



**THE INACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF PARENTS AS GOVERNORS AT  
SCHOOLS FOR LEARNERS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS**

**BY**

**PREMISHWAR HARIPERSAD**

**(STUDENT NO. 18950139)**

**SUBMITTED AS FULLFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
DEGREE MASTER OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES: PUBLIC  
MANAGEMENT**

**2017**

**APPROVED FOR FINAL SUBMISSION**

\_\_\_\_\_  
DR C MBALI (PhD: IEUL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE



## DECLARATION

I, Premishwar Haripersad, student number 18950139, hereby declare that this study entitled “The inactive participation of parents as governors at schools for learners with special education needs”, is based on research that was undertaken by me personally. I further declare that the findings, analysis, recommendations and conclusion resulting from such research is my personal effort.

The capturing of data on the SPSS software, the facilitation of the Focus Group and the typing and editing of the dissertation was also undertaken by me personally.

All sources used have been appropriately denoted and acknowledged in the bibliography.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

**I must express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following for making this study possible:**

- The Durban University of Technology for selecting me to participate in the Masters Programme;
- My supervisor, Dr Charlotte Mbali, for her guidance and unwavering support;
- All the people who participated in the survey and especially the principals of the participating schools whose combined experiences and wisdom proved to be invaluable;
- The Head of the Department of Education for granting me the necessary approval for the selected schools to participate in the survey and focus group;
- Mr Anandh Appanna for his moral support and continuous encouragement during times when I felt extremely burdened in undertaking this mammoth task;
- My family, especially my spouse Margaret, for their understanding and loyal support during the period of this study; and
- Last but not least, to God Almighty, for giving me the strength to complete this exercise.

## ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to establish the underlying reasons as to why parents do not actively participate in the governance of schools for learners with special education needs (LSEN).

I have been involved in the establishment and administration of these schools for a period spanning almost 39 years, the first 19 of which were under the auspices of separate development for the various population groups and the 20 years thereafter, in a democratised South Africa which resulted in the transformation of education for all of its people.

I am extremely fortunate to have witnessed how LSEN schools were governed during the previous dispensation by boards of management, on which I had the liberty of having served in the capacity of treasurer and subsequently chairperson of such boards at two LSEN schools. The enactment of the South African Schools Act, Act 84 of 1996, resulted in the establishment of school governing bodies and here again, I had the opportunity of serving as chairperson on one such governing body.

In comparing the governance of LSEN schools during these respective political dispensations, it became evident that currently, the membership of school governing bodies lacks expertise and there is a decline in the interest shown by parents to play an active role in the affairs of the institutions I was involved in. I was under the impression that the lack of parental interest was due to the fact that it was no longer a novelty of being elected as a governor and in the process, parents were reluctant to become involved in the education of their children. This conclusion was purely speculative and there was therefore an inherent desire within me to research such theory scientifically

This study afforded me the opportunity to gain an insight into the root causes as to why parents are reluctant to participate in school governance and related activities. The study also enabled me to examine existing literature on this subject so as to have an overview of the findings and recommendations of previous research undertaken. It is clearly evident from such findings that parents are indeed losing interest in becoming involved as the leaders in the education of their children. A number of factors have been identified for this state of affairs but notwithstanding the remedial measures recommended by researchers, it is apparent that the challenges are still prevalent.

The findings of this study lend credibility to the outcome of previous research undertaken. It is, however, apparent that the current system of governing LSEN schools is one of the significant factors that impedes the decision-making process, thereby necessitating the review of relevant legislation. This study also identifies other factors that impede active parental participation. These include ineffective training provided for governors, relationships between parents and management, lack of incentives and the timing of school governing body meetings and activities.

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS**

DUT:	Durban University of Technology
FRC:	Faculty of Research Committee
LSEN:	Learners with Special Education Needs.
MEC:	Member of the Provincial Executive Council
SASA:	South African Schools Act, Act No. 84 of 1996.
SGB:	School Governing Body

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1:	Calculation of sample population
----------	----------------------------------

**LIST OF APPEDICES**

	Page
Appendix 1: Letter of information.....	69
Appendix 2: Consent by participant.....	72
Appendix 3: Questionnaire for principal.....	73
Appendix 4: Questionnaire for parent governors.....	77
Appendix 5: Questionnaire for parents who are not governors.....	83
Appendix 6: Chi-Square Test.....	89
Appendix 7: Summary of SPSS statistics in MS Word table format.....	90
Appendix 8: Letter of authority from FRC Chairman (DUT).....	97
Appendix 9: Approvals from gatekeeper.....	99
Appendix 10: Ethics Clearance Report.....	101
Appendix11: Summary of Turnitin Report.....	102

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Declaration.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
List of acronyms.....	iv
List of tables.....	iv
List of appendices.....	v
Chapter 1: An introduction to the study.....	1
1. Definition of key concepts.....	1
2. General overview of this chapter.....	1
3. Context of the Research.....	1
4. Reasons for focusing on the research.....	2
5. Significance of the research.....	3
6. The problem statement.....	3
7. Aims of the study.....	3
8. Objectives of the study.....	4
9. Critical research questions.....	4
10. Potential outputs.....	5
11. Conclusion.....	5
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	6
1. Introduction.....	6
2. The South African Schools Act, 1996 (SASA).....	7
3. Research undertaken: general comment.....	8
4. A national perspective.....	9
5. An international perspective.....	17
6. Conclusion.....	20
Chapter 3: Research Methodology.....	22
1. Introduction.....	22
2. Research design.....	22



3.	Population.....	23
4.	Sample Population.....	24
5.	Sampling methods.....	25
6.	Measuring instrument.....	25
7.	Recruitment process/data collection.....	26
8.	Administering of questionnaires and conducting of the Focus Group.....	26
9.	Invitation to participate/informed consent.....	27
10.	Collection of survey instrument.....	27
11.	Data analysis.....	27
12.	Pre-testing.....	28
13.	Delimitation/scope.....	28
14.	Validity and reliability/trustworthiness.....	28
15.	Anonymity and confidentiality.....	29
16.	Ethical considerations.....	29
17.	Conclusion.....	29
	Chapter 4: Findings and analysis.....	31
	Part A: Findings.....	31
1.	Introduction.....	31
2.	Survey questionnaires completed by principals.....	31
3.	Survey questionnaires completed by parent representatives on SGBs...32	
4.	Survey questionnaires completed by ordinary parents who are not governors.....	36
5.	Focus Group discussions.....	39
5.1	Training.....	40
5.2	Provision of incentives.....	41
5.3	Timing of school meetings/activities.....	42
5.4	Improvement of the relationship with the management.....	43
5.5	Qualifications for election of parents as SGB representatives.....	44
5.6	Legislative requirements.....	45
5.7	Communication.....	45
5.8	Management of LSEN schools.....	46
5.9	Curriculum and functionality.....	48
	Part B: Analysis.....	48
1.	Introduction.....	48

2.	Barriers to effective parental participation.....	49
2.1	The need for management to improve their relationship with parents....	50
2.2	Timing of meetings and school activities.....	50
2.3	The reluctance of parents to participate in the activities of the school...	52
2.4	Qualifications for election of parents as SGB representatives.....	56
2.5	Legislative requirements.....	56
2.6	Management of LSEN schools.....	57
2.7	Bio-variables.....	59
Part C:		
	Conclusion.....	59.
	Chapter 5: Summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations....	60
1.	Introduction.....	60
2.	Summary of factors impeding the active participation of parents on governance structure.....	60
3.	Recommendations.....	62
4.	Conclusion.....	64
	Bibliography .....	66



## CHAPTER 1

### AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

#### 1. Definition of key concepts

- i. Parent refers to the person who is legally entitled to be the custodian of a learner.
- ii. Parent representative refers to the person who was elected by parents of learners attending the school to represent them on the school governing body.
- iii. Principal refers to an educator who has been appointed or who is acting as the head of a school.
- iv. Schools for learners with special education needs (LSEN schools) refer to public schools that cater for learners with special education needs.
- v. South African Schools Act, No. 84 Of 1996 (SASA) refers to an act promulgated by the South African Parliament which provides for a uniform system for the organization, governance and funding of schools.
- vi. School governance refers to the powers and duties assigned to a governing body in terms of SASA to govern a public school.
- vii. School governing body (SGB) refers to a body constituted in terms of SASA that is responsible for the governance of a public school.

#### 2. General Overview

This Chapter outlines the conceptual framework which provides the background information to the research area, reasons for focusing on such research, significance of the research, the problem statement, aims and objectives of the study, critical research questions to which responses are required, potential outputs and the scope of the study.

#### 3. Context of the research

Prior to the democratization of education in South Africa, non-White parents of learners with special education needs attending private state-subsidized special schools had little or no say in the education curriculum or administration of such institutions. These functions were assigned to Boards of Management which consisted of 5 representatives nominated by the sponsoring body of the school and 4 persons appointed by the relevant Minister responsible for education for the non-White population groups.

The new democracy in South Africa resulted in, inter alia, the review of the education laws and the subsequent promulgation of the South African Schools

Act, No 84 Of 1996 (SASA). The implementation of SASA transformed education in general but in the case of state-subsidized special schools, the transformation was significant. These schools, currently referred to as LSEN schools, were converted to public schools and unlike previously, parents were given the right to have a direct say in the education of the child through participation in school governing bodies (SGBs).

It is evident that SGBs are deemed to be an integral part of the school environment and have a significant role to play in the education of learners, especially those who have special needs.

When the concept of governing bodies for public LSEN schools was introduced as from the beginning of 1977, it became evident from research conducted over the years that there is a serious decline in the active participation of parents in school governance. Lombard (2007) refers to possible barriers that impede parents from taking an active role in a school's activities. She expresses the view that very little research has been done locally with regard to identifying such barriers.

Although previous research has identified some of the causes that hinder parental participation in school governance, it is apparent that the remedial measures recommended from such research have not resulted in any significant impact to improve parental involvement in matters of school governance. This study will attempt to establish the reasons why some of these remedial measures have not been effective. Current literature also appears to be silent on the question of whether or not parental apathy is due to the complexity of the legal framework pertaining to the constitution, powers and duties of governing bodies of LSEN schools. The study will also focus on this question.

#### 4. Reasons for focusing on the research

To enable LSEN schools to function effectively, parental involvement in school governance, fund-raising and other activities of the school is essential. From the researcher's personal experiences as a member of the erstwhile Boards of Management and as a governor of the current system of SGBs, it is evident that parents of children with special education needs are reluctant to become involved in the activities of the school, including participating in school governance. The decline in such interest could be attributed to numerous factors, some of which have been tested by existing research. The view must, however, be expressed that some of the underlying reasons for parental apathy must still be investigated. Hence the need for further research in this regard. It is anticipated that this study will determine what action should be taken to enhance the involvement of parents in the decision-making process within the school environment and in so doing,

indirectly result in an overall improvement in the culture of teaching and learning at these schools.

5. Significance of the research

The research is significant in that the outcome will determine from important role players what barriers are hindering parents from becoming involved in the education of the disabled child and what action should be taken to bring about an improvement in that regard.

The outcome will provide feed-back to the Department of Education on key aspects that must be addressed either through proposed amendment of legislation and/or the review of school based administrative and management processes to ensure that disabled children attending LSEN schools are not marginalized as a result of continued parental apathy.

6. The problem statement

An examination of prevailing literature supports the theory that the participation of parents in school governance is paramount to improve the partnership between the state and parents in addressing the needs of learners. Sibuyi (2000) expresses the view that negative and passive parental participation could lead to a disruption of the school environment. Studies undertaken on school governance confirm the argument that parents are not taking their responsibility as governors seriously for various reasons identified e.g. Ndlazi (2000) refers to radio talk shows and articles in local newspapers where it was reported that Black parents “have not been generally involved in the education of their children at traditionally Black schools”.

It is therefore apparent that parental participation in school governance is problematic. This study must address the reasons for this state of affairs and how the situation can be improved. The outcome of this study will assist to highlight issues that are seen by parents and school based management as barriers preventing parents from actively participating in school governance.

7. Aim of the study

The aim of the study is to investigate and report on the factors that impact negatively in the active participation of parents on SGBs.

8. Objective of the study

The objective of the study is to establish what can be done to improve parental-participation in school governance.

## 9. Critical research questions

The primary research question is:

How can parental participation be improved in LSEN SGBS?

The following sub-questions can be inferred:

- a. Effectiveness
  - i. What aspects of legislation should be reviewed (i.e. what text alterations should be made) to improve parental participation?
  - ii. Should a quota of the parents be elected on the basis of qualifications and expertise?
- b. Participation
  - i. What are the causes of non-participation by parents?
  - ii. What factors must be considered to improve the relationship between parent representatives and school management?
  - iii. Should incentives be provided to parents to encourage them to participate actively in school governance and if so, on what basis?

## 10. Potential outputs

One of the crucial aims of the research is the commitment of the researcher to bring about changes as part of the research act. It is therefore anticipated that this research will add value to the governance of LSEN schools by improving parental participation and thereby contribute to stability within the education system. The research will also be used to motivate for the review of national policy pertaining to the governance of LSEN schools especially in the light of the fact that current legislation groups all schools as being the same when in fact there are significant differences between LSEN schools and mainstream schools. The research will also be of benefit to other students pursuing a similar field of study and will contribute to a journal article.

## 11. Conclusion

It can be concluded from the above that school governance is problematic at public LSEN schools and that a scientific study is required to establish the underlying reasons as to why parents are reluctant to be elected as governors. This chapter outlines the processes that must be adhered to by the researcher to enquire into this matter and to suggest improvements to rectify the problem

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 1. Introduction

In noting the transformation of school governance that has occurred since the birth of a new democracy in South Africa, it is evident from research undertaken that the objective of attaining a system of governance as envisaged in Education White Paper 2, (1996), has not yet been attained. An examination of Education White Paper 2 reveals that schools in South Africa are unequal. To ensure equality, the said White Paper (page 10) recommends the introduction of “a structure of school organisation and a system of governance that will be workable and transformative.” The aforesaid document also acknowledges that a new organisational structure and governance in the new democracy “must be adequately uniform and coherent but at the same time, it must be flexible enough to take into account the wide range of school contexts, the significant contrasts in the material conditions of South African schools, the availability or absence of management skills, parents’ experience or inexperience in school governance and the physical distance of many parents from the schools attended by their children.” The significance of these views will be taken into consideration in assessing the effectiveness of the legislative framework that was promulgated for school governance in South Africa, especially for the establishment of LSEN schools. For the purpose of this study, the fundamental rights of parents in the education of their children are deemed to be of significance. These rights, extracted from Education White Paper 2 (1996), provide for parents or guardians to take the responsibility for the education of their children and are entitled to be consulted by the relevant state authorities in determining the form of education that should be provided. These rights confer upon the parents the power to choose the medium of instruction and curricular activities for their children.

Cognizance must also be taken of the capacity for school governance as alluded to in section 4.8 in Education White Paper 2 (1996) in terms of which the relevant state authorities are required to ensure that new SGBs and the constituencies from which such bodies are elected are provided with information pertaining to their basic powers, duties and functions and information on what such bodies are entitled to undertake without impinging on their rights. Another significant statement in Education White Paper 2 (1996), is that a “school governance structure should involve all stakeholder groups in active and responsible roles.” It stands to reason therefore that SGBs will be ineffective if there is no active participation by its membership or if the role functions are not understood.



