. In *Report of the national and provincial district development conferences, 1999/2000*, compiled by the Department of Education. Pretoria. Department of Education.

Govinda, R. (ed.) (1997). *Decentralisation of educational management: experiences from South Asia*. Paris. International Institute for Educational Planning.

Grant-Lewis S. and Motala S. (2004). Educational de/centralisation and the quest for equity, democracy and quality. In Chisholm L. (Editor). *Changing Class: Education and social change in post-apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town. HSRC Press.

Hannaway, J. and Carnoy, M. (eds.). (1993). *Decentralisation and school improvement: can we fulfil the promise?* San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.

Hanson, M.E. (2000). *Educational decentralisation around the Pacific Rim*. Online. Available url: <http://www.worldbank.org/education/globaleducationreform/pdf/Hanson>

Hargreaves, A. (1998). Pushing the boundaries of educational change. *International handbook of educational change: part 1* (Pages 281-294). The Hague: Kluwer Academic.

- Harris, K. (1994). Mill, the state, and local management of schooling. *Journal of philosophy of education*, 28(1):55-63.
- Hartshorne, K. (1992). *Crisis and challenge: black education 1910-1990*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hess, F. (1999). *Spinning wheels: the politics of urban school reform*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.
- Hopkins, D. and Lagerweij, N. (1996). The school improvement knowledge base. In *Making good schools: linking school effectiveness and school improvement*, edited by Reynolds D., Bollen R., Creemers B., Hopkins D., Stoll I., Lagerweij, N. London: Routledge.
- Huque, A.S. (1986). The illusion of decentralisation: local administration in Bangladesh. *International review of administrative sciences*, 52:79-95.
- Hurst, P. (1985). Decentralisation: panacea or red herring. In *The control of education: international perspectives on the centralisation-decentralisation debate*, edited by J. Lauglo and M. McLean. London. Heinemann Education Books.
- Jansen, J.D. (2002a). Political symbolism as policy craft: explaining non-reform in South African education after apartheid. *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(2):199-215.
- Jansen, J. D. (2002b). On the relationship between accountability and support. In *Balancing support and accountability to improve school performance: national consultation on school development*, edited by JET Education Services. Johannesburg. JET Education Services.
- JET Education Services (ed.) (2002). *Balancing support and accountability to improve school performance: national consultation on school development*. Johannesburg. JET Education Services.
- Karlsson, J. (1994). Decentralisation of education: international experience and its lessons for South Africa. *Education Monitor*, 5(2).
- Karlsson, J., Pampallis, J. and Sithole, S. (1996). *Restructuring educational governance at sub-national levels in South Africa*. Durban: Education Policy Unit, University of Natal.
- Karlsson, J., McPherson, G. and Pampallis, J. (2001). A critical examination of the development of school governance policy and its implications for achieving equity. In *Education equity: the impact of state policies on South African education*, edited by E. Motala and J. Pampallis. Johannesburg: Heinemann.
- Krige, D. (1998). The educational implications of the new provinces. In *Regionalism in the new South Africa*, edited by M. Khosa and Y. Muthien. London: Ashgate.

- Kruss, G. (1997). Educational restructuring in South Africa at provincial level: the case of the Western Cape. In *Education after apartheid*, edited by P. Kallaway *et al.*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Ladd, H.F. (ed.) (1996). *Holding schools accountable: performance-based reform in education*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.
- Lauglo, J. (1995). Forms of decentralisation and their implications for education. *Comparative Education*, 31(1):5-29.
- Lauglo, J. and McLean, M. (1985). *The control of education: international perspectives on the centralisation-decentralisation debate*. London. Heinemann Education Books.
- Levin, B. (2001). Conceptualising the process of education reform from an international perspective. *Education policy analysis archives*, 9(14).
- Litvack, J., Ahmad, J. and Bird, R. (1998). *Rethinking decentralisation in developing countries*. New York: World Bank.
- Lusi, F.S. (1997). *The role of state departments of education in complex school reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lyons, R. (1985). Decentralised education planning: is it a contradiction? In *The control of education: international perspectives on the centralisation-decentralisation debate*, edited by J. Lauglo and M. McLean. London. Heinemann Education Books.
- Malcolm, C. (1999). Districts and the management of educational change. Report commissioned by the National Centre for Curriculum Research and Development, Department of Education, Pretoria. RADMASTE Centre, University of the Witwatersrand.
- Malen, B. and Knapp, M. (1997). Rethinking the multiple perspectives approach to education policy analysis: implications for policy-practice connections. *Journal of education policy*, 12(5):419-45..
- Manganyi, N.C. (2001). Public policy and the transformation of education in South Africa. In *Implementing education policies: the South African experience*, edited by Y. Sayed and J. Jansen. Cape Town. UCT Press.
- Mangelsdorf, K.R. (1988). Administrative decentralisation and development: some conflicting evidence from Ecuador. *International review of administrative sciences*, 54:67-88.
- McGinn, N. and Street, S. (1986). Educational decentralisation: weak state or strong state. *Comparative education review*, 30(4):471-90.
- McLaughlin, M.W. (1998). Listening and learning from the field: tales of policy implementation and situated practice. *International handbook of educational change: Part I* (Pages 281-294). The Hague: Kluwer Academic Publishers..

- McLennan, A (2000). Education governance and management in South Africa. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Liverpool, England.
- Meiring, D. (1998). The provincialisation of education functions: from rationalisation to mopping up. In *Regionalism in the new South Africa*, edited by M. Khosa and Y. Muthien. London: Ashgate.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, B.M. and Huberman, M. (2002). *The qualitative researcher's companion*. California: Sage.
- Motala, E. and Pampallis, J. (eds) (2001). *Education and equity: the impact of state policies on South African education*. Johannesburg: Heinemann.
- Mphahlele, L. (1999). District development: what the research says (Part 1). In: *Education reform: a critical and post-structural approach*, edited by S.J. Ball. Buckingham. Open University Press.
- Mtafiti, M. (1999). Untitled. *African Researcher*, 5:2-8.
- Naidoo, J.P. (2002). Education decentralisation in Sub-Saharan Africa – espoused theories and theories in use. Paper presented to the Franco-South African conference of education and decentralisation: African experiences and comparative analyses. South Africa, 10-14 June.
- National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) (1992). *Governance and administration: report of the NEPI governance and administration research group*. A project of the National Education Co-ordinating Committee (NECC). Cape Town. Oxford University Press.
- Nieuwenhuis, F.J. et al. (1994). *Local governance models for education*. Pretoria. Human Sciences Research Council.
- O'Day, A.J. and Smith, S.M. (1993). Systemic reform and educational opportunity. In *Designing coherent education policy: improving the system*, edited by H.S. Fuhrman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Oldfield, S. (2001). The South African state in transition: a question of form, function and fragmentation. In *Education and Equity*, edited by E. Motala and J. Pampallis. Johannesburg: Heinemann.
- Olivera, C.E. (1984). *The role of the school inspectorate in plan implementation: a systemic approach*. Paris. International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO.
- Pampallis, J. (2002). The nature of education decentralisation in South Africa. Paper presented at the Franco-South African conference on education and decentralisation: African experiences and comparative analyses. South Africa, 10-4 June.