In accepting the argument that parents are an important component of a SGB, the question must be asked to what extent do they understand their roles, duties and functions as governors on the basis prescribed within the legal framework, The question must also be asked whether current legislation poses any barriers in providing for effective school governance. Current literature will be examined to establish whether there are any appropriate responses to these questions.

2. The South Africans Schools Act, 1996 (SASA)

For the purpose of this study, the relevant sections of SASA pertinent to school governance will be referred to.

Sections 23 and 24 of SASA (1996) regulate the constitution and membership of SGBs for ordinary public schools and public LSEN schools. In the case of ordinary public schools, the membership consists of parents who are in the majority, educators at the school, non-teaching staff and learners in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade or higher and the principal. Other persons can be co-opted by the SGB but such members do not have voting rights.

In the case of LSEN schools, the membership is as follows:

- i. Parents of learners attending the school;
- ii. Educators employed at the school;
- iii. Non-teaching staff employed at the school;
- iv. Learners attending the school but who are in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade or higher;
- v. Sponsoring body representatives;
- vi. Representatives of an organisations of parents of learners with special education needs if such organisation is in existence;
- vii. Representatives of an organisation representing disabled persons if such organisation is in existence;
- viii. Experts in the appropriate field of special needs education;
- ix. The principal of the school.

In the case of LSEN schools, section 24 of SASA (1996) dictates that the MEC responsible for education in the Province must by notice in the Provincial Gazette, determine the number of members in each category of the membership referred to above. In the Province of KwaZulu-Natal, the MEC for Education determined such membership in Provincial Notice No. 12 dated 9 March 2015. It must be noted that unlike public ordinary schools, parents serving as governors at a LSEN school are not necessarily in the majority. Except for educators, non-teaching staff, learners or the principal, the chairman of the SGB of a LSEN school can be elected from any

other category of membership mentioned above, unlike a public ordinary school which provides only for a parent to be elected as chairman.

For persons to be nominated for election as members of a SGB of a LSEN school, the regulations provided in the aforesaid Notice makes provision for eligibility as follows:

- a. They cannot be nominated if declared by a competent court to be mentally ill;
- b. They cannot be nominated if they are rehabilitated insolvents;
- c. They cannot be nominated if they were convicted for an offence and imprisoned for a period in excess of 6 months without the option of a fine;
- d. They cannot be nominated if declared unsuitable to work with children;
- e. They cannot be nominated if they are not South African citizens and are not in position of a permanent or temporary residence permit;
- f. They cannot be nominated if they no longer fall within the category of membership;
- g. They cannot be nominated if their membership was terminated by the Head of Education.

Section 20 of SASA (1996) also provides for SGBs to perform a variety of functions. The following are deemed by the researcher to be functions requiring specialised skills:

- Drafting of documents of a legal nature such as the school's constitution or the code of conduct for learners;
- Conducting interviews for vacant or promotion posts;
- Financial Management; and
- Chairing disciplinary hearings in respect of learner misconduct.

Section 27 of SASA (1996) prohibits any member of a SGB from being reimbursed in the performance of his or her duties. The said section does, however, provide for necessary expenses incurred by a member to be reimbursed in the performance of his or her duties such as for example travelling expenses.

In the opinion of the researcher, the legislative requirements pertaining to the participation of parents on the SGB of an LSEN school could be a factor contributing to the ineffectiveness of such bodies. Current literature will also provide input in this regard.

### 3. Research undertaken: general comment

Considerable research has been undertaken in respect of school governance in South Africa since the birth of democracy. Such research was, however, confined mainly to public ordinary schools. Very little research was focussed in respect of school governance at public LSEN schools. Be that as it may, available research in respect of school governance has been generalised and made applicable in respect of all schools, notwithstanding the uniqueness of LSEN schools. Reference will also be made to research undertaken in respect of school governance in other countries for comparative purposes.

### 4. A national perspective

According to a study undertaken by Grant-Lewis and Naidoo (2004), different stakeholders agreed that SASA provides an opportunity for parents (and others) to be involved in school governance.

Schofield (2003) regards school-community partnerships as an important component in decision-making, management and teaching.

In her synopsis, Lombard (2007) also emphasizes the need for family involvement in the education of children with barriers to learning. She views family-school partnerships as an important relationship that should be developed.

During the Eleventh Biennial Conference in Alicante, Spain, Chitiyo (2009) made reference to the fact that educational effectiveness is enhanced when parents and families of children with disabilities are involved in the educational programme.

Jonas (2005, page 1 of 4) is more explicit in his views on parental participation. In his opinion, "the manner in which education is organized, governed and funded impacts directly on the process and outcomes of learning and teaching." He expresses the hope that more research will be undertaken in public policy which could bring about improvements in the way LSEN schools are being administered.

In referring to "the 2003 Annual Survey for Ordinary Schools for the Department of Education's Management Information System", Grant-Lewis and Naidoo (2004) highlight, inter alia, the following:

- a. The SGB does not understand the role it should play; and
- b. The roles of management and governance are confused and this results in tension and conflict between these two role players.

This conflict can be evidenced in a recent Durban High Court application made by a parent representative under case number 8399/2015 by Masipa Incorporated (2015) wherein he challenges the appointment of a non-parent as Chairman of the

governing body of a particular LSEN school. His argument is based on his failure to understand that the composition and membership of the SGB of a public LSEN school is not the same as that for a public ordinary school.

Grant-Lewis and Naidoo (2004) may have, however, erred when making a generalised statement that in local school governance, parents serve as majority members. Similarly, Heystek (2004), confines himself to the interpretation of only section 23(9) of SASA when he concludes that parents are the majority on the SGB. Cognizance must be taken of the fact that the legal framework for school governance differentiates between a public ordinary school and a public LSEN school. In the case of a public LSEN school, parents are not in the majority. At LSEN schools in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal, the maximum number of parents ranges from 6 to 8 in comparison to a maximum total membership of 21. The views of parent representatives can therefore be out-voted by virtue of their minority status on such SGBs.

It is apparent that the participation of parents in school governance and the curricular activities at a public LSEN school is on the decline. Further confirmation concerning the lack of and ineffective parental participation in school governance and related activities can be established from the following comments made by researchers in respect of this subject matter:

- 4.1 In her synopsis, Lombard (2007) states that the implementation of Education White Paper 6 of 2001 emphasises the role and rights of families with children with barriers to learning. She expresses the view that this policy has had an impact on the role of the family in that they are no longer traditionally involved in activities such as “fund-raising and homework” but families are now participating in curriculum changes, learning support, provisioning and services. Notwithstanding the implementation of education White Paper 6, Lombard’s research reveals that the majority of parents from formerly disadvantaged communities do not take an active interest in what happens within the school environment. She states that as the principal of a LSEN school, she experienced a lack of involvement by many families. The researcher concurs that without family involvement, especially in the education of a child with barriers to learning, there can be significant and adverse effects in the effective administration of schools. Lombard (2007) concludes that partnerships between families and the school are the most valuable external relationship that any LSEN school should develop.

- 4.2 Grant-Lewis and Naidoo (2004) argue that there is a lack of “authentic participation by parents and learners”. They express the view that one of the causes for this state of affairs is the complexity of the legislative requirements pertaining to school governance. As elucidated above, this view is supported by the researcher and requires input from parents.
- 4.3 In his executive summary, Naidoo (2005), agrees that “participatory approaches to school governance are justified in terms of ensuring the efficient management of schools and contributing to citizen empowerment and democratisation”. His argument in this regard is supported by the South African Constitution, 1996, which stipulates that the new democracy should be both a “representative and a participatory one”. In relation to school governance, this concept is regulated by SASA wherein the landscape for school governance is based on citizen participation between the state, parents, learners and other role players.

An interesting observation in Naidoo’s (2005) executive summary is his remarks that the reforms of school governance in South African schools do not take cognizance of the differences in school systems that currently exist especially with regard to the diverse cultures and population groups, historical back grounds and specific challenges that are in existence at individual schools.

This observation is deemed to be significant in that it could be one of the factors which impedes the participation of parents in active school governance. Factors such as language barriers, disparities in educational qualifications, poverty and customs and practices as well as race could have a detrimental effect in the attainment of the aims and objectives of the prevailing legislation pertinent to school governance.

Naidoo (2005) also believes that the roles of stakeholders are interpreted in different ways. In his findings, Naidoo established that parent governors, including chairpersons, do not understand their roles. As a result, they are either influenced by the school principal or interpret the applicable policies incorrectly. He also found that parents were under the impression that their participation on SGBs was primarily geared towards improving school conditions. The researcher is in support of Naidoo’s (2005) assertion that meaningful participation by parents on school governing bodies and school-level decision-making is a key element to democratise the school environment. His study, however, reveals that many parents lack the expertise to participate effectively in the decision-making process and they therefore accept the principals’ and educators’ definition of participation in such process. Naidoo’s (2005) analysis also reveals that in almost all the schools researched, the volume of participation of parents in the election of SGB members was very low. The primary reason for such low participation was due to

parental apathy and their reluctance to become involved. He also established that at most schools, parents are seen as the problem and they are looked down upon and treated as though they do not belong due to being uneducated and lacking the necessary skills.

- 4.4 Schofield (2003) acknowledges that post 1994 the South African government initiated a wide- ranging school reform programme. He, however, points out that almost a decade after the reforms commenced, there have been very few substantial changes in the majority of South African schools. In support of his argument, he quotes from the Education Rights Project and the South African Human Rights Commission that school reform is failing the majority of South Africans. One of the intended objectives of the school reform programme was to “prioritise those most disadvantaged under apartheid”. Those priorities included the reconstruction of school government and management.

Although Schofield’s (2003) emphasis is on school reform and the challenges that go with it, he also draws attention to the fact that “partnerships are emerging as a central component of an expanded vision of education”. The formation of partnerships between school and the community is deemed to be a central concept in planning and managing education.

Schofield (2003) established that it was difficult for parents to be involved in voluntary work due to illiteracy, unemployment and the declining relationship with educators who are quick to judge parents. It was also established that the participation of male parents on SGBs is lacking.

- 4.5 According to Ngidi (2004), educators perceive SGBs to be ineffective as a result of the failure of parents to perform or deliver on the expectations of such educators. He notes further that SGBs are poor in curriculum related activities and on this basis recommends that only parents with such expertise should be elected. It must be pointed out that implementation of such recommendation will be deemed to be undemocratic in terms of the current legislation relative to the election of governors on SGBs.
- 4.6 Van Wyk (2004) is of the view that the government recognises that many SGBs, particularly in the rural areas and less advantaged rural areas, “do not have the required skills and experience to exercise their new powers and may have difficulty in full-filling their functions”. To overcome this challenge, she refers to

SASA which makes it obligatory for provincial governments, in particular the provincial education departments, to provide the requisite training for members of governing bodies. Notwithstanding this statutory obligation, the question must be asked whether the training provided is adequate and whether it can have meaningful impact in uplifting the skills of parents.

Van Wyk (2004), however, again confirms the view that parents lack the necessary skills or expertise to function effectively as members of SGBs. The following are the reasons advanced for ineffective participation:

- i. Lack of educational qualifications;
- ii. Illiteracy;
- iii. Lack of incentives to motivate parents to fulfil their tasks as governors.
- iv. Training not provided in the language understood by parents.

Hence van Wyk (2004) concludes that many parents do not want to serve on SGBs as they lack expertise in the field of governance.

- 4.7 Mncube and Mafora (2013) argue that in South African SGBs, parents are the majority on such bodies with the chair of the SGB also being one of such. They are of the view that the “perceived reasoning for such legislative requirement is an attempt by the law makers to give power and voice to parents as a way in which issues of democracy and social justice issues can be advanced in a country that was fraught with racism, oppression and authoritarianism”.

As eluded to previously, the legislative framework for the constitution and membership of SGBs makes a clear distinction between a public ordinary school and a public LSEN school. It must be noted that parents may not necessarily be in the majority on the SGB of an LSEN school and the chair need not necessarily be a parent. The reasoning why the law makers created such a discrepancy is left to speculation. It could well be that the law makers were of the view that parents do not have the expertise to deal with LSEN schools due to the challenges that are encountered in the education of learners with special needs.

It is, however, evident that social tension does exist within SGBs in South Africa, especially in the light of linguistic barriers, race, culture etc. and as rightfully pointed out by Mncube and Mafora (2013), such an ethos can lead to the isolation of those parents who have low socio-economic status and thereby compromise their participation in school governance. The research findings by Mncube and Mafora (2013) confirm that the involvement of parents in school governance is poor and ineffective for a number of reasons such as for example the illiteracy of parents, lack of compensation for work related to school governance and the

consequent reluctance to participate, the marginalisation of parents and the inability of the school governing body to enforce participation.

- 4.8 Mncube (2009), in arguing that parental participation in SGBs is an important ingredient in enhancing democracy in the activities of schools, concludes that more should be done to educate and encourage parents in the school participation process. His findings reveal that parents require training particularly in sporting activities. This finding cannot be entirely supported taking cognizance of the fact that sporting activities play a minor role in effective school administration. Hence the lack of training in school sporting activities is deemed to be a symptom rather than a cause.
- 4.9 Xaba (2011) notes that parents are “unable or unwilling to participate in the decision-making process and are continually absent from meetings and workshops”. He highlights serious challenges in school governance in South Africa such as difficulty in understanding roles and functions, lack of capacity building which impacts on performance and the functions expected of governors are deemed to be of a specialist nature e.g. financial management. It is apparent from Xaba’s study that the challenges apply in particular to parent representatives. Hence he concludes as follows
- i. That the governors require expertise through adequate capacity building;
  - ii. That the functions of school governors require reclassification which will necessitate amendments to SASA. In this regard, he recommends that the Department of Education should appoint qualified personnel at schools or provincial districts to take responsibility for financial and resource management..
  - iii. That the term of office of SGBs should be increased from 3 to possibly 5 or 6 years.

Cognizance must be taken of the fact that it will not always be possible to obtain parent representatives with the requisite skills to serve on SGBs for the reason that the criteria for the election of such representatives is deemed by the researcher to be inappropriately regulated. Minimum educational qualifications are not stipulated and as a result, the election process normally results in parents with requisite skills and expertise being overlooked in favour of those parents who are most popular. Hence it is felt that lack of capacity can be resolved if the criteria for the election of parent representatives is reviewed.



- 4.10 In his abstract, Ntshangase, (2002), declares that despite the appropriateness of parental participation on SGBs, there are still misunderstandings, confusion and conflict with regards to the role of parent governors in democratic governance. In his research findings, Ntshangase (2002), reveals that “parents in rural areas appear to find it very difficult to become involved in the educational life of schools and are especially reluctant to serve on governing bodies.” This is due to the challenges of illiteracy and feelings of ignorance and inferiority. Ntshangase’s (2002) findings also revealed that parent elections are also problematic due to poor attendance and the reluctance of parents to stand for such elections. It was also evident that the democratic involvement of parents is manipulated by certain parents and principals who want to satisfy their own motives. It was also evident that parents regard their participation on SGBs as constituting nothing more than being “rubber stamps.” Ntshangase concludes that negative and harmful attitudes towards parent governors remain critical barriers to participative school governance.
- 4.11 Contrary to the findings of other researchers, Quan-baffour (2006) is of the view “that community members, particularly parents, caregivers and guardians are beginning to see themselves as equal partners with educators in the education of children.” His study however, reveals that parents, especially in the rural areas, do not take an interest in school matters and they do not provide any support for the improvement of schools. This is attributed to the low educational background of most parents coupled by their lack of experience and capacity to assist the schools to improve academic performance.
- 4.12 Heystek (2011) views SGBs “within the South African context to be less successful in the participative democratic model due to various factors such as the illiteracy of parents, their expectations, negative perceptions of both parents and principals and the availability of parents to attend governing body meetings.” Statistical data provided by Heystek (2011) reveals that “a large number of the South African population is not sufficiently literate to meet the requirements of reading or drafting policies.” He is of the view that many parents serving on SGBs do not have the required literacy levels, even with learning to read, to understand legislation, draft policies and managing budgets. Whilst Heystek (2011) believes that the limited literacy rate of parents should not preclude them from being capable SGB members or limit their involvement, it is difficult to understand how they can play a meaningful role in a leadership role when such barriers are in existence.