- Patel, F. (2002). 'Putting our money where our mouth lies' – norms and standards for school funding in South Africa – empowered decentralisation! Paper presented at the International Conference on Education and Decentralisation: African Experiences and Comparative Analysis, 10-14 June.
- Prawda, J. (1992). *Educational decentralisation in Latin America: lessons learned. A view from LATHR*. Washington: World Bank.
- Prew, M. (2003). Transformation and development of marginalised schools in South Africa: a school and district development model. Unpublished PhD thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Exeter, England.
- Prud'homme, R. (1994). *On the dangers of decentralisation*. Policy research working paper 1252. Washington: World Bank.
- Psacharopoulos, G. (1990). *Why education policies can fail: an overview of selected African experiences*. World Bank Discussion Papers. Africa Technical Department Series. No. 82. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Reimers, F. and McGinn, N. (1997). *Informed dialogue: using research to shape education policy around the world*. Westport CT: Praeger.
- Rensburg, I. (2000). Opening address presented at the district development conference held in 1999/2000. In *Report of the national and provincial district development conferences, 1999/2000, compiled by the Department of Education*. Pretoria. Department of Education
- Republic of South Africa (RSA) (1993). *The Interim Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Online. Available url: <http://www.info.gov.za/documents/constitution/93cons.htm>. Accessed 8 April 2005.
- Republic South Africa (RSA) (1994). Public Service Act, 1994 (Proclamation 103 of 1994). *Government Gazette*, No. 15791, 3 June.
- Republic of South Africa (RSA) (1996a). National Education Policy Act, 1996 (Act 27 of 1996). *Government Gazette*, No. 17118, 24 April.
- Republic of South Africa (RSA) (1996b). *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Act 108 of 1996.
- Republic South Africa (RSA) (1996c). South African Schools Act, 1996 (Act no. 84 of 1996). *Government Gazette*, 377(17579), 15 November.
- Republic of South Africa (RSA) (1998). Employment of Educators Act (Act No. 76 of 1998). *Government Gazette*, 400(19320). 2 October.
- Republic South Africa (RSA) (2004). National Health Act, 2003 (Act No. 61 of 2003). *Government Gazette*, No. 26595, 23 July.

- Reynolds, D., Bollen, R., Creemers, B., Hopkins, D., Stoll, L and Lagerweij, N. (1996). *Making good schools: linking school effectiveness and school improvement*. London: Routledge.
- Roberts, J. (2001). District development - the new hope for educational reform. Paper presented at a conference of the Development Support Programme (DDSP), Research Triangle Institute, Johannesburg, 2001.
- Rondinelli, A.D. *et al.* (1989). Analysing decentralisation policies in developing countries: a political-economy framework. *Development and change*, 20(1):57-87.
- Samoff, J. (1990). Decentralisation: the politics of interventionism. *Development and change*, 21(3):513-30..
- Sayed, M.Y. (1995). Educational policy developments in South Africa, 1990 – 1994: a critical examination of the policy of education decentralisation with specific reference to the concepts of decentralisation, participation and power. Unpublished PhD thesis, Faculty of Social Sciences, School of Education, University of Bristol, England.
- Sayed, M.Y. (2001). Post-apartheid educational transformation: policy concerns and approaches. In *Implementing Education Policies: The South African Experience*, edited by Y. Sayed and J. Jansen. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Sayed, M.Y. and Soudien, C. (2003). Decentralisation and the construction of inclusion education policy in South Africa. Unpublished paper, University of Cape Town.
- Schofield, J.W. (2002). Increasing the generalisability of qualitative research. In *The qualitative researcher's companion*, edited by B.M. Miles and M. Huberman. California: Sage.
- Simkins, T. (2000). Education reform and managerialism: comparing the experience of schools and colleges. *Journal of education policy*, 15(3):317-32.
- Slavin, E.R. and Fashola, S.O. (1998). *Show me the evidence: proven and promising programs for America's schools*. California: Corwin.
- Smylie, A.M. and Perry, S.G. Jr (1998). Restructuring schools for improving teaching. *International handbook of educational change: Part 2* (Pages 976-1005). The Hague: Kluwer Academic.
- Spillane, P.J. and Thompson, C.L. (1997). Reconstructing conceptions of local capacity: the local education agency's capacity for ambitious instructional reform. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 19(2):185-202.
- Sutton, M. and Levinson, B.A.U. (2001). *Policy as practice: towards a comparative sociocultural analysis of educational policy*. Westport: Ablex.
- Taylor, A., Neu, D. and Peters, F. (2002). Technocratic control and financial governance. *Educational management and administration*, 30(4):469-86.

- Taylor, N., Muller, J. and Vinjevold, P. (2003). *Getting schools working: research and systemic school reform in South Africa*. Cape Town. Pearson Education South Africa.
- Tshoane, M. (2000). The role of Gauteng districts in improving the quality of education: 1994-1998. Unpublished MA thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Tyack, D. (1993). School governance in the United States: historical puzzles and anomalies. In *Decentralisation and school improvement: can we fulfil the promise?* Edited by J. Hannaway and M. Carnoy. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.
- Vulliamy, G., Lewin, K. Stephens, D. (1990). *Doing educational research in developing countries*. London: Falmer.
- Weiler, H.N. (1993). Control versus legitimation: the politics of ambivalence. In *Decentralisation and school improvement: can we fulfil the promise?* Edited by J. Hannaway and M. Carnoy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilcox, B. (2000). Making school inspection visits more effective: The English experience. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning/UNESCO.
- Winkler, D.R. (1993). Fiscal decentralisation and accountability in education: experiences in four countries. In *Decentralisation and school improvement: can we fulfil the promise?* Edited by J. Hannaway and M. Carnoy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yin, K.R. (2003). *Case study research: design and methods*. Third edition. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Volume 5. California: Sage.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: List of respondents***A1.1 Individual and focus group interviews conducted for the study***

No	Date	Name of Person or Group	Organisation/post
1.	27 January 2004	Eben Boshoff	DoE: Legal Services Department
2.	28 January 2004	Leps Mphahlele	DoE: Former DDP staff member
3.	24 February 2005	Trevor Coombe	DoE: Former Deputy Director-General
4.	15 March 2005	Dirk Meiring	DoE: Former Deputy Director-General
5.	15 April 2005	Chabani Manganyi	DoE: Former Director-General
6.	2 March 2004	Thulas Nxesi	National General Secretary: SADTU
7.	16 February 2004	Sue Muller	Director: NAPTOSA
8.	22 January 2004	Professor Hugh Davies	Chief Executive Officer: SAOU
9.	11 February 2004	Kathy Callaghan	National Secretary: FEDSAS
10.	29 January 2004	Vusi Zwane	Provincial Secretary: NASGB
11.	8 September 2004	Professor Malherbe	Legal expert (Professor of Law:RAU)
12.	2 September 2004	Justice Prinsloo	Legal expert (Legal advisor: SAOU)
13.	10 March 2004	Jan Niewenhous	University of Pretoria
14.	28 September 2004	Thami Mali	GDE – Chief Director: Districts
15.	27 September 2004	Reena Rampersad	GDE – Chief Director: Curriculum Professional Development and Support
16.	27 July 2004	Albert Chanee	GDE – Acting Divisional Manager: OFSTED
17.	21 July 2004	Prosperitus High School	Teacher
18.	21 July 2004	Prosperitus High School	Principal
19.	11 June 2004	Joupie Fourie Primary	Teacher
20.	11 June 2004	Joupie Fourie Primary	Principal
21.	8 June 2004	Flavius Mareka Secondary	Teacher
22.	8 June 2004	Flavius Mareka Secondary	Principal
23.	17 June 2004	Norridge Park Primary	Teacher
24.	17 June 2004	Norridge Park primary	Principal
25.	14 June 2004	Jacaranda Primary	Principal
26.	15 June 2004	Makgatho Primary School	Teacher
27.	15 June 2004	Makgatho Primary School	Principal
28.	3 August 2004	Gatang Secondary School	Teacher
29.	7 June 2004	Ladium Secondary School	Principal

30.	9 June 2004	Voortrekker Hoer Skool	Principal
31.	18 June 2004	Bohlabasatsi Primary School	Teacher
32.	18 June 2004	Bohlabasatsi Primary School	Principal
33.	10 June 2004	Group Interview (Two teachers)	Laudium Secondary and Voortrekkerhoogte Hoerskool
34.	5 February	Jane Murray	District: CDS Coordinator
35.	13 August 2004	Tim Mafokane (1)	District Director
36.	30 September 2004	Tme Mafokane (2)	District Director
37.	29 June 2004	Seth Hlatshwayo (1)	District: IDS Coordinator
38.	30 August 2004	Seth Hlatshwayo (2)	District: IDS Coordinator
39.	14 July 2004	Reuben Baloyi	District: Administration
40.	2 June 2004	ESS Focus Group	District: ESS Unit
41.	10 Sept 2004	IDS Focus Group (1)	District: IDS officials
42.	10 Sept 2004	IDS Focus Group (2)	District: IDS officials
43.	10 Sept 2004	IDS Focus Group (3)	District: IDS officials
44.	20 May 2004	CDS Focus Group	District: CDS officials
45.	1 July 2004	Avril Barker	District: Examinations Unit
46.	16 July 2004	Jane Murray and Gerda Odendaal	District: CDS coordinators (one person in acting post)
47.	10 August 2005	Rebecca Malopane Andre Korkie	Assistant Director: Policy and Planning DCES: Policy and Planning

A1.2 Non-participant observer at meetings, discussions and school visits

No	Date	Nature of interaction observed	Persons involved	Additional notes
1	6 September 04	Non-participant observer at a meeting of IDS officials	IDS officials	12 IDS officials were present
2	2 February 05	Non-participant observer of a school visit undertaken by a district support team. The school visit was directed at the Foundation Phase of the school	4 CDS officials and 2 members from ESS from the district office. Interaction took place with the school principal and Foundation phase teachers.	Visit to Pfundo NdiTshedza Primary School, Mamelodi.
3	22 February 05	Non-participant observer of school visits undertaken by an IDSO	Paula Galigo (IDSO) and Principals of schools (in one school, 3 other staff members were also present)	Visits to Garsfontein Hoerskool, Garsfontein Laerskool and Lynwood Laerskool

A1.3 Telephonic interviews

NO	DATE	NAME OF PERSON	ORGANISATION/POST
	3 August 2005	Gerda Odendaal	CDS Coordinator (GET)
	4 August 2005	Daya Govender	CEO: Education Labour Relations Council

Appendix 2: Interview schedules

A2.1 Overview of research activities undertaken over the period of the study

Research activities	Estimated time frames
Finalisation of the research proposal	November 2003
Negotiating access to schools and the district office	November 2003 – January 2004
Document analysis (RSA Constitution, national policy and legal documents, national reports)	January – February 2004
Preparation of interview schedules for national stakeholders; Interviews with national stakeholders	February – March 2004
Document analysis (provincial policies, provincial and national legislation, strategic and operational plans, organograms, annual reports)	March 2004 – April 2005
Preparation of interview schedules (district and provincial stakeholders); Interviews with provincial-level stakeholders; First wave of district-level data collection (interviews, on-site observation)	April – May 2004
Preliminary data analysis (1 st round)	May – June 2004
Preparation of school-level research instruments; Focus-group interviews with teachers and principals	May - August 2004
Second wave of district-level research (interviews, on-site observation, school visits)	August - November 2004
Preliminary Data Analysis (2 nd round)	November 2004
Outstanding interviews	January – April 2005
Main data analysis	March 2005
Interpretation of research findings	April 2005
Completion of first draft	July 2005
Finalisation of research report	September 2005