- 4.13 Smit (2015) reveals, inter alia, that SGB elections have become problematic due to the inability to obtain a 15% quorum of voters and inadequate parent participation. Smit (2015) points out that notwithstanding national guidelines regulating SGB elections, there is no uniformity prevailing at provincial level in this regard. He states that currently, the 9 provincial education departments have their own variations of MEC-approved regulations for SGB elections. The resultant consequence leads to confusion amongst the various role players. Smith makes an interesting observation in that only 2 provinces, viz, KwaZulu-Natal and the Free State, have regulations that specifically cater for the constitution of governing bodies for LSEN schools.

It must be noted that SASA does make a distinction of the membership of SGBs for public ordinary schools and those for public LSEN schools. However, it is obligatory for MECs responsible for education in the province to determine the categories of the membership of school governing bodies for LSEN schools, The fact that the 7 other provinces have not introduced such regulations is indicative of the inconsistencies prevailing in the legal framework for the constitution of SGBs.

Smit (2015) confirm that many SGBs in South Africa are “dysfunctional”. He attributes this to challenges such as parent governors not understanding their roles, lack of skills to perform the functions and duties of SGB. He attributes this impediment to poverty, lack of transport and barriers to communication. The ethical aspect pertaining to the elective process could also be a bone of contention in the selection of parents who are capable of making a positive contribution in the decision-making process in school governance. Smit (2015) mentions 4 principles that could influence the election process thereby making it undemocratic. These are:

- i. Principle 1: The exclusion of parents from the discussion process;
- ii. Principle 2: The denial to parents of the freedom of choice;
- iii. Principle 3: The undue influence of parents by unjust power relations;
- iv. Principle 4: Hidden agendas.

One of Smit’s findings reveals that during the election process, parents were not provided with adequate information about the candidate nominated for election. Hence they were required to vote for candidates unknown to them. This finding could be one of the factors that inhibit the election of suitable candidates to serve as members on the SGB thereby lending credibility for the need for a review of the guidelines in this regard.

Smit (2015) also cautions against the Departments of Education, whether national or provincial, from usurping SGB functions through statutory amendments or revised

regulations as this action could lead to diminished parental involvement on such structures.

Smit's cautionary remarks as stated above could have emanated from draft legislation introduced by the Minister of Basic Education to amend SASA to the effect that SGBs will no longer have the power to appoint school management personnel.

The concept of partnership between State on the one hand and parents on the other becomes uncertain with proposed changes to legislation in terms of which the State wants to wrest certain powers and duties from SGBs. In this regard, reference is made to an article published in the Mercury (2015). This article mentions proposed changes to SASA that aim to take power away from parents, and "compromise the quality of public education". The following extract from this article lends credibility to the intentions of the State in this regard:

*"A draft version of the Basic Education Laws Amendment Bill, which the Mercury has seen a copy of, proposes that school governing bodies have no part in the appointment of school-level heads of department, deputy principals or principals. It also says that the law should be amended so the heads of provincial education departments have the final say on school admissions, and may instruct a public school to have more than one language of instruction."*

The researcher agrees with Smit's contention that the proposed legislative amendments will further alienate parents from the decision-making process at schools thereby inhibiting their active participation in school governance.

## 5. An international perspective

- 5.1 Chitiyo (2009) agrees that "research and practice have demonstrated that educational effectiveness is enhanced when parents and families of children with disabilities are involved in the education of their children". In comparing policies pertinent to special education in the United States of America and Zimbabwe, he notes that with specific reference to parental participation, "American law (IDEA) requires collaboration between schools and families of children with disabilities." He points out that in the case of Zimbabwe, there is no law governing parental participation in school administration. According to laws governing education in Zimbabwean the consent of parents is required to precede all student assessments and teachers are compelled to discuss such assessments with the parents. The absence of a legal framework for parental participation implies that parents are denied an opportunity to appeal against any official decision as Zimbabwean does not provide any due process for that purpose.

- 5.2 Cotton and Wikelund (1989) are of the view that parent involvement is a major issue since the 1980s. Various definitions are provided in respect of parent involvement but with reference in particular to school governance, these researchers regard the active involvement of parents as being necessary for school governance and decision-making.

In the case of the parents' role with disadvantaged learners, it was discovered that parents whose income is significantly low are often under-represented among the ranks of parents involved with the schools, due to factors such as late working hours, tiredness, embarrassment due to one's educational qualifications and the lack of cooperation from educators in being helpful.

Cotton and Wikelund (1989) believe that parental involvement is one of the most "controversial subjects" in the United States of America. Surveys undertaken reveal that there is an interest amongst parents to take a more active interest in school governance but school administrators and teachers do stifle the interest shown by parents. Such reluctance stems from a view that educators are averse to parents becoming involved in matters that have a direct interest in such professional staff e.g. staff selection, financial management and procurement matters.

- 5.3 Brandt (1989), makes reference to the fact that Joyce Epstein has been conducting research on teachers' practices of parental involvement and the effects of family-school connections on students, parents and teachers for over a decade. In discussing parental involvement in an article entitled "On Parents and Schools: A conversation with Joyce Epstein", it is affirmed that parents want to become more involved in their children's learning, especially at home and that they need clear direction from the schools in this regard. Five types of parental involvement are discussed in this article, one of which is parental involvement in leadership roles such as governance. Whilst such participation is deemed to be important, few parents are involved directly, noting that not all parents can serve on such structures. Those parents who do participate in leadership roles rarely communicate with the parents they supposedly represent to solicit their ideas or to report on the activities of such structures. Epstein proposes that "this challenge can be eradicated if schools can consider new forms of recruitment and training of parent leaders."
- 5.4 Gordon (1992), defines the term "parent involvement as encompassing both the involvement of individual parents in their children's education and the collective involvement of parents in school decision-making bodies." Although Gordon (1992) supports the argument that the involvement of parents in school decision-making

lends credibility to a democratic and legal process, she notes that “democracy does not always mean equity”. She advances an argument that “parents are not a monolithic group and points out that parents from lower socio-economic classes, minority parents and less educated parents are perceived by school personnel and mainstream parents as participating less actively in their children’s schooling than their better educated White, Anglo, middle class counter-parts.” It is evident from Gordon’s (1992) findings that parents in the minority or those who are low income earners do take an interest in the education of their children but there are barriers such as personal resources, lack of training and lack of government support that inhibit their active participation in school governance. It is indeed surprising that these circumstances are prevalent in third world countries such as the United States of America in comparison to an emerging democracy such as South Africa which reflects the complexities of parental involvement in school governance.

5.5 Earley and Evans (1999) state that in November 1997, “the Management Development Centre at the Institute of Education, University of London, undertook a research project on behalf of the Department of Education and Employment to investigate the composition of school governing bodies in the United Kingdom, their current effectiveness and ways in which they might be improved.” Some of the key findings of this research project are mentioned hereunder:

- i. An effective school has an effective governing body;
- ii. Governors are adequately qualified and trained;
- iii. Chairpersons of SGBs are adequately qualified and experienced;
- iv. Governors are highly committed;
- v. The selection process of governors is undertaken carefully to ensure continued effectiveness and stability;
- vi. Training has proved to be essential in ensuring effective SGBs; and
- vii. Governance becomes effective when there is additional learning, payment for governors or paid time off work, more school visits, better organisation and communication with the SGB, the selection of governors with the necessary skills and expertise, clarification of governors’ roles and more support/cooperation from the relevant authorities.

It is apparent from the aforesaid research project that parental participation in school governance in the United Kingdom is not as problematic as here in South Africa. This can be attributed to various factors, the most significant of which is that school governance at South African Schools is still in the process of evolving from the effects of apartheid.

5.6 According to Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia (2015) “in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, every state school has a governing body consisting of specified numbers of various categories of governors depending on the type and size of school.” It is interesting to note that in the United Kingdom, governors are unpaid but may be reimbursed for expenses such as the care of dependants or relatives and travel costs. In terms of section 50 of the Employment Rights Act of 1996 applicable in those countries, Employers in the United Kingdom are legally obliged to give their employees who serve as school governors reasonable time off to execute their duties as governors. Such time off may be with or without pay. Governors consist of parents, school based personnel, persons nominated by the local authority, co-opted community members and sponsoring body representatives.

SGBs in the United Kingdom are responsible for upholding the standards of the school and are primarily accountable for 3 main strategic functions viz. “ensuring clarity of vision, ethos and strategic direction, holding the headmaster to account for the educational performance of the school and its pupils and overseeing the financial performance of the school and making sure its moneys are well spent.”

## 6. Conclusion

*Notwithstanding the democratisation of education in South Africa, a review of literature reveals that school governance in South Africa has not yet attained the desired levels expected in a democracy.*

*Researchers generally agree that parental involvement is either ineffective or there is a lack of active participation by parents.*

*It is also evident that current research has not delved significantly into the governance structures prevailing at LSEN schools. Although it can be argued that the general research findings in respect of school governance is also applicable to LSEN schools, cognizance must be taken of the uniqueness of such schools which cater for learners with disabilities. Here again, LSEN schools are not all the same. In South Africa, LSEN schools are categorised as follows:*

- i. Sensory handicapped schools (providing education for partially sighted and blind learners);*
- ii. Neurologically handicapped schools (providing education for cerebral palsied learners);*
- iii. Aurally handicapped schools (providing education for hard of hearing and deaf learners);*

- iv. Physically handicapped schools (providing education for learners with physical disabilities);
- v. Schools for the autistic (providing education for autistic learners. Classes for these learners in KwaZulu-Natal are combined with other LSEN schools).
- vi, Schools for the mentally handicapped (referred to as training centres which cater for severely mentally retarded learners)

In this literature review, it is also observed that insufficient details are provided by researchers as to how school governance can be improved and the methodology that must be used to bring about recommended changes e.g. in certain instances, it has been recommended that parents should be compensated for the work they do as governors. However, no mention is made as to how this recommendation can be implemented noting that SASA restricts compensation to parents serving as governors. No arguments are advanced as to how schools will fund such expenditure in the event SASA is amended to be more flexible.

It is also of importance to note that school governance in certain developed countries is also problematic with reference to parental participation. According to literature review from an international perspective, researchers attribute such ineffective participation to similar problems experienced at South African schools.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 1. Introduction

Conducting of research in any field of study is deemed to be a scientific process which involves adherence to specific methods that are implemented nationally and internationally.

Welman and Kruger (2001) note that “*research involves the application of various methods and techniques in order to create scientifically obtained knowledge by using objective methods and procedures*”. For the purpose of this study, the following research methods are applied:

#### 2. Research design

The research paradigm focuses on both the quantitative and qualitative research methods, i.e. mixed methods for the reasons outlined.

The quantitative research design was deemed appropriate to undertake a general survey amongst parents and principals who serve on the SGBs of the selected schools. According to Msweli (2015) “designing a quantitative research project involves, inter alia, a survey instrument design which will allow for the collection of a large amount of data from a known population by using a questionnaire, structured observation or structured interviews.” In this regard, three different types of questionnaires have been used, i.e. one to cater for parents who serve as governors of the selected schools, one for parents who do not serve as governors of the selected schools and one to cater for the principals. The data received from the questionnaires completed by the principals served as a guide for formulating the tone and agenda for conducting the subsequent Focus Group session with them as participants. Data collection in the format of surveys is linked to the quantitative research design as it allows for the collation of statistical information in response to structured questions about behaviour, perceptions, opinions and beliefs.

The qualitative approach was used in the case of conducting a Focus Group session with principals of the selected LSEN schools. Harrell and Bradley (2009) state “that focus groups are dynamic group discussions used to collect information.”

Information gathered from the Focus Group did not only assist in the validation process in respect of data analysed through the survey but it also allowed the researcher to obtain a more balanced view as to why parents are reluctant to participate actively in school governance. Focus Groups can consist of between 6 to 11 participants but in this regard there are no precise prescriptions. Msweli (2015)



argues that the qualitative research approach provides for the mechanism for understanding latent, underlying, or non-obvious issues in organisations, societies or communities. In designing a qualitative research project, she stresses that sample size is of less concern. Instead, the main concern is the context in which the events are taking place.

In order to achieve the research aims in conducting the Focus Group, qualitative data methods are employed viz. participant observation, discussion and analysis of opinions expressed. Such approach allowed for greater interaction with these participants who are significant role players. The use of this methodology also involved describing in detail specific situations during interaction with role players. The process necessitated a tape recording of the discussions with the consent of the participants, arranging for a transcript of the recordings with no names being mentioned and personal analysis. The data was analysed and grouped together according to their similarities and differences.

### 3. Population

According to Cox (2011), population refers to the total unit of analysis, i.e. everyone for which the data will be used for generalisation.

In this study, population consisted of people, in particular parents of learners and school principals of 33 LSEN schools within the eThekweni municipal boundary in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal. The total population in this study is 6897, made up as follows:

Total number of school principals:	33
Number of parent representatives on 33 SGBs:	264
Estimated number of parents who do not serve on SGBs	6600

Note: The following are the categories of LSEN schools:

<u>Category of school</u>	<u>Number of schools</u>
Blind	1
Deaf/Hearing Impaired	5
Training Centres	23
Cerebral Palsy	3
Physically Disabled	1
Total:	33

Each category of the schools listed was included in the survey so as to ensure adequate representation.

#### 4. Sample Population

Cox (2010) regards sample population as the reference to a sub-set of the research targeted population for which data for generalisation will be drawn. The sample will be a smaller collection of subjects from the broader population from whom data will be collected as it is time consuming and expensive to access information from the total estimated population of 6897.

The selected schools approved by the gatekeeper for the survey are representative of all LSEN schools from which the sample population is selected.

The table below reflects how the respondents are selected:

Table 1: Calculation of sample population

CATEGORY OF SCHOOL	TARGET POPULATION	SAMPLE POPULATION	PARTICIPANTS
1xSchool for the Blind	1 Principal 208 Parents	1x Principal 8xparent representatives on SGB 8 x parents who are not members of the SGB	17
5xSchools for Deaf/Hearing Impaired	5x Principals 1000 Parents	1x Principal 8xparent representatives on SGB 8 x parents who are not members of the SGB	17
23xTraining Centres	23x Principals 4600 parents	2x Principals 16xparent representatives on SGB 16 x parents who are not members of the SGB	34
3xSchool for Cerebral Palsy	3x Principal 600 parents	1 x Principal 8xparent representatives on SGB	17

		8x parents who are not members of the SGB	
1xSchool for Physical Disabled	1x Principal 200 parents	1x Principal 8xparent representatives on SGB 8 x parents who are not members of the SGB.	17
Total number of respondents			102

#### 5. Sampling methods

According to McLeod (2014), sampling is the process of choosing a representative group from a specified population being studied. He describes sample as a group of people who participates in an investigation. There are different kinds of sampling methodologies such as probability and non-probability. In this study both methods are used.