A2.2 List of interview schedules

Number	Interviewees
1(A)	National Stakeholders
1 (B)	National stakeholders (DoE)
2	Provincial officials
3 (A)	District Director (1st wave)
3 (B)	District Director (2 nd wave)
4	Legal experts
5 (A)	IDS and CDS officials (1 st wave)
5 (B)	IDS and CDS officials (2 nd wave)
6	Principals
7	Teachers
8	Examinations official
9	District Deputy Director

A2.3 Interview protocol number 1(a): national stakeholders⁹⁹

The purpose of this interview schedule is to obtain the meanings that national education stakeholders ascribe to the concept of education 'districts' in South Africa. It seeks to do so by probing stakeholder understandings of the rationale for the establishment of local education structures and the role of 'districts' in the education system. In addition, the interviews probe for explanations on the common and contested meanings of education 'districts' by tracing the historical and political roots for the establishment of education provincial sub-structures since 1994.

Deleted:

1. During the education restructuring processes in 1994, provincial departments of education established geographical sub-units such as regions, districts and circuits as part of their organisational system. Why do you think it was necessary for provincial departments of education to create such sub-structures?

Probes:

- Improve efficiency and effectiveness
- Constitution (interim and current)
- Legacy (cultural, structural)
- Political accommodation

2. Who was involved in the processes of amalgamating the former racial education departments together into single provincial departments of education in 1994? What were the roles of the different parties in establishing these unified provincial departments of education?

Probes:

- Public Service Commission
- National Department of Education
- Political parties
- Old guard/new guard

3. What was the nature of the debate (in the 1994 period) regarding the establishment of provincial sub-structures?

Probes:

- Powers/roles/functions/administrative mechanisms to transfer functions, power,

⁹⁹ National stakeholders include the following: Teacher unions and national school governing body structures.

authority

- Local governance
- Links to local government

4. The current sub-systems of the provincial departments of education vary considerably across the different provincial departments. For example, some provinces have three administrative tiers (KZN), whilst others have only one tier of administration between schools and provincial head offices (Gauteng, Northern Cape). Why do you think this variation in sub-structures exist?

Probes:

- Contextual differences in provinces (eg. size of province)
- Legacy
- Political interests; interests of individuals
- Education interests

5. Should there be uniformity in the form and design of local education, or are there adequate grounds for retaining variation in sub-provincial design? Why do you think so?

Probes:

- National unity
- Equity in service delivery
- Equity in service conditions of district officials

6. The term 'districts' is used in a number of national education policy documents (eg. WSE, White Papers 5 and 6). Yet 'districts' do not exist in certain provincial departments of education (eg. North-West Province and Mpumalanga), while in other provinces, districts co-exist with other structures such as regions and circuits. How then can one interpret the meaning of 'districts' as used presently in DoE policy texts?

Probes:

- Districts – a conceptual term?
- Replace term with 'provincial sub-units'
- A problem of national 'incompetence', and hence a problem for the national

7. What do you see as the core functions of education 'districts'? That is, what are 'districts' for?

Probes:

- District identity (management unit, administrative unit, support centre..?)

- Support vs accountability
 - Facilitation, passive mediation
 - Powers/functions/authority
8. The Departments of Education, have in the recent past, been promoting the idea of strengthening links between education and local government. What are your views on this matter?

Probes

- What should be the nature of these links ('common borders')
- Movement of some functions to local government

Summary

The data obtained from the interview will be recorded with the aid of a tape-recorder, and transcribed into text. The text of the data will be submitted to interviewees for verification.

The data will be analysed against existing conceptions of decentralisation, and in the context of the absence of official policy on education 'districts'. In addition, the data will be analysed to derive explanations for why 'districts' took the shape and form they did in post-apartheid South Africa.

A2.4 Interview protocol number 1(b): national stakeholders¹⁰⁰

The purpose of this interview schedule is to obtain deeper insight into the historical trajectory of district development. In particular, it attempts to understand why the DoE did not pursue the option of a local tier of education governance in the post-1994 period. It also seeks to understand why provincial education departments aligned their district boundaries to those of local government in the period after 1999.

1. The ANC and NECC had floated the idea of a separate layer of local governance between schools and provinces in their pre-1994 policy proposals on Education. The DoE did not take up this idea after 1994. What do you think are the reasons for this?
2. Did the DoE at any time place the matter of local level education on its own agenda, or that of HEDCOM and CEM, in any significant way? Please explain.
3. NEPA (Section (3) (4) (b)) suggests that the Minister may determine national policy for the organisation, management and governance of the national education system. How do you interpret this clause of NEPA? Does it imply that the Minister could develop policy for the organisation, management and governance of provincial systems?
4. In 1999, all provincial education departments initiated processes to re-organise themselves to align their sub-structures to local government boundaries. Was this in response to any particular directive from higher level authorities?
5. What has been your experience of the regions/circuits that existed in education departments of the apartheid era, particularly in terms of their relationship to schools and Head offices?
6. The term 'district' is used commonly today to refer to the local level of the education system. How do you think this came about?

Summary

The data obtained from the interview will be recorded with the aid of a tape-recorder, and transcribed into text. The text of the data will be submitted to interviewees for verification.

The data will be analysed against existing conceptions of decentralisation, and in the context of the absence of stated national policy on education 'districts'. In addition, the data will be analysed to derive explanations for why 'districts' took the shape and form they did in post-apartheid South Africa.

¹⁰⁰ National stakeholders include the following: Current and former staff of the DoE.

A2.5 Interview protocol number 2: provincial-level officials of the Gauteng Department of Education

The purpose of this interview schedule is to obtain the perceptions, insights and views of provincial level education officials about the rationale for and role of education districts in the Gauteng Department of Education (GDE). It seeks to do so by probing officials' understandings of the current organisation of districts as well as their vision for GDE districts. In addition, the interview searches for explanations on the common and contested meanings of GDE districts by tracing historically, how the current form of districts in the GDE came into being.

1. During the education restructuring processes in 1994, the GDE established regions and districts as part of its organisational system. Why do you think it was necessary for the GDE to create such sub-structures?

Rationale for decentralisation – comparison with international perspectives.

Probes:

- Improve efficiency and effectiveness
 - Constitution (interim and current)
 - Legacy (cultural, structural)
 - Political accommodation
2. Who was involved in the processes of amalgamating the former racial education departments together into a single education department in 1994? What were the roles of the different parties in establishing these unified provincial departments of education?

Political explanation for why decentralisation took the form it did.

Probes:

- Public Service Commission
- National Department of Education
- Political parties
- Old guard/new guard

- 3 What was the nature of the debate (in the 1994 period), regarding the establishment of regions and districts in the GDE?

Explanation for why different meanings of education districts exist.

Probes:

- Powers/roles/functions/administrative mechanisms to transfer functions, power, authority
 - Local governance
 - Links to local government
4. After the 1994/1995 restructuring period, the GDE underwent further restructuring processes. Regions were done away with, and to date the GDE has a single tier of administration between schools and the provincial head office. In addition, a further restructuring process shifted some functions to the Gauteng Shared Services Centre. Why did the GDE undergo its second and third round of restructuring?

Rationale for decentralisation. Explanation for why different meanings of education districts exist.

Probes:

- Efficiency
 - Effectiveness
 - Individual interests
 - Ideology
5. Have the new structures delivered on what was expected of them? If not, why not?

Rationale and effects of decentralisation. What problem is addressed by decentralisation. Explanation for why different meanings of education districts exist.

6. It appears that the GDE does not have a stated policy or any legislation that outlines the rationale for the establishment of districts, or that proclaims a vision for districts. Why has the GDE not deemed it necessary to develop such a policy or enact legislation that outlines what it expects of districts?

Reasons for absence of policy. Legal status of districts.

Probes:

- No national policy
- Viewed as administrative action
- Lack of capacity
- Staff turnover

- Organogram serves purpose

7. What do you see as the core purpose of districts? That is, what are districts for?

Stakeholder understandings of the meanings of districts – purpose of districts.

Probes:

- Support vs accountability
- Drive policy/ensure policy compliance
- Promote school change
- Facilitation, passive mediation
- District identity (management unit, administrative unit, support centre..?)

8. What do you see as the key functions of districts, as opposed to that of the head office of the GDE? To what extent do district functions correspond to what districts actually do?

Stakeholder understandings of the meanings of districts – functions of districts. Discrepancy analysis.

Probes:

- Compare with official text
- Why does discrepancy exist

9. There has been some discussion within the GDE about the powers and authority of districts. What has been the nature of this debate? Where has the debate originated from – from the districts themselves, or from provincial level officials? Do districts, in your view, have too much or too little power?

Stakeholder understandings of the meanings of districts – powers and authority. Demands for decentralisation?

Probes:

- Are powers and authority concomitant to responsibilities and functions?
- Can districts undertake implementation and be held responsible without appropriate authority and powers?
- Budgets of districts – effects of PFMA
- Delegations – how they happen
- What factors are decisions for decentralised powers based on

10. The South African Schools Act (SASA: Sections 20 and 21) appears to grant schools 'self-management' status in terms of the following: the right of SGBs to develop school-level policy on matters such as the language of instruction, extramural activity and religion; the right to set and levy fees; management of the school budget etc.

Should the role of districts be reconsidered in view of the trend towards the ‘self-management’ of schools

Stakeholder understandings of the meanings of districts – in context of self-managing schools.

Probes:

- Change in role of districts over time
- Is greater school decentralisation accompanied by greater regulation and control
- Varying approaches to Section 20 and Section 21 schools

11. Where do the programmes and agendas of districts derive from presently? Do districts look to the provincial head office or to schools to derive their programmes? Please explain your answer....

Stakeholder understandings of the meanings of districts – looking up or down.

Probes:

- Is the status quo satisfactory/what needs to change

12. What space exists for districts to interpret and mediate policy? Have there been instances where districts have been able to mediate policy appropriate for their contexts? To what extent do districts develop their own policies? Please give examples. Should more space be given to districts to contextualise policy implementation? Why?

Stakeholder understandings of the meanings of districts – district autonomy – effectiveness rationale for decentralisation

Probes:

- Sources that districts draw on to develop policies and programmes
- How policies reach schools
- Timing of policy implementation
- Co-ordination of policies
- Contextualisation of curriculum policies

13. What do you view as the key challenges facing districts presently?

Stakeholder understandings of the meanings of districts – challenges

Probes:

- Lack of authority/power
- Absence of integrated planning between national, provincial and district level
- The current period of education transformation

- Resource and capacity issues
- Ideology
- Human agency
- System issues (job descriptions, business processes)
- Contending priorities
- Conflicting roles

14. The establishment of decentralised units by the GDE requires district officials to have the capacity to undertake their tasks effectively. Do you agree? What programmes has the GDE initiated for the development of district officials?

Decentralisation implementation – assigning meaning to districts

Probes:

- Induction programmes
- Orientation for new policies
- Skills development (use of skills development budget from the skills levy)

15. How would you describe the relationship between district and provincial level officials?

Decentralisation implementation – assigning meaning to districts

Probes:

- Collegial
- Antagonistic
- Professional (accepting professional autonomy of district officials)
- Hierarchical/Bureaucratic
- Demanding and rewarding loyalty as opposed to rewarding initiative, creativity and innovation

16. How do you view the role and activities of the Gauteng Shared Services Centre?

Stakeholder understandings of the meanings of districts – role of districts.

Probes:

- Appropriate role
- Has improved service delivery/has potential to do so
- Not working

17. The recent restructuring processes of the GDE has lead to the boundaries of districts correspond closely with the structures of local government. What/who was the driving force for this initiative? What have been the effects of changing the boundaries of districts?

Stakeholder understandings of the meanings of districts – relationship to local government.

Probes:

- Role of Premier's office
- Integrated public service delivery (one-stop shop service)
- Education vs other considerations in developing boundaries

Summary

The data obtained from the interview will be recorded with the aid of a tape-recorder, and transcribed into text. The text of the data will be submitted to interviewees for verification.

The data will be analysed against existing conceptions of decentralisation, and in the context of the current practice of districts. In addition, the data will be analysed against district-related policy texts of the GDE, as well as compared with responses received by different provincial level interviewees.