In the case of the survey, the quantitative sampling method is used. Marshall (1996) states that the aim of all quantitative sampling approaches is to draw a representative sample from the population so that the results of studying the sample can then be generalized back to the population. The researcher adhered to the random sampling approach as the nature of the population is defined and all members have an equal chance of selection.

In the case of the Focus Group, the convenience sampling approach was adhered to for the reason that the process is least costly in terms of time, effort and money. Marshall (1996) regards this approach to be the least rigorous technique, involving the selection of the most accessible subjects.

#### 6. Measuring instrument

In this study, three different questionnaires were used to conduct the survey. Taking cognizance of the fact that the survey had to be conducted independently amongst the 3 different groupings i.e. principals of selected schools, parents who are governors and parents who are not, the questionnaires were designed to obtain relevant data from each grouping so as to facilitate appropriate responses to the research questions. The Likert scale was used to obtain responses from the participants. Jamieson (2004) expresses the view that Likert scales are commonly used to measure attitude, providing "a range of responses to a given question or

statement". Questionnaires were coded for statistical analyses and to protect the identity of respondents. In this regard, for each question, all possible responses were assigned a numerical value. This facilitated ease of referencing and capturing of data. .

A Focus Group comprising the principals of the selected LSEN schools was conducted. This process served to obtain a more professional response to the research questions and served as a platform to validate responses in respect of the survey.

7. Recruitment process/data collection

Participants were invited to participate voluntarily in the survey. In this regard, a letter of information outlining relevant details of the researcher and the research study was made available to each participant. The informed consent of the participants was required before undertaking the survey. The distribution and collection of the questionnaires and the facilitation of the Focus Group was undertaken personally by the researcher.

8. Administering of questionnaires and conducting of the Focus Group

In the case of the survey, questionnaires were made available to all participants who had agreed to participate in the study voluntarily. Respondents were required to self-administer the questionnaire to prevent any form of bias. As questionnaires were coded, this ensured participants' anonymity. Questionnaires were personally distributed and collected by the researcher to ensure proper control and record keeping.

A maximum of 7 principals of the different categories of LSEN schools were invited to participate in the Focus Group. According to Krueger (2002), the first few moments in focus discussions are critical. The facilitator is required to create a thoughtful and permissive atmosphere, set the tone for discussion and provide ground rules. The questionnaire responses from principals and parents were used as a guide to formulate questions for discussion and further elaboration to establish the extent to which there is agreement/disagreement. This approach allowed for more meaningful discussion in respect of the research questions. The entire discussions were recorded electronically and thereafter, a transcript was arranged for assessment purposes. Notes of the focus group were also kept.

9. Invitation to participate/informed consent

Participants were invited by letter which provided details of the researcher, his supervisor and the study to be undertaken (i.e. information letter). In the event of the

participant agreeing to such participation, he/she was required to provide written consent to participate in the study.

The gatekeeper's approval was obtained to conduct the research at the identified LSEN schools.

## 10. Collection of survey instrument

Harrell and Bradley (2009) outline various types of data collection. For the purpose of this research, two methods were used, viz.

### 10.1 Survey in the form of a questionnaire distributed to selected parents and principals.

The survey instrument was collected personally by the researcher. Parents were requested to return the completed questionnaires to the principals of the schools attended by their children in sealed envelopes so as to avoid conflict between the two parties. This action facilitated collection of the survey instrument.

### 10.2 Focus Group. From the discussions emanating from this group, dynamic responses were obtained to add value to the research. During the convening of the Focus Group, the researcher acted as the moderator and recorded important points. A note taker was also in attendance to take notes. In addition, with the consent of the participants, the discussions were recorded electronically, using two electronic devices to avoid technical issues. The recoding was subsequently transcribed so as to facilitate analysis.

## 11. Data analysis

In accordance with the quantitative approach, the IBM SPSS Statistics software, courtesy of the Library Department of the Durban University of Technology, was used to capture numeric and string data obtained from the survey questionnaires so as to facilitate analysis. The data was captured separately in respect of each category of participant viz. principals, parent governors and ordinary parents so as to ensure that the responses from the relevant role players can be viewed separately. In addition, the data obtained from the SPSS software was summarised in tabular format in MS Word to facilitate the interpretation of the statistical information, This information is contained in Appendix 11.

Simple descriptive statistics were used, such as frequencies, modes and median.

In the case of discussions emanating from the Focus Group, the entire process was recorded electronically with the prior permission of the participants. Arrangements were then made to obtain a transcript of such recording so as to personally

assimilate the data, summarise the views expressed and make a conclusion. In terms of a directive from DUT, the analysis of the data obtained from the Focus Group was done manually by the researcher. In this regard, the researcher had to be guided by the “framework analysis” method referred to by Krueger (2002). As the Focus Group consisted of only 5 participants, it was possible to use Microsoft Word to undertake an analysis of the transcript.

12. Pre-testing

Pre-testing is necessary to test the validity of the questions. For this purpose, a pilot test was undertaken using a small group (12 people) from the defined population.

13. Delimitation/scope

Delimitation is a means by which the parameters of the investigation must be defined. Due to the magnitude of the work involved in undertaking this study, the research area focussed on selected LSEN schools within the boundaries of the eThekweni Municipality. The primary purpose for restricting the study to this geographical location is that time and funding did not permit an investigation to be undertaken at all schools within the Province of KwaZulu-Natal or the country as a whole.

14. Validity and reliability/trustworthiness

For the purpose of ensuring validity in quantitative research: Kendall and Kendall, (2002) express the view that “questionnaires must be valid and reliable.” Validity is deemed to be the degree to which the question measures what the analyst intends to measure. Validity is therefore deemed to be important to test whether the conclusions of a research study are valid. A pilot study was initially undertaken with a small group of respondents to test for consistency, reliability and trustworthiness of the instrument before the general survey was undertaken.

Ensuring consistency, transparency and trustworthiness in qualitative research: Noble and Smith, (2015) point out that “*if qualitative methods are inherently different from quantitative methods, in terms of philosophical positions and purpose, then alternative frameworks for establishing rigour are appropriate*”. In considering the strategies recommended by Noble and Smith (2015) to ensure the credibility of the findings emanating from the Focus Group, the researcher had to ensure, inter alia, the following:

- i. Avoid personal bias;
- ii. Meticulous record-keeping;

- iii. The contributions made by the participants of the focus group were quoted verbatim to support the findings in instances where deemed necessary; and
  - iv. Thought processes were clarified during data analysis and interpretations; It must also be noted that members of the Focus Group also participated in the completion of separate survey questionnaires. Hence data triangulation was adhered to in ensuring that the responses from the Focus Group represent a fair degree of reliability and trustworthiness.
15. **Anonymity and confidentiality**  
Anonymity was adhered to by ensuring that the study makes no reference to the names of participants and by providing an undertaking in that regard in the letter of information and the gatekeeper's letter. Anonymity and confidentiality are important in research studies so as to be in compliance with the ethical standards applicable both nationally and internationally.  
The rights of participants must also be protected in terms of the Bills of Rights as entrenched in our country's constitution.
16. **Ethical considerations**  
As alluded to above, ethical considerations are a pre-requisite to any research studies undertaken nationally or internationally. Msweli (2015) defines research ethics as a code of guidelines to conduct scientific research in a morally acceptable way. This code outlines the principles and standards that must be adhered to by all researchers to uphold the value of knowledge construction. To ensure compliance with the stipulated ethical requirements, the researcher binds himself to uphold such requirements through the signing of a declaration of intent in that regard. In addition, the researcher has classified his research under the category of "Humans" and "Organisations" which required expedited review from the University. This study will not result in any risk to the participants or the organisations concerned.  
Participants were informed that if they are uncomfortable in answering any question, that particular question should be left unanswered.
17. **Conclusion**  
The outcome of scientific research undertaken can only be acceptable if the process is undertaken in accordance with approved methods and procedures. In the case of this study, such methods and procedures have been detailed in the research methodology mentioned above.

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

#### Part A: Findings

##### 1. Introduction

This Chapter outlines in detail the research findings of the study and the researcher's personal analysis thereof. The findings are dealt with separately in respect of each grouping. This methodology will provide insight into the views expressed by the participants in their respective roles i.e.

- i. Principals of the selected schools who completed the survey questionnaires;
- ii. Parent governors of the selected schools who completed the survey questionnaires;
- iii. Ordinary parents who are not governors and who completed the survey questionnaires; and
- iv. Principals of the selected schools who participated in the Focus Group discussions.

##### 2. Survey questionnaires completed by principals

Questionnaires were distributed to 7 principals, including the principal of the school where the pilot study was conducted. For the purpose of anonymity, these schools are referred to throughout this chapter as school A, B, C, D, E, F and G.

The survey amongst the principals of schools A to G revealed the following:

- i. Of the 7 principals, one is an African female and six are Indian males. Their ages range from between 50 to 60 years. They are adequately qualified with degrees except for one who has a diploma. Five of them have served as principals for periods in excess of 10 years. Two served for periods less than 5 years.
- ii. Except for 3, all the others agreed that parents are adequately trained to perform their duties. The positive response from the other 4 must be treated with caution for the reason that during the Focus Group discussions, these participants back-tracked on their initial response that parents were adequately trained. The primary reason provided by those respondents who disagreed that parents were adequately trained was as a result of inadequate training provided by the Department of Education. A



view was also expressed that parents do not attend when invited to training workshops.

- iii. The majority of the participants expressed the view that their school governing bodies are not playing any meaningful role. The one who disagreed was based on the assumption that there are no support structures for parents.
  - iv. The majority of participants are of the view that the current legislative framework is not complex for parents to understand. Two participants, however, disagreed and felt that the legislation requires review.
  - v. The relationship between management and parent representatives on the SGB was deemed to be positive, i.e. 4 participants described such relationship to be excellent, 2 as good and one as satisfactory. It was, however, felt that relationships could be improved through regular meetings between both parties, the conducting of workshops, that a management representative be co-opted to serve on the SGB, the roles of both parties should be clearly defined and that team effort should be encouraged especially over week-ends.
  - vi. The majority of participants agreed that incentives should be provided to parents to attend SGB meetings whilst 1 disagreed. Here again, this majority view must be treated with caution for the reason that the majority of the participants felt differently during the Focus Group discussions.
  - vii. The incentives recommended by the majority of the participants included the provision of meals during meetings, the remuneration of parents to attend meetings, the subsidisation of school fees of those learners whose parents are governors and the payment of a travelling allowance to parent governors to attend meetings.
3. Survey questionnaires completed by parent representatives on SGBs.

During the distribution of the questionnaires to the parent representatives of the SGBs of schools A to G, it emerged that the number of parents who are eligible to be elected is either 6 or 8 as was legislated in the provincial gazette issued by the MEC for Education in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal in 2015.

The lower parent membership is prevalent at those LSEN schools that cater for severely mentally retarded children i.e. commonly referred to as training centres. At

school E, it was noted that 8 parents were elected but only one parent, the Deputy Chair, attends SGB meetings. When principal of school E was asked to provide a reason for this state of affairs, he advised that it was due to parental apathy. He pointed out that he provides transport and refreshments for parents to attend meetings but the attendance is pathetic. Fortunately he is able to obtain a quorum at SGB meetings due to the attendance of his staff representatives, learner representatives and sponsoring body representatives.

Of the 45 questionnaires that were issued, only 28 parent governors responded. Their responses revealed the following:

- i. The majority of the governors are females, i.e. 24 out of 28. The majority of the respondents fall within the age group 30 to 50. Most are unemployed (16) whilst most have attained qualifications at secondary school level (21). Five of the respondents have post matric qualifications.
- ii. Communication in English is problematic. Whilst 17 respondents are able to communicate in English, at least 39% cannot. This aspect needs to be flagged as it could be one of the underlying reasons for non-attendance and the creation of barriers in communication at SGB meetings.
- iii. The period of service as governors varies with the majority (i.e. 19) having served between 1 to 3 years, 6 having served between 3 to 6 years and only 2 having served more than 10 years.
- iv. The timing of meetings has obtained diverse responses. Five parents indicated that they would prefer to attend SGB meetings on weekdays in the mornings, 9 opted for the evenings on weekdays, 10 preferred Saturday mornings and 4 responded under "other".
- v. With regard to the mode of transport, the majority (13) use public transport, followed by own transport (10). Two parents walk to attend meetings and 4 parents travel by other means. The majority of parents deem their mode of transport to be satisfactory to good (22) whilst 9 regard their transport to be unsatisfactory.
- vi. Attendance at meetings are described by the majority as being good to satisfactory (22) whilst the others deemed their attendance to be poor. The majority of parents (22) will attend meetings regularly if provided with school transport.

- vii. 14 parents indicated that they cannot be influenced by management, 10 were unsure and there was no response from 2. Only 2 parents responded to the effect that they can be influenced by management.
- viii. The reasons why the 2 parents agreed that they could be influenced by management was to resolve issues and to work in the best interests of the child.
- ix. The majority of parents expressed the view that they would be qualified to accept the position of secretary or treasurer if training is provided. However 5 parents responded that they were qualified to accept these positions and 5 were unsure.
- x. On the question of whether parents will attend meetings regularly if provided with incentives such as refreshments, 21 responded in the affirmative whilst 7 did not respond.
- xi. On the question of whether parents are playing a leading role in the school's budget, only 4 responded that they were always involved in such activity, 7 parents never played any role, 3 rarely got involved and 11 were sometimes involved.
- xii. On the question on the improvement of the relationship between management and parent governors, 15 agreed that there is room for improvement whilst 5 disagreed.
- xiii. Of those who agreed that the relationship requires improvement, 11 responded that all aspects recorded in the questionnaire requires improvement, 1 selected respect, communication and courtesy, 1 selected transparency, 3 selected trust, respect communication, openness and transparency and 3 selected communication.
- xiv. The majority of parents agreed (13) that the role of the parent as governor is to promote the best interests of the school, 2 were unsure and 2 disagreed.
- xv. The majority of parents (16) agreed that parents in general are reluctant to participate in school activities including becoming members of the SGB, 6 were unsure and 3 strongly disagreed.

- xvi. The reasons for non-participation were varied, i.e. parents are working, parents are scared of management, parents felt inferior, mind-set of parents, lack of communication by the school, SGB duties are onerous, meetings are not arranged for the convenience of parents, no incentives and parents are illiterate.
- xvii. On the question of understanding legislation pertaining to the duties of SGBs, 12 parents responded that their understanding was either good or excellent. The knowledge of others (7) ranged from fair to poor.
- xviii. The school booklet and attendance at workshops were selected as the primary means by which parents were made aware of the legislative framework for SGBs. The internet and other means were also selected.
- xix. The existing legislation was described by the majority of parents (12) as being easily understood whilst 11 parents felt it needs to be simplified. Five parents did not provide any response.
- xx. A number of parents did not provide any response concerning the functions and duties of SGBs. Of those who did, it was mainly to find solutions, to work in the interest of the child, to approve the budget, to fund-raise and to control finances.
- xxi. On the question of whether they are aware that an LSEN school SGB is different from that of a normal school, the majority of parents (17) responded that they are aware of the difference, 2 responded in the negative, 5 were unsure and there was no response from 4.
- xxii. On the subject of whether the existing policy for the election of parents should be amended to make provision for persons to be elected on the basis of their experience and qualifications, the majority agreed and it was recommended that the percentage should be as follows: 5% (5 respondents), 25% (3 respondents), 50% (10 respondents) and 75% (4 respondents). Six parents did not respond.
- xxiii. The quality of training currently provided to governors was deemed to be good by 9 respondents, while 10 deemed training to be either fair or poor. However 6 did not know and 3 did not respond.