A2.6 Interview protocol number 3(a) (1st wave):¹⁰¹ Director of Tshwane South District

The purpose of this interview schedule is to probe how the Director of the Tshwane South District of the GDE understands the meanings of districts, particularly in relation to the rationale for the establishment of districts, and their roles and functions.

Interview questions	Probes	Use of responses
1. What do you regard as the core purpose of districts? That is, why do districts exist?	<input type="checkbox"/> support schools <input type="checkbox"/> support head office <input type="checkbox"/> promote change	Meanings ascribed to districts in terms of purpose
2. Why do you think the GDE deemed it necessary to establish districts? Could the GDE have functioned without districts?	<input type="checkbox"/> access to schools <input type="checkbox"/> reduce clogging <input type="checkbox"/> legacy <input type="checkbox"/> constitution	Rationale for decentralisation
3. Given the trend towards the ‘self-management’ of schools, do you think that is necessary to reconsider the role of districts? If so, in what way?	<input type="checkbox"/> regulatory role <input type="checkbox"/> support role	Meanings ascribed to districts in relation to ‘self-managing schools
4. How do you view the structural relationship between districts and the provincial head office?	<input type="checkbox"/> administrative arm <input type="checkbox"/> extension <input type="checkbox"/> autonomous <input type="checkbox"/> semi-autonomous	Meanings ascribed to districts in relation to the provincial head office
5. How do you view the structural relationship between districts and schools?	<input type="checkbox"/> hierarchical <input type="checkbox"/> collegial	Meanings ascribed to districts in relation to schools
6. Why has the GDE not developed a specific policy or legislated the establishment of districts?	<input type="checkbox"/> administrative action <input type="checkbox"/> absence of national directive <input type="checkbox"/> lack of capacity/vision <input type="checkbox"/> lack of clarity regarding the implications <input type="checkbox"/> hesitancy to devolve power/authority	Meanings ascribed to districts in absence of policy
7. What do you think are the reasons why the	<input type="checkbox"/> integrated service delivery	Meanings ascribed to districts in relation to

¹⁰¹ The district director was interviewed in two waves.

<p>boundaries of education districts correspond to those of local government structures?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> directive from Premier</p>	<p>local government</p>
<p>8. In one sentence, how would you describe GDE districts? What are they?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> admin units <input type="checkbox"/> management units <input type="checkbox"/> support units</p>	<p>Identity of districts</p>

A2.7 Interview protocol number 3(b)(2nd wave): District Director

The purpose of this interview schedule is to obtain an understanding of how the district office functions in relation to its roles and powers.

1. How would you describe the relationship between the district office and the provincial Head office?

Probes:

- Structures
- Nature of relationship
- Accountability

2. How does the system of delegation of powers to districts work?

Probes:

- Legal issues
- Form of delegation
- Kinds of powers delegated

3. How does the process of budgeting work in the district office?

Probes:

- Budget received
- Authority on the use of budget
- Programme budget vs line function budget
- Relationship between budgeting and planning
- Involvement of the district office in budgeting processes

4. How are district programmes developed?

Probes:

- Influence of PHO
- Influence of DoE
- Authority and agency

5. What do you see as the added value of districts?

Summary

The data obtained from the interview will be recorded with the aid of a tape-recorder, and

transcribed into text. The data will be analysed against existing conceptions of decentralisation, and in the context of the absence of official policy on education 'districts'. In addition, the data obtained will be utilised to provide a 'thick' description of the district office.

A2.8 Interview protocol number 4: interview with legal experts

The purpose of these interviews is to obtain insights into the legal status of education districts in South Africa. The interviews will serve to clarify the legal basis of districts, and examine whether the current legal framework is adequate in facilitating the implementation of the roles and functions of districts.

1. How do you understand the current legal position of education districts in South Africa?

Probes:

- Constitution
- Public Service Act

2. The law is silent about how power and authority can be shifted from the provincial level of the system to the district level (except through delegation from one individual to another individual). The concept of 'assignment' is restricted to spheres of government and does not apply to administrative structures. Can this be regarded as a gap in the public service legal framework?

3. Can the district office be held accountable for decisions taken at the PHO?

4. Does the present legal framework allow districts to raise funds? If such a function is decentralised to districts, what implications will it have for the legal status of districts?

Probes:

- Can you hold people accountable for functions if legal framework does not exist for decentralisation?
- Presently – case law is lagging – can the DO be held accountable for certain decisions taken at HO
- The law does not allow powers to be granted from one layer to another. Assignment is allowed bet two spheres of govt – not from a structure to a sub-structure. Gap in public service legal framework.

A2.9 Interview protocol number 5 (1st wave): focus group interviews with IDS and CDS officials

The purpose of this interview schedule is to obtain the perceptions, insights and views of IDS officials, and CDS officials of the Tshwane South District of the Gauteng Department of Education (GDE). The focus group discussion aims to illicit how district officials understand the meanings of districts, particularly in terms of how they view the place of districts in the education system.

The interview schedule is drawn up in tabular format to demonstrate clear links between the interview questions, the probes that may be used by the researcher during the course of the interview and the use that of interviewee responses in data analysis.

Interview questions	Probes	Use of responses
1. What do you regard as the core purpose of districts? That is, why do districts exist?	<input type="checkbox"/> support schools <input type="checkbox"/> support head office <input type="checkbox"/> promote change	Meanings ascribed to districts in terms of purpose
2. Why do you think the GDE deemed it necessary to establish districts? Could the GDE have functioned without districts?	<input type="checkbox"/> access to schools <input type="checkbox"/> reduce clogging <input type="checkbox"/> legacy <input type="checkbox"/> constitution	Rationale for decentralisation
3. Given the trend towards the 'self-management' of schools, do you think that is necessary to reconsider the role of districts? If so, in what way?	<input type="checkbox"/> regulatory role <input type="checkbox"/> support role	Meanings ascribed to districts in relation to 'self-managing schools'
4. How do you view the structural relationship between districts and the provincial head office?	<input type="checkbox"/> administrative arm <input type="checkbox"/> extension <input type="checkbox"/> autonomous <input type="checkbox"/> semi-autonomous	Meanings ascribed to districts in relation to the provincial head office
5. How do you view the structural relationship between districts and schools?	<input type="checkbox"/> hierarchical <input type="checkbox"/> collegial	Meanings ascribed to districts in relation to schools

Interview questions	Probes	Use of responses
1. Why has the GDE not developed a specific policy or legislated the establishment of districts?	<input type="checkbox"/> administrative action <input type="checkbox"/> absence of national directive <input type="checkbox"/> lack of capacity/vision <input type="checkbox"/> lack of clarity regarding the implications <input type="checkbox"/> hesitancy to devolve power/authority	Meanings ascribed to districts in absence of policy
2. What do you think are the reasons why the boundaries of education districts correspond to those of local government structures?	<input type="checkbox"/> integrated service delivery <input type="checkbox"/> directive from Premier	Meanings ascribed to districts in relation to local government
3. In one sentence, how would you describe GDE districts? What are they?	<input type="checkbox"/> admin units <input type="checkbox"/> management units <input type="checkbox"/> support units	Identity of districts

A2.10 Interview protocol number 6: interviews with school principals

The purpose of this interview schedule is to obtain the perceptions, insights and views of school principals with regards to their experience of districts. In doing so, the interview will draw out how school principals assign meanings to districts through their practice. In addition the perspectives of principals on the present, and ideal role of districts, will be elicited.

The interview schedule is drawn up in a tabular format to demonstrate clear links between the interview questions, the probes that may be used by the researcher during the course of the interview and the use that of interviewee responses in data analysis.

Interview questions	Probes	Use of question
1. What has been your experience of districts since the establishment of the GDE in 1994? How has it changed since 1994?	<input type="checkbox"/> shifts over time <input type="checkbox"/> role of districts <input type="checkbox"/> strengths/challenges <input type="checkbox"/> relationship with districts	How principals understand the meanings of districts through practice and their experience of districts Shifts in school-district relationships since 1994
2. In your experience, what has been the key role of districts since 1994? Do you think that this should change in any way?	<input type="checkbox"/> support vs accountability <input type="checkbox"/> administrative services <input type="checkbox"/> policy implementation <input type="checkbox"/> policy compliance/regulate <input type="checkbox"/> identity	How principals understand the meanings of districts in terms of their experience of districts Principal perspectives on the 'ideal' role of districts
3. Are districts playing the roles you expect of them? If not, why do you think that this is the case?	<input type="checkbox"/> challenges <input type="checkbox"/> expectations of roles	How principals assign meanings of districts in terms of their expectations versus actual practice
4. How would you describe your relationship with districts?	<input type="checkbox"/> collegial <input type="checkbox"/> antagonistic <input type="checkbox"/> professional autonomy <input type="checkbox"/> bureaucratic/hierarchical	How principals assign meanings of districts in terms of the relationship between schools and districts
5. On what kinds of issues do you interact most often with district officials?	<input type="checkbox"/> nature of issues <input type="checkbox"/> frequency/quality of contact which officials	How principals assign meanings of districts in terms of the nature of interaction between schools and districts
Interview questions	Probes	Use of question
6. Does your interaction with district officials support you in your work as a school principal? In what way?	<input type="checkbox"/> district response to problems <input type="checkbox"/> usefulness of district monitoring	How principals assign meanings of districts in terms of support/non-support provided by districts to principals

		Value-addedness of districts Role of districts
7. Have district officials influenced the way you go about your duties as a principal? In what way?	<input type="checkbox"/> change in practice, school systems <input type="checkbox"/> beneficial/not beneficial	How principals assign meanings to districts in terms of changes in their practices Role of districts
8. How do schools link organisationally with districts?	<input type="checkbox"/> communication protocols <input type="checkbox"/> access to information	Model of school-district interface
9. When you experience problems at your schools, do you expect districts to assist you? What has been your experience of districts in this regard?	<input type="checkbox"/> which officials <input type="checkbox"/> district responsiveness <input type="checkbox"/> are other avenues more effective	Capacity of districts to mediate school problems Authority of districts Decentralisation
10. Do you think schools that have Section 21 status in terms of SASA require a different district approach as compared to schools that have Section 20 status? In what way?	<input type="checkbox"/> support <input type="checkbox"/> regulation/monitoring <input type="checkbox"/> accountability	Role of districts Value-addedness of districts
11. The present geographical boundaries of districts correspond closely with those of local government structures. Have you experienced any changes in terms of broader public service delivery since the restructuring processes of the GDE?	<input type="checkbox"/> health <input type="checkbox"/> security <input type="checkbox"/> water, electricity <input type="checkbox"/> access to sports facilities	The relationship between education districts and local government
12. What has been your experience of the administration services provided by the Gauteng Shared Services Centre?	<input type="checkbox"/> greater/less efficiency	The GSSC – effects of restructuring
13. Will your schools be affected if there were no district offices, and all links were made directly with the provincial head office? In what way?	<input type="checkbox"/> administrative blockages <input type="checkbox"/> economies of scale <input type="checkbox"/> ease of access to information/resources <input type="checkbox"/> resolution of problems	Rationale for decentralisation Value-addedness of districts

A2.12 Interview protocol number 7: interviews with school teachers

The purpose of this interview schedule is to obtain the perceptions, insights and views of school teachers regarding their experience of districts. In doing so, the interview will draw out how school teachers assign meanings to districts in practice. In addition, the interview aims to illicit teacher perspectives on what the present role of districts is, and what they, ideally would like it to be.

The interview schedule is drawn up in tabular format to demonstrate clear links between the interview questions, the probes that may be used by the researcher during the course of the interview and the use that of interviewee responses in data analysis.