- xxiv. 12 respondents felt that their experience of the school's finances were either good or excellent. However, 3 felt that their experience was poor and 9 felt it was fair. There was no response from 4 parents.
- xxv. The majority of parents (21) agreed that the SGB is playing a meaningful role, 4 were unsure and there was no response from 3 parents.

4. Survey questionnaires completed by ordinary parents who are not governors

Notwithstanding the fact that they are not members of school governing bodies, the return of the questionnaires from ordinary parents was more encouraging in comparison to the return of questionnaires received from parent governors. A total of 52 questionnaires were distributed and of these, 40 questionnaires were completed and returned. The responses from these parents revealed the following:

- i. The majority of respondents were female i.e. 30 out of 40. Whilst the home language of the majority is English (25), a significant number of respondents (15) responded to the effect that their home language was IsiZulu. The majority of respondents were in the age group 30 to 50 (33). The majority of respondents are in employment (25), 10 were unemployed and 5 were at home. The majority of parents attained an education at secondary school level (27), 6 had diplomas and 4 had degrees. The number of respondents who had children attending school for periods of 1 to 5 years was 18, from 5 to 10 years the number was 19 and more than 10 years, the number was 3.
- ii. The majority of parents felt that it was appropriate to have meetings on a Saturday morning, 11 felt that weekday mornings would be ideal, 7 opted for weekday evenings, 5 for other options and there was no response from 2 parents.
- iii. The majority used their own transport to attend meetings (19), 15 used public transport, 5 used other means of transport, 2 walked to meetings and there was no response from 2 parents. The mode of transport used was described by the majority to be good or satisfactory and 2 felt it was poor.
- iv. Only 7 of the 40 respondents did not attend any parent meetings and the reasons advanced for such non-participation was primarily due to them not being eligible to serve on SGBs, working, baby-sitting or not being invited to attend meetings.

- v. The majority of those who attended meetings (29), did not raise any matters at these meetings. Those who raised matters raised issues such as transport, hostel accommodation, child's career and school fees.
- vi. The majority of respondents (26) did not know the names of their school governors.
- vii. A majority of 36 respondents did not raise any matters with their parent governors. Those who raised matters did so only in respect of the safety of learners and transport.
- viii. With regard to communication in English, only 2 parents experienced difficulty. The rest did not experience any challenges.
- ix. The majority of respondents felt that there was no specific issues that the SGB should be involved in (17) but there are a significant number (11) who responded in the affirmative.
- x. Only 4 respondents previously served as members of the SGB. The majority (35) had never served as such members. The reasons provided by the majority included responses such as their children were new at school, time constraints, lack of experience, awaiting their turn, meeting times are not suitable, some are not interested, many are working and they were not nominated to serve.
- xi. The majority of respondents (23) indicated that they cannot be influenced by the school's management, 15 were not sure and 2 responded in the affirmative for the reason that it would be in the best interests of their children.
- xii. On the question of whether parents would attend meetings regularly if provided with school transport, 28 responded in the affirmative, 7 said no, there was no comment from 4 respondents and 1 parent provided no response.
- xiii. On the question of whether parents are qualified to accept the position of secretary or treasurer, the majority (15) agreed if training was provided, 9 responded in the affirmative, 10 were not sure and there was no response from 1 parent.

- xiv. On the question of incentives being provided to attend meetings regularly, the majority (26) agreed and 14 did not.
- xv. The majority (23) of respondents felt that the relationship between management and parents requires improvement, 7 disagreed, 14 did not respond and 7 were unsure. Of those who agreed, 11 felt that all aspects of the relationship listed required improvement, 1 listed transparency, 1 listed helpfulness, 6 listed trust, respect, 2 listed openness and courtesy and 5 listed communication.
- xvi. The majority of respondents (29) agreed that the role of the parent as a governor is to promote the best interests of the school, 3 disagreed, 5 were unsure and there was no response from 3.
- xvii. Exactly 50% of respondents agree that parents are reluctant to participate in the activities of the school, including becoming SGB members, 6 disagreed, 10 were unsure and there was no response from 4 participants. Of those who agreed, the reasons provided for such non-participation were due to ignorance, lack of commitment, duties being too onerous, lack of transport, staff is condescending, lack of focus, timing of meetings lack of skills and lack of time.
- xviii. The majority of respondents (21) viewed their understanding of the functions and duties of the SGB as being good to excellent, 9 described their understanding as fair, 7 as poor and there was no response from 3 participants. Some of the functions indicated were school governance, communication between parents, finances, interests of children, development of the school, school decision-making, maintenance, code of conduct for learners, support and school sports.
- xix. The majority of the respondents (18) were made aware of the constitution, powers and duties of the SGB through the school booklet or by attending school meetings, 7 claimed awareness through the internet and a significant number (12) was not aware of these functions.
- xx. A total number of 14 respondents described existing legislation pertinent to SGBs as being easily understood, 3 felt it was too complex, 12 felt it needs to be simplified, 5 felt it was not applicable to them and there was no comment from 5 respondents.

- xxi. Although 15 respondents were aware that a LSEN school SGB is different from that of a normal school, a significant number (13) were not aware and 10 were not sure.
- xxii. The majority of parents agreed that the existing policy for the election of parents on the SGB should make provision for persons to be elected on the basis of experience and educational qualifications. Of that majority, 15 recommended that 15% of parents should be elected on the basis of experience and qualifications, 12 recommended 75%, 5 recommended 25% and 3 recommended 5%. There was no response from 5 participants.

## 5. Focus Group discussions

A total number of 7 principals of the selected schools were invited to participate in the Focus Group. However, on the day of the meeting, 5 principals were in attendance, the other 2 having tendered their apologies for personal reasons. The participants were introduced to the researcher (moderator) and his team. The researcher was personally responsible for facilitating the discussions and making notes of important points discussed. A note-taker was in attendance to take notes and an assistant was in attendance to attend to technical matters such as the tape recording of the entire discussions.

At the outset, the moderator explained the purpose of the Focus Group i.e. to help explain results obtained through data collection methods, such as the survey. The moderator pointed out that these groups are deemed to be especially helpful in explaining findings that appear to be counterintuitive or conflicting. He also emphasised the need for maintaining anonymity and in this regard, he pointed out that the respective principals will be referred to as the principal of school A, school B, school C, school D or school E. He also explained the need to record the discussions electronically and there was no objections with regard to such request.

Following a brief overview of the study and after having provided a summary of the results obtained from the questionnaires completed by the principals and parents of the selected schools, the moderator pointed out that discussions will take cognizance of the following main issues that were deemed by participants to be the perceived primary causes of parental apathy:

- i. Training;
- ii. Provision of incentives;
- iii. Timing of school activities/meetings;



- iv. Improvement of relationship between school management and parents;
- v. Qualifications for the election of parents as SGB members;
- vi. Legislation; and
- vii. Communication.

The moderator also outlined the need to raise issues not covered during the discussions and the need to obtain comments in relation to the management of LSEN schools.

## 5.1 Training

As participants of the survey were of the majority view that training provided to parent governors is inadequate, it was necessary to obtain clarity from the Focus Group in respect of the following:

- i. What training is currently provided?
- ii. Is there a training manual available for governors and is such manual updated periodically?
- iii. Is the training manual inadequate or ineffective and if so, how can it be reviewed to make it more acceptable?
- iv. Should there be a competency test to determine whether parents are able to implement what they have learnt from the manual or the training provided?
- v. Should training be provided to parents who have the potential of serving as governors or should such training be restricted only to elected governors?

It emerged that training of governors is undertaken by the Department of Education in the form of workshops but inevitably, the attendance is extremely poor. It was also pointed out that these workshops are held during weekdays which makes it difficult for parent governors to attend. The principal of school E was more explicit in his response. He pointed out that the Department of Education provides training only once or twice per year and this is inadequate. In his opinion, "the level of literacy means that there are few affluent parents, which compromises the parents' level of understanding of certain topics, also due to language barriers."

It also emerged that whilst a training manual is in existence, such manual was printed 10 or 15 years ago and "no reviews have taken place since. Pieces of legislation were being received instead".

It was also apparent that the type of training provided does not cater adequately to serve the needs of the school. One principal commented to the effect that he oversees the election of parents on school governing bodies and during this process he "noted that parents come from all walks of life and those serving on the SGB need visual stimuli as well as theoretical knowledge." He believes that all aspects of

governance should be capacitated to all individuals bearing in mind that there are many shortfalls with the interview committees. Hence this leads to “corruption and various other problems during interviews and selection of appropriate candidates.”

On the subject of a competency test, principal of school A remarked that “competency tests need to be contextualised and the way to do competency tests is to democratise the process.” He stated further that “In order for this to be achieved and to level the playing field, every person who has an interest in serving at governance level should be afforded an opportunity to attend such training as a person cannot be subjected to a test if every person is not put on an equal platform.”

The principal of school B remarked that the State should undertake an exercise to “train the general public on what school governance is about”. Principal of school B also felt that departmental presenters at training workshops did not know the structure of the SGB of LSEN schools. When questions are put to such presenters, the inevitable response is that they have to check with the Department of Education. It also emerged that training provided for governors serving at LSEN schools is essentially the same training provided for mainstream schools, notwithstanding the differences prevalent when comparing both schools.

A view was expressed that the Department of Education provides training specifically for the purpose of ensuring compliance with the legal requirements. It emerged that the said Department places more focus on the election process of SGB representatives and minimum training takes place.

## 5.2 Provision of incentives

The proposed introduction of incentives such as provision of meals, transportation to meetings and free transport for learners to entice parents to participate in the activities of the school was supported by the majority of respondents during the survey. Hence it was necessary to obtain clarity from the Focus Group in respect of the following:

- i. Are there other cost effective ways to entice parents to participate in school activities and if so, what are these ways?
- ii. Assuming that all these incentives are provided, will the school be able to sustain the costs of such incentives and if so, how can such expenditure be financed from the school’s budget?
- iii. What role, if any, should the Department of Education play in creating awareness amongst parents in active school participation or should this role be the sole responsibility of the principal?

Principal D commented that education is a national initiative and that something needs to be done from that level in terms of legislation. He expressed the view that it is important for the State to get companies where parents are employed to be given either time off or get paid for the time that they are attending SGB meetings.

It was noted that incentives such as the provision of meals during meetings and free transport are being provided and in most instances this arrangement does enhance the attendance of parent governors.

Principal of school A, however, expressed the view that parents are elected to serve on the SGB for the betterment of the school and to bring about an improvement in the lives of their children. He therefore questioned the need for incentives and therefore subscribed to the concept that serving on SGBs should be voluntary. He also cautioned against providing incentives in terms of monetary value as such action would be in conflict with legislation.

There was general consensus that if incentives are provided to parents, then expenditure resulting therefrom should be through sponsorships and not school funds. Principal of school B also agreed that the introduction of incentives may result in corruption and may create various other problems.

### 5.3 Timing of school meeting/activities

On the basis that a significant number of parents felt that meetings and other school activities should be held on a Saturday morning to enable them to attend, it was necessary to pose the following questions to the Focus Group:

- i. What are your views to such proposal?
- ii. If such activities are to be held on a Saturday morning, will this result in any implications such as payment of over-time for staff?

The following is the response from the principal of school D:

“One of the biggest problems that I reported was my experience on sports days which were held on Sundays, and now staff members feel that they should not be on duty on a Sunday. They are willing to stay for extra-curricular activities for an hour or two from Monday to Friday, however, they are not prepared to spend a whole day at school over a week-end, therefore the sports day has had to move to a week day. As special schools, there is a large number of non-teaching personnel and they have been expressive with regard to their start and end times for work and they are also not prepared to work on week-ends.”

The principal of school A also expressed challenges in having school activities on a Saturday, especially if it involved staff to be on duty. He drew attention to the fact that there could be serious labour implications. He stated further that “There needs to be a balance of the expectations of the teacher versus the expectations of the parent. There seems to be a far greater expectation from parents of the teacher. It is unfortunate that as a school, the expectation of the parent is never realised due to poor parent involvement.”

Principal of school A pointed out that an incentive system for staff to be on duty on a Saturday can be determined by the school’s management and the SGB such as time off but he cautioned that staff cannot be forced to be on duty over week-ends.

The principal of school C was also not in agreement with the remuneration of State employees for week-end duty as he felt it would be unauthorised and irregular. He supported the idea of time-off for such personnel.

Principal of school A, however, drew attention to section 18A of the SASA which made provision for State personnel to be remunerated by the SGB for extraneous work subject to prior approval from the Head of Education. He suggested that this be investigated further.

#### 5.4 Improvement of the relationship with the management

Taking cognizance of the fact that almost 75% of parent governors felt that there is room for improvement in respect of the relationship between the school’s management and parents, the following questions were posed to the Focus Group:

- i. What are your views in this regard?
- ii. If you are in agreement with the opinion of the parents, what remedial action can you put in place as the institutional head to improve such relationship?
- iii. If you are in disagreement, can you explain reasons why?

There was general consensus that the relationship between management and parents require improvement. In the words of the principal of school C, “There is a need to have a good relationship between management and the parent component as one cannot be divorced from the other.”

In the words of the principal of school B “.....without a positive relationship between parents and management, there won’t be a positive reaction in so far as the welfare of the child is concerned.”

Principal of school A believes that many management members fail in their relationship with parents due to their inability to listen. In his words, “the ability to listen is now becoming a very rare quality.” He agrees that many management members do not know how to handle irate parents and resulting therefrom, the

school's name becomes tainted. To overcome shortcomings in this regard he recommends that management members should be easily identified by the wearing of name badges, they must be provided with support to deal with difficult parents. He also suggested that feedback must be provided to parents who have complained.

Principal of school D felt that schools must be transparent and communicative with parents. He has observed in his personal capacity that at some schools, there is no positive relationship within the management in the first place.

#### 5.5 Qualifications for election of parents as SGB representatives

The Focus Group was informed that the survey had revealed that the majority of parents believe that the criteria for elections as promulgated in SASA and the relevant provincial regulations should be reviewed so as to allow a certain percentage of parents to be elected on the basis of qualifications, experience in financial management, experience in HR management, experience in health and safety and experience in minute taking. The Focus Group was asked whether they are in agreement with such proposal and if not, what is their standpoint on such proposal and why.

All the participants of the Focus Group agreed that there should be some level of qualifications and expertise of parents serving on SGBs. However, the question of percentages posed a problem. One participant questioned, "Where do we draw the line in terms of percentages."

Principal of school E posed a question as to what can be construed as an adequate qualification for serving on the SGB.

Principal of school A qualified his support for the proposal by stating that whilst people with qualifications are needed, the experience of those with limited qualifications cannot be neglected. He stated further that parents must not be constructively dismissed on the basis of their lack of qualification.

#### 5.6 Legislative requirements

The attention of the Focus Group was drawn to the response from some parents to the effect that the constitution, powers and duties of school governing bodies are too onerous and complicated. The Focus Group was asked to provide its views in this regard taking cognizance of the fact that as principals they must ensure compliance with the legal requirements.

Principal of school A responded to the effect that the constitution of the governing body needs to be relooked at very seriously with specific reference to the composition. He also believes that it is not fair for parents to raise funds for infrastructural development and improvement and he questions the role of the Department of Education in addressing this responsibility.