Interview questions	Probes	Use of question
1. On what kinds of issues do you interact most often with district officials?	<input type="checkbox"/> nature of issues <input type="checkbox"/> frequency/quality of contact <input type="checkbox"/> which officials <input type="checkbox"/> adequacy of contact <input type="checkbox"/> where (classroom, school, w/shops)	School-district interactive spaces
2. What has been your experience of district officials since the establishment of the GDE in 1994? How has this changed since 1994?	<input type="checkbox"/> shifts over time <input type="checkbox"/> strengths/challenges <input type="checkbox"/> relationship with districts	How teachers understand the meanings of districts through their experience of districts
3. Has your interaction with district officials supported you in your work as a teacher? Please explain your answer.	<input type="checkbox"/> district response to problems <input type="checkbox"/> usefulness of district <input type="checkbox"/> monitoring	Support vs accountability Authority of districts to solve problems
4. Have district officials influenced the way you go about your duties as a teacher? In what way?	<input type="checkbox"/> change in classroom practice <input type="checkbox"/> change in admin systems <input type="checkbox"/> beneficial/not beneficial	Impact of districts on the work of teachers – value addedness/role
5. When you experience problems with curriculum issues, do you expect districts to assist you? What has been your experience of districts in this regard?	<input type="checkbox"/> which officials <input type="checkbox"/> district responsiveness <input type="checkbox"/> are other avenues more effective	Capacity of districts to mediate curriculum problems. Role of districts.
Interview questions	Probes	Use of question
6. How would you describe your relationship with district officials?	<input type="checkbox"/> collegial <input type="checkbox"/> antagonistic <input type="checkbox"/> professional autonomy	How teachers assign meanings of districts in terms of their relationship

	<input type="checkbox"/> bureaucratic/hierarchical	with district officials
7. What do you think should be the key roles of districts?	<input type="checkbox"/> support vs accountability <input type="checkbox"/> administrative services <input type="checkbox"/> policy implementation <input type="checkbox"/> policy compliance/regulate <input type="checkbox"/> identity	Role of districts
8. Are district officials playing the roles you expect of them? If not, why do you think that this is the case?	<input type="checkbox"/> challenges <input type="checkbox"/> expectations of roles	Discrepancy between expectations and actual practice
9. Teacher development is an important ongoing activity, key to the work of teachers. What are the most effective ways in which teachers can learn? Please explain your answer.	<input type="checkbox"/> university <input type="checkbox"/> district workshops <input type="checkbox"/> networking with teachers <input type="checkbox"/> on-site support	Role of district officials
10. What has been your experience of the administration services provided by the Gauteng Shared Services Centre?	<input type="checkbox"/> greater/less efficiency	Decentralisation effects

Summary

The data obtained from the interview will be recorded with the aid of a tape-recorder, and transcribed into text. The data will be analysed in terms of how teachers understand and experience the role of districts, and thereby assign meanings to districts. The data will be corroborated with responses received from other categories of stakeholders that have been interviewed.

A2.13 Interview protocol number 8: interview with Examinations Officer

The purpose of this interview schedule is to obtain information on the role played districts in administrating matriculation and other examinations.

The interview schedule is drawn up in tabular format to demonstrate clear links between the interview questions, the probes that may be used by the researcher during the course of the interview and the use that of interviewee responses in data analysis.

Interview questions	Probes	Use of question
1. What is the role of the examination unit in the district?	<input type="checkbox"/> support schools <input type="checkbox"/> support Head office <input type="checkbox"/> support DoE <input type="checkbox"/> implement policy	Role of the district office Support vs Pressure
2. What kinds of issues do you deal with in this unit?	<input type="checkbox"/> administration <input type="checkbox"/> monitoring <input type="checkbox"/> Liaison with parents	Role of districts
3. What kinds of activities do you actually engage in?	<input type="checkbox"/> school visits <input type="checkbox"/> logistics <input type="checkbox"/> liaison with schools	Role of districts
4. What does your typical week at work look like?	<input type="checkbox"/> meetings <input type="checkbox"/> administrative work <input type="checkbox"/> Liaison with schools	Role of districts
5. What is the nature of the relationship between your unit and the PHO?	<input type="checkbox"/> administrative arm <input type="checkbox"/> extension of PHO <input type="checkbox"/> autonomous <input type="checkbox"/> semi-autonomous	Level of decentralisation
6. How do you view your relationship with schools?	<input type="checkbox"/> collegial <input type="checkbox"/> antagonistic <input type="checkbox"/> professional autonomy <input type="checkbox"/> bureaucratic/hierarchical	Relationship between schools and districts
7. What do you see as the key challenges facing districts?	<input type="checkbox"/> resources <input type="checkbox"/> relationship issues	Challenges facing districts

A2.14 Interview protocol number 9: interview with the District Deputy Director

The purpose of this interview schedule is to illicit information on the role of district in the administration of human resource issues in schools.

The interview schedule is drawn up in tabular format to demonstrate clear links between the interview questions, the probes that may be used by the researcher during the course of the interview and the use that of interviewee responses in data analysis.

Interview questions	Probes	Use of question
1. How do you see the role of the HRM Unit ?	<input type="checkbox"/> in relation to schools <input type="checkbox"/> in relation to the PHO <input type="checkbox"/> in relation to other units in the district office	Role of districts Support vs accountability relationship with schools and PHO
2. What kinds of issues do you deal with?	<input type="checkbox"/> staffing of schools <input type="checkbox"/> labour issues <input type="checkbox"/> conditions of service	Role of district office Support to schools
3. What kinds of activities do you actually engage in?	<input type="checkbox"/> school liaison <input type="checkbox"/> school visits	Role of district Relationship with schools
4. What does your typical week look like?	<input type="checkbox"/> meetings (with whom/where) <input type="checkbox"/> Liaison (with whom) <input type="checkbox"/> Statistics (how)	Role of districts
5. How do you view your relationship with schools?	<input type="checkbox"/> hierarchical <input type="checkbox"/> collegial	Relationship with schools
6. What do you see as the key challenges facing districts?	<input type="checkbox"/> resources <input type="checkbox"/> relationship issues <input type="checkbox"/> structural issues	Challenges facing districts

Appendix 3: District profile**Institutional and staff profile of Tshwane South District as at July 2005**

Area of information	Quantity
Total number of schools in the district	226*
Number of primary schools in the district	136
Number of secondary schools in the district	90
Number of Independent schools in the district	48
Number of ABET Centres in the district	6 (35 sites)
Number of ECD centres in the district	52
Total number of teachers (Post levels 1 and 2) in the district	4,854
Number of primary school teachers in the district	2,310
Number of secondary school teachers in the district	2,544
Total number of staff in the Tshwane South District office	238
Total number of CS staff in the district office	108
Total number PS staff in the district office	130
Number of IDSOs in the district office	13
Number of post level 3 curriculum support staff (ECD)	08
Number of post level 3 curriculum support staff (Intersen)	14
Number of post level 3 curriculum support staff (FET)	24
Number of ESS staff (including 13 psychologists)	20

Source: Information obtained from EMIS and OFSTED

* The total number of schools excludes independent schools.