Principal of school B believes that without legislation, there will be corruption. He pointed out that every special school is unique in nature and are different from the other. Notwithstanding these differences, the Department of Education, through legislation, has placed all LSEN schools in one basket creating challenges. He notes that over the past 20 years some schools have shown improvement and others have shown none due to restrictions in the legislation and challenges pertinent to the composition of SGBs. He believes that legislation needs to be reviewed on an ongoing basis as there is always growth in the development of a school.

The principal of school D indicated that the Department of Education transferred its duties to parents. He believes that the infrastructure of the school is the responsibility of the said Department and the SGB should be fund raising for projects that will be of direct benefit to the learners.

#### 5.7 Communication

The lack of communication between parents and the school was one of the factors that seemed to be inhibiting the active participation of parents in the activities of the school. Some parents expressed the view that existing communication methods were ineffective. The Focus Group was asked to explain the methods employed by their schools to communicate with parents and whether these methods were effective in ensuring the dissemination of information.

According to the principal of school C, the only form of effective communication is by means of a 'message book' which learners take home on a daily basis to be read, signed and brought back to school the following day.

Other methods employed by the participating schools include the following:

- i. Letters outlining school events and activities are sent to parents with the learners. In most instances, no responses are received to such letters. The following comment in this regard was made by the principal of school D: "The interesting thing is that when a written reply or acknowledgement is requested, for some reason or other, the parent finds it convenient not to respond."
- ii. Some schools have created a web site which is used to highlight school activities.

- iii. Contact with parents is also made by land line but invariably, these calls are not answered by the parent. Similarly with cell phones. Parents have the habit of changing their cell phone numbers but they do not inform the schools of their new numbers.
- iv. Parent meetings are also arranged but here again, all parents do not attend.

The principal of school B indicated that at times when learners are sick and there is no response from the parents, then this poses a serious challenge for his school. There were instances when he was forced to leave learners at the nearest police station and make an entry to that effect in his log book.

### 5.8 Management of LSEN schools

The Focus Group was asked to indicate whether they were of the view that the management of LSEN schools is more complex than the management of mainstream schools and if so, to elaborate on the following:

- i. What are the reasons for the complexity?
- ii. Do you think that arising from such complexity, LSEN schools should be managed by Boards of Management like it was done pre-1996, but with the condition that a portion of the members be appointed by the MEC for Education on the basis of their expertise in special education and the remaining number be parents elected democratically?
- iii. What would your response be for supporting such a proposal?

Principal of school B responded to the effect that a board of management was the structure that give birth to all special schools. In supporting the idea of referring to systems that worked in past years, he also agreed that special schools are complex. The principal of school A also agreed that LSEN schools are far more complex than mainstream schools. He stated that the complexity is further compounded by the fact that LSEN schools are required to transport learners, provide supplementary health services and other administrative functions that are not performed at mainstream schools. He supported the concept of establishing boards of management for LSEN schools and felt that the appointment by the MEC for Education of members with expertise in specialised education is a brilliant suggestion for the simple reason that the debate around the qualifications and experience of parents will fall away. He also agreed that parent representatives should continue to be elected democratically. Principal A also felt that currently the responsibility of governance lies with the parents when in fact it should lie with the State.

The principal of school E also supported the role of a management system as he felt that currently there is a lack of expertise on the governing body. He also agreed that LSEN schools are very complex to manage. He, however, felt that in terms of composition, the parents should be in the majority by at least one more than the number appointed by the MEC for Education.

Principal of school D supported the concept of LSEN schools being governed by a board of management but he felt that the Department of Education should not have control of the funds that are raised by parents.

Principal of school C responded that when he joined his school, there was a board of management in control and different expertise was noticeable, unlike now when such expertise is lacking. He felt that it was a good idea for the MEC for Education to “get involved.”

In response to a question from the moderator as to whether SASA dictates that parents must be responsible for education, principal of school A argued that in terms of national legislation, special schools are different. He pointed out that the SGB must have active members. He reiterated that “The State should be the majority as there is a need for the presence of personnel from the State who will report back to the State. In this way, they are accountable to the state and the governing body.”

#### 5.9 Curriculum and Functionality

Participants were given an opportunity of raising matters that may not have been adequately covered during the session and in response, the following issues were raised:

Principal of school A mentioned that one of the core functions of the SGB in terms of the SASA is to determine the school curriculum. In his view, the parents in general should provide a mandate in this regard to the SGB. In making reference to school B where he once taught, he pointed out that the skills development curriculum is not a legislated curriculum but it was developed by proactive principals who used the Continuous Assessment Programme (CAPS) as a guideline. It was an illegitimate curriculum and to date the Department of Education has not approved a curriculum for learners in the prevocational phase. He lays the blame on SGBs for not taking the initiative in this regard. Principal of school A pointed out that the whole idea of parental involvement is to improve education and curriculum development must be looked at as a core function.

Principal of school C pointed out that both educators and management personnel are empowered in terms of management issues but at no time was there any feedback from the Department of Education when parent governors attended CAPS workshops and neither was any information subsequently disseminated to parents.



He mentioned that parents of learners with special needs were never consulted on the concept of inclusive education.

Principal of school D agreed with the views expressed by his colleagues and he emphasised that there is no curriculum for special schools. The expectation from the Department of Education is that special schools must integrate into the CAPS system. He pointed out that a major part of the CAPS system (at least 25%) cannot be used for learners with special education needs.

Principal of school B expressed the view that the manner in which LSEN schools are lumped with functionality and management with mainstream schools is not working and this is to the detriment of special education. He pointed out that the very managers from the Department of Education who are required to provide the schools with support do not know what is needed at a special school. He mentioned that at his school there is no support received for sign language.

## Part B: Analysis

### 1. Introduction

Taking into consideration that the Focus Group findings will have an impact on the survey findings i.e. the completed questionnaires and/or vice versa, it is deemed prudent to undertake the analysis on a holistic basis. This process will also determine the extent to which the data furnished is reliable bearing in mind that in exercises of this nature, there could be a tendency for participants from both sides to exaggerate or provide responses that are inaccurate.

The primary purpose of the analysis is to establish why parents in general are not participating actively in the governance of LSEN schools and activities relating thereto. The identification of the root causes of such inactive participation will help pave the way forward to find solutions to these challenges and in so doing, bring about an improvement in the overall governance of LSEN schools which are still referred to as special schools by certain role players within the education environment.

### 2. Barriers to effective parental participation

It is evident that female parents are playing a dominant role in the education of the disabled child. Of those parents who currently serve as governors, 85% are women. In the case of the survey conducted amongst parents who do not currently serve as governors, 75% of the respondents were women.

These statistics reveal that male parents of disabled children attending LSEN schools are reliant on their spouses to take control of matters pertinent to the education of the child.

During the Focus Group discussions, the principal of school B made reference to a programme that was being conducted at his school by a medical practitioner and which was being attended by 30 parents. Of these 30 parents, there were only 4 male parents present. In congratulating the attendance of the fathers, this principal asked the mothers where the other fathers were because raising a child is not the responsibility of the mother alone. Whilst the principal did not receive any response to this pertinent question, the participation of male parents in the activities of LSEN schools is a matter of concern that must receive attention by the Department of Education as part of ongoing awareness programmes.

During the survey, the majority of principals agreed that parents were not playing a meaningful role on the SGBs. Although this opinion may be considered one of fact, such circumstances could be attributed to the following reasons advanced by both categories of parents for the lack of active participation on SGBs and other school activities:

#### 2.1 The need for management to improve their relationship with parents.

All the respondents agreed that the relationship pertinent to trust, respect, communication, courtesy, openness and transparency requires improvement. This aspect was also raised with the Focus Group during which the principals agreed that there is a need to have a good relationship between management and parents. The following is a comment from the principal of School B: "...without a positive relationship between parents and management, there won't be a positive reaction in so far as the welfare of the child is concerned."

The principal of School A puts the blame squarely on management for not ensuring a positive relationship between parents and management. His comment to the effect that "many management members do not know how to handle irate parents" is indicative that such staff members have not been adequately trained to deal with difficult parents on the SGB or parents in general. Hence the need for relevant personnel to be identified and trained so as to enhance the relationship between management and parents.

The improvement of relationships must also adequately address the concerns of some parents to the effect that they are scared of management, that staff are condescending or that they feel inferior in the presence of such management.

## 2.2 Timing of meetings and school activities

This question solicited diverse views from parent governors. Whilst the majority preferred meetings to be held on week-days, a substantial number preferred Saturday mornings. It is of significance to note that currently at almost all the selected schools, meetings are held on a week-day afternoon but in spite thereof, attendance of parent governors at SGB meetings is problematic. Hence the question must be raised as to whether the majority response from parent governors to have these meetings on a week-day is in fact a genuine response. On the other hand, the majority of parents who are not parent governors opted to have school meetings and activities on a Saturday morning. This matter was raised with the Focus Group to obtain further clarity.

Although all principals felt that there was merit in having school meetings and activities on a Saturday morning, there was a reluctance to support such proposal on the grounds that staff members feel that they should not be on duty over a week-end.

One principal commented as follows: "With regard to meetings on a Saturday, I wish to contextualise that there are serious implications from a labour point of view."

Another principal felt strongly that school personnel cannot be compelled to work over week-ends based on the fact that they are 5 day workers. The majority of principals agreed that in the event staff were required to work during such periods, then they must be remunerated by the State for such additional days or alternatively they must be given time off.

Another participant, however, expressed the view that he was not in favour of financial remuneration from school funds for state employees as such action would be deemed to be unauthorised and irregular.

Notwithstanding the views expressed by the principals, one cannot ignore the fact that not all parents are in a position to participate in the activities of the school if such are scheduled on a week-day. The proposal to hold such activities on a Saturday morning is not unreasonable bearing in mind that a significant number of parents can make themselves available on that day of the week.

The timing of meetings becomes a serious issue when considering the following remarks of the principal of school E:

“It is also a reality that the vast majority of parents in the LSEN schools are poverty stricken and work below the bread-line and when school activities are scheduled they do not get paid for attendance. This then presents a choice for the parent having to balance between earning a living and attending school activities and they are choosing to be at work, which is understandable.”

Due to the challenges mentioned above, principals do find themselves in an invidious position in that they have no option but to hold meetings on a week-day. One cannot, however, ignore the fact that meetings and other school activities held on week days does impede the active participation of parents. Hence the need for intervention by the Department of Education to address and resolve the impasse.

### 2.3 The reluctance of parents to participate in the activities of the school

The majority of respondents (both parent governors and those who are not) agreed that parents in general are reluctant to take an active part in the activities of the school including becoming members of the SGB. The main reasons advanced for such behaviour are lack of incentives, parents are working, some parents are scared of management, some feel inferior, lack of communication, meeting times are inappropriate, illiteracy amongst parents, ignorance, duties of the SGB are too onerous, lack of transport, lack of skills, school staff is condescending and some parents do not have the time.

These reasons for non-participation are of concern and require further analysis. The issues regarding the relationship between management and parents and the timing of meetings have been dealt with above. The following concerns raised, however, require comment:

- i. The lack of communication  
This concern seems to be a debatable issue taking cognizance of the fact that it was also raised during the Focus Group discussions. As alluded to by the principals during these discussions, adequate communication systems are in place to keep in touch with parents. In addition to sending out letters on a regular basis, all schools adhere to the system of a ‘message book’ which learners take home on a daily basis.

The message book has to be initialled by the parent and returned on the following school day. Some schools also have web sites and most of the schools use the SMS system to also communicate with parents. The telephone and cell phone are also used to communicate with parents but as mentioned by the principals, these systems are ineffective for two reasons, viz. parents are not at home to answer their land lines and cell phone numbers are frequently changed by parents without notification to the school.

As one principal put it, "Communication should be a two way thing." It is apparent that messages from the school are received but there is reluctance on the part of parents to provide responses.

This attitude on the part of parents was summarised by one principal as follows: "The interesting thing is that when a written reply or acknowledgement is requested, for some reason or other, the parents find it convenient not to respond."

From the foregoing, it is evident that communication is not one of the factors that impedes the effective participation of parents in the activities of the school. It is, however, deemed necessary to educate parents on the need for regular communication with the school concerning their children's education.

ii. The lack of incentives

The majority of parents agreed that the introduction of incentives such as provision of meals during meetings, provision of school transport to attend school meetings and free transport for learners whose parents serve on the SGB would entice parents to participate in school activities. During the survey, 6 of the 7 principals also agreed that incentives will be a means to get parents to attend SGB meetings. During the Focus Group discussions, it emerged that schools do provide transport and refreshments for parents to attend SGB meetings. Notwithstanding this arrangement, it was noted that attendance of parents at SGB meetings was not entirely satisfactory. As already mentioned under the heading 'findings', the principal of school E pointed out that of 8 parent representatives on his SGB, only one attends in spite of providing transport to pick up parents.

Hence the question must be asked as to whether the lack of incentives is indeed a barrier to effective parental participation on SGBs.

The views of principals during the Focus Group discussions provided more clarity on their initial support for the provision of incentives to parents to

attend meetings. One principal questioned why incentives should be provided as he felt that serving on the SGB should be a voluntary action. The following remark illustrates his views in this matter: "When parents serve in governance, it should not be for financial reward or for reimbursement. If there is any incentive created, even if it is of a financial nature, it should perhaps come through a sponsorship."

This view was supported by other participants during the Focus Group discussions and as one principal put it, "I must point out that once money is introduced in the system, there is a possibility that there will be people that work in cahoots and in unison and the best person may not be known by the rest of the populist. Therefore there will be a group of wrong people with ulterior motives serving on the board."

Another principal felt that the introduction of incentives may create an opportunity for manipulation and will not assist the situation with regard to active parent participation.

During the Focus Group discussions, the legality of using school vehicles to transport parents was also raised. It was pointed out that the school's buses are provided for the transportation of learners and support staff such as the teacher aides. There are no guidelines from the Department of Education as to whether these vehicles can also be used for the transportation of parents. Hence the question arose as to who will be liable in the event a parent is injured in an accident.

Taking into consideration the financial and legal implications pertinent to the provision of incentives such as transportation of parents to meetings and the payment of an allowance for attendance at meetings, it will be necessary for the Department of Education to issue guidelines to all LSEN schools in this regard.

Cognizance must also be taken of the comment made by one principal concerning the introduction of incentives for parents:

"Education is a national initiative, and something needs to be done from that level in terms of legislation. It is important for the State to get companies, for example, where parents are employed, that they are given time off, or get paid for that time that they are attending meetings. This could be another incentive for parents to attend meetings."

Under the chapter Literature Review of this dissertation, reference is made under the sub-heading 'an international perspective' that in the United Kingdom, labour legislation provides for employees to be given time-off to attend SGB meetings.

The introduction of such incentive within the South African context may prove to be advantageous in encouraging the active participation of parents in school governance especially in the case of those in employment.

These incentive may also address the concerns of those parents who have stated that they are unable to attend school activities due to work commitments.

iii. Inadequate training provided to parent governors

The majority of parent governors have indicated that the quality of training offered by the Department of Education to make them effective governors is unsatisfactory. The majority of these respondents have also indicated that they have no experience to accept the position of either secretary or treasurer on the SGB and neither have they received any training in this regard. Similarly, the majority of parents who are not governors have no experience to accept the position of secretary or treasurer if they are appointed on the SGB.

The initial reaction of the Focus Group to the response by parents was one of cautiousness. Even in their responses to the questionnaire, the majority of the principals agreed that the training provided was adequate.

However, following probing during the Focus Group discussions, the following emerged:

- a. The training provided is inconsistent and does not cover visual stimuli;
- b. Training is provided once or twice a year and makes no provision for new governors who are appointed as replacements during the 3 year term of office;
- c. Training is not provided for parent governors to participate as members on interview panels. Hence there are many shortfalls with interview committees which creates administrative and legal challenges.
- d. Chairpersons are not adequately trained to handle SGB meetings and principals have to intervene and provide guidance;
- e. Dates chosen for training are inappropriate;
- f. Training becomes problematic due to language barriers. Workshops are either held in English or IsiZulu and no translation services are provided when English-speaking and IsiZulu-speaking parents are present at the same workshop.
- g. Presenters conducting workshops are not adequately trained and during question time, they invariably are unable to provide adequate responses.

- h. The primary objective of the Department of Education in providing training appears to be compliance with the legislative requirements. The focus is not to improve the level of competence of parents to exercise their duties as governors.
- i. Training is restricted to parents who are elected to be governors. The State has not undertaken any awareness programmes to sensitise the general public on school governance at public schools.
- j. The Department of Education relies on principals to provide ongoing training to parents and this is an onerous task.
- k. The training manual was introduced almost 15 years ago and was not reviewed since that date.

In noting the views recorded above, it is obvious that the training currently provided is outdated and is not having the desired effect in ensuring good governance at schools. The Department of Education must play a more positive role in the training of parent governors and in this regard should not rely solely on school principals to undertake such task.

If parents are not adequately trained, their participation on school governance becomes ineffective.

#### 2.4 Qualifications for election of parents as SGB representatives

The election of parents on SGBs is governed by SASA and in terms of the relevant criteria contained in the said act, a candidate standing for election does not have to have relevant experience or educational qualifications to be nominated for appointment as a member of the SGB.

The majority of parents, in both categories, agreed that the legislative requirements should be reviewed to make it a legal requirement for a percentage of candidates to be nominated on the basis of experience and educational qualifications.

The Focus Group did not have any objection to the review of legislation as proposed but there were questions raised as to the level of qualifications that must be stipulated and the percentages that should be reserved for candidates with relevant experience.

The Group felt that principals should be in attendance during the election of parent representatives as it will enable them to know in advance the type of parents who are being nominated for election to serve as SGB members. Currently, as the CEO of the school, they are not permitted to be in attendance at such elective meetings and are only aware of the calibre of candidates after the process has been finalised.



Although this argument may be justified as it will allow for principals to ensure that the elected parents are the ones they want, the implementation of such a proposal can lead to the abuse of a democratic election process of parents and ultimately will negate the intention of the legislature. The proposal to legislate for a percentage of the parents to be elected on the basis of qualifications and experience will also restrict the democratic election process. It would be more appropriate to legislate for a suitable nomination process before elections are held. It is apparent that the process of nominations and elections being conducted in one day is presenting problems as parents are not made aware in advance of the calibre of persons who are to be elected.

## 2.5 Legislative requirements

It is apparent that the legislative framework pertaining to school governance is not easily understood by both governors and parents in general. It must be noted that legislation outlines how the SGB must be constituted, how its members must be elected and what duties and functions must be performed by governors. It stands to reason, therefore, that these requirements must be easily understood by parents and especially parent governors so as to ensure the SGB functions effectively and in accordance with the law.

Failure to understand their duties and functions can result in unnecessary conflict situations between those who know and those who do not.

The Focus Group also agreed that the current legislation requires review.

One principal remarked that the constitution of the SGB needs to be relooked at very seriously with specific reference to its composition. In his view, "The vast majority of LSEN schools within the province are faced with this problem." He also points out that it is a burden for parents to govern when they have no background knowledge of how the school was established.

Another principal pointed out that current legislation lumps all LSEN schools in one basket when in fact every school is unique.

In this regard it must be pointed out that under the title LSEN, there are different categories of schools, viz. schools for the blind, schools for the deaf, schools for the physically handicapped, schools for the cerebral palsied, schools for the autistic and schools for severally mentally retarded children. Each of these institutions has its own unique character, culture, traditions and learning methods. The view was expressed that a proposed review of the existing legislation must take cognizance of the uniqueness of individual categories of LSEN schools.

The view was also expressed that the Department of Education is abdicating on its responsibility in providing funding for the upkeep and maintenance of the school buildings. The SGB is required to raise funds for this purpose and this is one of the reasons parents are reluctant to serve on the SGB.

## 2.6 Management of LSEN schools

Some of the crucial questions posed to the Focus Group was whether LSEN schools are more complex than public ordinary schools (i.e. mainstream schools), the reasons for such complexity and whether the governance structure for such schools should be reviewed on the basis that existed immediately prior to the enactment of SASA.

It was unanimously agreed that LSEN schools are more complex than public ordinary schools in terms of the type of learners admitted, the type of infrastructure provided (e.g. the provision of hostel and ancillary facilities), the provision of transport for learners, provision of therapy services, the school curriculum, sporting codes, the provision of in-house health services etc. Arising from this view, it was noted that there is a serious lack of expertise on LSEN SGBs. In this regard, it was pointed out that prior to the establishment of the current system of SGBs, LSEN schools were managed by a board of management that consisted of 5 representatives nominated by the sponsoring body and 4 by the relevant Minister of Education. The said Minister appointed representatives on the basis of their expertise on special education pertinent to different categories of disability.

Similarly, sponsoring bodies that catered primarily for specific disabilities nominated representatives who had expert knowledge in respect of disabled children e.g. deaf and blind. This arrangement ensured that persons with the relevant expertise and appropriate qualifications served on the board of management.

One of the principals remarked as follows with regard to the management of LSEN schools by a board of management: "This was the structure that gave birth to all special schools. Why not refer to past years and see what worked?"

Another participant on the Focus Group felt that that a system of establishing boards of management for LSEN schools is a 'brilliant idea' in that it will ensure that the MEC for Education in the Province will be able to nominate his representatives on the basis of knowledge of and expertise on special education and that the debate on experience and qualifications of parent representatives

serving on such boards will fall away. It was suggested that the MEC responsible for education in a Province could appoint a certain number of representatives and the remaining number be parents elected democratically thereby ensuring that parents do have a say in the education of the disabled child.

The discussion on this topic was summed up by one principal as follows: "All the principals seem to concur that the establishment of a board of management is the way to go. As parents come and go, the calibre of parent changes. There should be a fixed term for parents once elected. The State should make up the majority of members given that this is a State institution."

During discussion under 'curriculum and functionality', it emerged from the Focus Group that there is a lack of parental involvement in the development of the curriculum for non-academic learners and that the SGB should take responsibility for this state of affairs.

It is agreed that arising from the lack of parental involvement at governance level, various other SGB functions are at risk of not being performed. Hence the need to review the current system of governance at LSEN schools.

## 2.7 Bio-variables

For the purpose of this study, it was also deemed necessary to use the SPSS software to undertake structural analysis between variables. Data received from parents was used to assess the association between certain variables and the level of significance. For this purpose the Chi-Square Test Statistic was used. One of the examples related to the association between the parents' experience as a governor and the extent to which management has influence on such parents. This process could not proceed for the reason that the frequencies were too low as per the outcome of the Test. The expected count in terms of the Test is 16 or more. Notwithstanding this impediment, the data from the SPSS software was summarised in a table format in MS Word so as to facilitate comparison of the variables. These tables are contained in Appendix 11.

## Part C: Conclusion

The research findings and analysis recorded under this chapter lend credibility to conclusions arrived at by other researchers on the subject of school governance which confirm that there is a serious problem in the involvement of

parents on such structures. The primary reasons for this state of affairs have been identified previously by researchers and corrective measures were recommended. It is, however, extremely disconcerting to note that the challenges have not been addressed by the relevant authorities and resulting therefrom there is a continuous decline in parental involvement in the education of their children as can be evidenced from this Chapter.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 1. Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the significant factors that impede the active participation of parents on the governance structures of LSEN schools. It also highlights the recommended solutions to overcome the identified challenges as well as the researcher's concluding remarks.

#### 2. Summary of factors impeding the active participation of parents on governance structures

The findings outlined in the preceding chapter supports the outcome of research undertaken in respect of similar topics that there is a reluctance on the part of parents generally to participate actively on governance structures established at South African schools.

Whilst it can be stated that apathy is a contributing factor in the declining involvement of parents in the education of their children, this research has identified other underlying factors that have an impact in the lack of parental involvement. These factors can be summarised as follows (not in any order of priority):

- 2.1 There is a tendency for a majority of male parents to abdicate their role and responsibilities as the leader in the household. This is evidenced by the number of females who are currently involved in school governance and those who participated in the survey.
- 2.2 The quality of training provided and the lack thereof has resulted in ineffective governance structures especially in leadership roles such as the chairing of meetings and undertaking the role of secretary and treasurer. Invariably there is a tendency for parents to decline acceptance of such leadership roles to avoid being embarrassed within an environment consisting primarily of intellectuals. The reluctance to participate can also be attributed to ignorance and the fear to assume responsibilities that makes one accountable for one's actions.
- 2.3 The attitude of management towards parents is deemed to be a motivating factor in the lack of parental involvement in governance structures and other school activities. Parents have commented that they feel inferior in the presence of management and that staff is condescending. These concerns were confirmed by the principals during

the Focus Group discussions. It is also apparent that the principles of Batho Pele as advocated by the State are not being adhered to within the schooling environment and as a result this causes parents to become disillusioned.

- a. Language poses a serious barrier in effective communication, especially during workshops held to train governors and during parent meetings conducted at school. This challenge is significant at English medium schools and when training is undertaken by English speaking instructors without any translation services being provided for parents whose home language is IsiZulu. Parents who are unable to understand English or IsiZulu tend to become frustrated and show no interest to participate in school activities.
- b. The timing of school meetings during weekday mornings and evenings does prevent a number of parents from becoming actively involved in school governance. The survey undertaken has revealed that the majority of governors are females and it can stand to reason that attending school activities during the day or in the evenings will become a challenge for them if they are working or if they have to tend to small children at home.
- c. The existing legislative framework for school governance, especially for LSEN schools, is problematic. Notwithstanding the diverse nature of LSEN schools, such institutions have all been “lumped” together with public ordinary schools and in the process there are inconsistencies prevailing in issues such as funding and staffing at such schools. Parents have complained that the legislation is too complex and should be simplified. The majority of parents also see the need to regulate election criteria so as to ensure that a percentage of those who are nominated for election are appropriately experienced or qualified to serve on governing bodies.
- d. Whilst the principals of the participating schools were not entirely in support of providing incentives to entice parents to participate on governance structures, the majority of parents indicated that they would attend school meetings and activities regularly if they are transported by the school or provided with refreshments during meetings or if their children are transported without payment of the requisite transport fee. Although schools are currently transporting parents to SGB meetings, the continued provision of such incentive may have to be reviewed in the light of legal implications as school vehicles have been provided solely for the transportation of learners to and from school and for educational excursions. The provision of refreshments will also depend on the

availability of funding in the approved school budgets. The remuneration of parents from school funds to serve as governors was not supported by the Focus Group as such action will be in conflict with SASA. It was, however, suggested that working parents should be given time off by their employers and in this regard it will be necessary for the labour laws to be reviewed appropriately.

- e. The concept of establishing a new governance structure for LSEN schools was advocated by the Focus Group on the basis that there is a need for more involvement from the State in the education of the disabled child. A management board with representation from the State and parents of learners is deemed to be an ideal platform to govern LSEN schools.

### 3. Recommendations

The primary purpose of this dissertation is to enhance the active participation of parents on the governance structures of LSEN schools and in so doing, make it possible for parents to become more involved in the education of their children. Due to the complexity of LSEN schools, it is unfair to only impose upon parents of disabled learners to play an active role in the governance of such schools. The Department of Education through its political head must also play a meaningful role in the affairs of the disabled child.

In this regard, it becomes necessary for the said political head to review the existing legislative requirements for the establishment, constitution, powers and duties of the governing structures for LSEN schools. On the other hand, it will also be necessary to improve parental participation on such structures. On that basis, it is recommended as follows:

- i. The existing legal framework for the establishment of a governing body should be amended to provide for the establishment of a management board consisting of a certain number of representatives with relevant expertise from the State or the community and appointed by the relevant MEC for Education and a certain number of parents of learners elected through a simplified democratic process. The nomination process for the election of parent representatives should be clearly stipulated so as to ensure that parents are made aware prior to the election process of the names of nominees, their qualifications and experience.

- ii. In considering the proposed amendment of the legal framework referred to above, the various categories of LSEN schools should be listed to specify their differences in character and uniqueness.
- iii. The Department of Education must take steps to:
  - a. Update the existing training manual in respect of school governance;
  - b. Create awareness programmes to sensitise parents on the need to be more actively involved in the education of their children within the schooling environment;
  - c. Ensure that the training manual covers all aspects of school governance including school finances, selection and interviewing of staff, curriculum development and other relevant functions of the SGB. The training manual should also cater for all official languages;
  - d. Ensure that its presenters undertaking training workshops are adequately capacitated to respond to questions raised by both parents and principals;
  - e. Ensure that training is provided in the language understood by parents and principals.
  - f. Arrangements should be made for school based management personnel to be trained to deal with parents according to the principles of Batho Pele;
  - g. Clear –cut directives should be issued to all principals of LSEN schools as to whether parents can be officially transported on school vehicles to and from school activities;
  - h. Investigate the possibility of remunerating staff who are required to work after normal working hours so as to enable school activities to be held on a Saturday. Such remuneration should be paid by the State and not school funds. As an alternative to remuneration, time-off is suggested in lieu of the over-time worked.
  - i. Make representations to the Department of Manpower to consider the possible amendment of the Labour Relations Act to make it



compulsory for employers to provide time-off, with or without pay, for its employees to attend SGB meetings if such are conducted during normal working hours.

#### 4. Conclusion

It is clearly evident from this study as well as research undertaken previously that parental participation in school governance and related school activities is unsatisfactory and requires improvement. A number of factors have contributed to this situation.

In spite of researchers identifying these factors and recommending solutions to improve the active participation of parents on governance structures, it is of concern to note that the status quo has not changed. The current study has identified a further decline in the interest shown by parents to become involved in school governance or other school activities.

This can only be attributed to the fact that the recommend solutions offered by researchers have not been implemented by the relevant authorities responsible for school governance. In this regard, the Department of Basic Education and the relevant Provincial Education Departments must be held accountable.

This study has also revealed that parents of disabled children are experiencing difficulty in governing LSEN schools on their own, primarily as a result of the uniqueness and complexity of these institutions and coupled by the fact that parents lack the expertise to make informed decisions. It is therefore necessary for SGBs of LSEN schools to be reconstituted so as to ensure that its membership can also consist of experts in the field of specialised education as well as in certain instances, professionals from the local communities such as doctors and retired academics, so that together with elected parents, such schools are able to perform at their optimum.

Principals of LSEN schools are under immense pressure to manage without effective support from their governing bodies and their superiors who lack an understanding of the needs of the disabled child.

It is therefore imperative that the recommendations emanating from this study be given serious consideration by the relevant authorities in an attempt to ensure that LSEN schools function effectively and efficiently.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brandt, R. 1989. *On Parents and Schools. A Conversation with Joyce Epstein*. [http://\(Accessed from Google Scholar on 9 January 2016\)](#).
- Chitiyo, M. 2009. *Special Education Law in Zimbabwe: The Journal of the International Association of Special Education*, Vol. 9(1): 5-12.
- Cotton, K. and Wikelund, K. R. 1989. *Parental involvement in Education*. <http://www.nwrelorg/scpd/sirs/3>. (Accessed on 9 January 2016).
- Department of Education. 1996. *Education White Paper 2: The organization, governance and funding of schools*, Government Printer, Pretoria.
- Gordon, V. 1992. *Reproducing segregation. Parent Involvement, Diversity and School Governance*. University of California. [http://](#) (Accessed from Google Scholar on 9 January 2016)
- Grant-Lewis, S. and Naidoo, J. 2004. *Whose theory of participation? School Governance and Practice in South Africa*, Teaching College, Columbia University.
- Harrel M.C. and Bradley M.A. 2009. *Data Collection Methods. Semi-structured interviews and Focus Groups*. (Accessed from Google Scholar on 22 April 2016).
- Heystek, J. 2004. *School Governing Bodies-the principals' burden or the light of his/her life*. *South African Journal of Education*, 24(4) 308-312.
- Heystek, J. 2011. *School Governing Bodies in South African Schools. Under Pressure to Enhance Democratisation and Improve Quality*. <http://ema.sagepub.com/content/39/4/45>
- Jamieson, S. 2004. *Medical Education* (Pages 1212 to 1218). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. (Accessed from Google Scholar on 17 November 2015).
- Jonas, P.T. 2005. *The governance of public special schools in the Western Cape: A comparative analysis of John Kriel School and Thembaletu Elsen School*, Available from <http://hdl.handle.net/100191/2584>. (Accessed on 28 July 2015).

Kendall and Kendall, 2002. *Systems Analysis and Design*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. (Accessed from Google Scholar on 15 October 2015).

Krueger, R.A. 2002. *Designing and Conducting Focus Group Interviews*, University of Minnesota.

Lombard, A. 2007. *Barriers to family-school partnerships: Exploring challenges in LSEN Schools*, University of Johannesburg.

Marshall, M.N. 1996. *Sampling for qualitative research*. Vol. 13. No.6. (Accessed from Google Scholar on 22 April 2016).

Mcleod, S. 2014. *Sampling Methods*. (Accessed from Google Scholar on 12 December 2017).

Mercury.2015. Changes will compromise SA Education. Article published on 13 October 2015.

Mncube, V. 2009. *The perceptions of parents of their role in the democratic governance of schools in South Africa: Are they on board?* *South African Journal of Education*, 2076-3433.

Mncube, V and Mafora, P. 2013. *School Governing Bodies in Strengthening Democracy and Social Justice: Parents as Partners*. UNISA, Department of Educational Leadership and Management. Accessed from <http://Google Scholar> on 14 May 2016.

Msweli, P. 2015. *Methodology: Research Ethics and Ethical Clearance*. Faculty of Management Science. Durban University of Technology.

Naidoo, J. P. 2005. *Educational Decentralisation and School Governance in South Africa*. From Policy to Practice. UNESCO, 2005. Accessed from <http://Google Scholar> on 12 May 2016.

Nell, J.S. 2010. *Sage Research Methods, Encyclopaedia of Research Design*. Available from <http://srmo.sagepub.comdutlib.ac.za/view/encyc>. (Accessed on 21 September 2015).

Ngidi, D. P. 2004. *Educators' Perceptions of the efficiency of school governing bodies*. *South African Journal of Education*. (Vol. 24 (4), Pages 260 to 263).

Noble, H and Smith J. 2015. *Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research*. (Accessed from Google Scholar On 26 April 2016).

Ntshangase, M. 2002. *School Governing Bodies from the Perspective of the Rural Parent Governors and School Principals in the Vryheid Region*. Stellenbosch University, <http://scholar.sun.ac.za>.

Province of KwaZulu-Natal, 2015. *Provincial Notice No. 12 dated 9 March 2015*. Government Printer, Pretoria.

Quan-baffour, K. P. 2006. *The Role of School Governing Bodies in Improving School Performance in Taung Rural Schools*. UNISA. Accessed from <http://Google Scholar> on 14 May 2016.

Republic of South Africa, 1996. *South African Schools Act, 84 of 1996*, Government Printer, Pretoria.

Schofield, A. M. 2003. *Integrating School Reform and School Community Development. Four case studies from South African Schools*, University of British Columbia.

Sibuyi, S.X. 2000. *The role of parents in governance of secondary schools: a qualitative study of the Bushbuckridge border dispute*, Technikon South Africa.

Smit, M. H. 2015. *School Governing Body Election Deficiencies: Deliberate Democracy Knocking at the Door*. Down-loaded from <http://Google Scholar> on 12 May 2016.

Van Wyk, N. 2004. *School Governing Bodies: The experience of South African Education. International Journal about Parents in Education*. (Vol. 1. No. 0, 132 to 139).

Welman, J.C. and Kruger, S.J. 2001. *Research Methodology*, 2nd Edition, Oxford, Southern Africa.

Wikipedia. *School Governing Bodies*. Accessed from [Wikipedia.org/wiki/school-governing-bodies](http://Wikipedia.org/wiki/school-governing-bodies) on 9 November 2015.

Xaba, M.I. 2011. *The possible cause of school governance challenges in South Africa. South African Journal of Education* 31: 201-211.

## APPENDIX 1

**LETTER OF INFORMATION**

Dear Participant

I am currently a Master's student at the Durban University of Technology. My personal details and that of my Supervisor and information about the study I am embarking upon are reflected below.

**Title of the Research Study:**

The inactive participation of parents as governors at LSEN Schools

**Researcher: (Name, qualifications):**

Premishwar Haripersad, B Tech: Public Management

**Supervisor: (Name, qualifications):**

Ms Charlotte Mbali, PhD (IEUL)

**Brief Introduction and Purpose of the Study:**

An examination of prevailing literature supports the theory that the participation of parents in school governance is paramount to strengthen the partnership between the state and the community in addressing the needs of learners.

Research undertaken in this regard reveals that parent participation in school governance is, however, problematic. The aim of the study is to investigate and report on the extent to which the legal framework for the constitution, powers and duties of governing bodies of LSEN schools is impacting negatively in the active participation of parents on such structures.

**Outline of the Procedures: (Responsibilities of the participant, consultation/interview/survey details, venue details, inclusion/exclusion criteria, explanation of tools and measurement outcomes, any follow-ups, any placebo or no treatment, how much time required of participant, what is expected of participants, randomization/ group allocation):**

Participants will consist of two groups. The first group will consist of the principals of selected LSEN schools who will be required to participate as a focus group. Discussions in the form of open ended questions, based on the research question, will be led by the researcher and responses will be recorded electronically. The duration of discussions within the focus group should last not more than 3 hours. The second group will consist of principals and parents of the selected LSEN schools. They will be required to fill in a questionnaire on the basis of classification and rank ordering. The questionnaire should take between 20 to 25 minutes to complete. The research will be restricted to selected LSEN schools within the boundary of the eThekweni Municipality. The focus group will be held at any one of the LSEN schools that is deemed to be suitable to the participants. In the case of collecting data from the principals and parent representatives, the researcher will personally attend meetings of the SGBs of the selected

LSEN schools to explain the process and to issue questionnaires to the participants. Questionnaires will be collected by the researcher on dates that are mutually acceptable to both parties. Both the qualitative and quantitative research methods will be used. Collected data will be analysed using MS Excel Software in the case of the quantitative approach and the NVIVO software in the case of the qualitative approach. Follow-ups will only be necessary if a questionnaire has not been completed in accordance with the instructions.

**Risks or Discomforts to the Participant: (Description of foreseeable risks or discomforts to for participants if applicable e.g. Transient muscle pain, VBAI, post-needle soreness, other adverse reactions, etc.)**

No risks or discomfort are anticipated.

**Benefits: (To the participant and to the researcher/s e.g. publications)**

The research will not have any direct benefit to the participant. It is, however, anticipated that the research will result in an improvement in active parent participation in matters of school governance thereby contributing to stability in the education system. The researcher is expected to benefit from a qualification should the research be published.

**Reason/s why the Participant May Be Withdrawn from the Study: (Non-compliance, illness, adverse reactions, etc. Need to state that there will be no adverse consequences for the participant should they choose to withdraw)**

Participation in this research project is purely voluntary. Hence participants are advised that they may refuse to participate or withdraw from the project with no negative consequence.

**Remuneration: (Will the participant receive any monetary or other types of remuneration?)**

There will be no monetary gain in participating in this project.

**Costs of the Study: (Will the participant be expected to cover any costs towards the study?)**

Participants will not be required to meet any costs of this study.

**Confidentiality: (Description of the extent to which confidentiality will be maintained and how will this be maintained?)**

Confidentiality will be maintained during and after the study so as to safeguard the interest of participants and the schools concerned. Names will not be mentioned during or after the study. In the case of the focus groups, code names will be provided. Questionnaires will be suitably coded. Arrangements will be made with the Durban University of Technology to preserve data collected from participants for an agreed period and then destroyed.

**Research-related Injury: (What will happen should there be a research-related injury or adverse reaction? Will there be any compensation?)**

No risks are anticipated during this study.

**Persons to Contact in the Event of Any Problems or Queries:**

Please contact the researcher on telephone 0834472051, my supervisor on 031 2016195 or the Institutional Research Ethics administrator on 031 373 2900. Complaints can be reported to the DVC: TIP, Prof F. Otieno on 031 373 2382 or [dvctip@dut.ac.za](mailto:dvctip@dut.ac.za).

**General:**

Participants are hereby assured that participation is voluntary and the approximate number of participants to be included will be disclosed. This information letter must be acknowledged by providing the researcher with the attached consent form duly signed. This information letter and consent form will be translated and provided in the primary spoken language of the research population e.g. isiZulu, should this be requested.

Your participation in this research project will be sincerely appreciated in which event, your prior approval as per attached consent letter is required.

Yours faithfully

---

P HARIPERSAD  
RESEARCHER

---

DATE

## APPENDIX 2

**CONSENT BY PARTICIPANT**

Statement of Agreement to Participate in the Research Study:

1. I, hereby confirm that I have been informed by the researcher, Premishwar Haripersad, about the nature, conduct, benefits and risks of this study. (Student No: 18950139).
2. I have also received, read and understood the above written information (Participant Letter of Information) regarding the study.
3. I am aware that the results of the study, including personal details regarding my sex, age, date of birth, initials and diagnosis will be anonymously processed into a study report.
4. In view of the requirements of research, I agree that the data collected during this study can be processed in a computerised system by the researcher.
5. I may, at any stage, without prejudice, withdraw my consent and participation in the study.
6. I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and (of my own free will) declare myself prepared to participate in the study.
7. I understand that significant new findings developed during the course of this research which may relate to my participation will be made available to me.

\_\_\_\_\_

Full Name of Participant

\_\_\_\_\_

Date/Time

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature / Right Thumbprint

I herewith confirm that the above participant has been fully informed about the nature, conduct and risks of the above study.

Premishwar Haripersad

Full name of Researcher

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date



## APPENDIX 3

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

THE INACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF PARENTS AS GOVERNORS AT LSEN SCHOOLS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

## SECTION A: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

(Mark appropriate column with X)

## 1. SEX:

MALE	FEMALE
------	--------

## 2. AGE:

20 to 30	30 to 40	40 to 50	50 to 60	Over 60
----------	----------	----------	----------	---------

## 3. MARITAL STATUS:

MARRIED	SINGLE	DIVORCED	WIDOWED
---------	--------	----------	---------

## 4. EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS:

DIPLOMA	DEGREE	MASTERS	PHD
---------	--------	---------	-----

## 5. FOR WHAT PERIOD HAVE YOU BEEN A PRINCIPAL OF A LSEN SCHOOL?

1 to 5 years	5 to 10 years	More than 10 years
--------------	---------------	--------------------

## PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ON THE SGB:

## 6. Would you agree that parents are actively involved in your school's SGB?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

7. If you have disagreed with the above statement, please explain your reasons for such disagreement hereunder:

---

8. Would you agree that parents are not adequately trained to perform their duties as governors?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

9. If you have responded in the affirmative to question 8 above, please elaborate hereunder why.

---



---

10. What should be done to ensure that parents are adequately capacitated?

---



---



---



---

11. Is your school governing body playing a meaningful role in the activities of your school?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

12. If your school governing body is not playing a meaningful role in your school's activities, could you provide reasons why?

---



---



---



---

13. Do you believe that the legal framework constituting governing bodies for LSEN schools is too complex?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

14. If you have agreed to the question above, what aspects of the legal framework should be reviewed?

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

15. How would you describe the relationship between your management and parent representatives on your SGB?

POOR	FAIR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT

16. In your opinion, how should the relationship between management and parent representatives be improved and maintained?

---



---



---



---

17. Would you agree that incentives should be offered to parents to attend meetings of the SGB and other school activities on a regular basis?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

- 18.** If your response to the above is in the affirmative, please state below as to what these incentives should be and whether such incentives are sustainable.

---

---

---

## APPENDIX 4

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

THE INACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF PARENTS AS GOVERNORS AT LSEN SCHOOLS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENT REPRESENTATIVES ON SGBs

SECTION A: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERITICS  
(Mark appropriate column with X)

1. SEX:

MALE	FEMALE
------	--------

2. LANGUAGE:

Is English your family language?

YES	NO

3. AGE:

20 to 30	30 to 40	40 to 50	50 to 60	Over 60
----------	----------	----------	----------	---------

4. OCCUPATIONAL STATUS:

UNEMPLOYED	EMPLOYED	AT HOME TIME	FULL	SELF-EMPLOYED
------------	----------	-----------------	------	---------------

5. EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS:

PRIMARY	SECONDARY	DIPLOMA	DEGREE
---------	-----------	---------	--------

6. FOR WHAT PERIOD HAS YOUR CHILD/CHILDREN BEEN ATTENDING A LSEN SCHOOL?

1 to 5 years	5 to 10 years	More than 10 years
--------------	---------------	--------------------

## YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL GOVERNANCE:

(Mark with a cross where applicable)

7. For what period have you served as a Governor on the SGB?

1 to 3 years	3 to 6 years	More than 6 years
--------------	--------------	-------------------

8. What times are most suitable for you to attend meetings of the SGB?

Weekdays (am)	Weekdays (pm)	Saturdays (am)	Other
---------------	---------------	----------------	-------

9. What mode of transportation do you use to attend meetings of the SGB?

Walk	Bus	Taxi	Own Transport	Other
------	-----	------	---------------	-------

10. How would you describe your present mode of transport to attend school activities?

Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unreliable
------	--------------	------	------------

11. How would you describe your attendance at SGB meetings?

Good	Satisfactory	Poor
------	--------------	------

12. Would you attend meetings regularly if you were provided with transport by the school?

YES	NO	NO COMMENT
-----	----	------------

13. Do you think that you can be easily influenced by the school's management if elected?

NO	NOT SURE	YES

14. If you have responded yes to the question in 13 above, indicate in the space below why you believe the management can influence you in the decision-making process?

---



---



---



---

15. Are you qualified to accept the position of secretary or treasurer of the SGB?

YES	NO	NOT SURE	YES, IF TRAINING IS PROVIDED

16. Will you attend meetings of the SGB regularly, if you are offered by the school any of the following:  
(Mark with a cross whichever is applicable)

DESCRIPTION OF THE OFFER MADE BY THE SCHOOL	Tick only one block of the choice you make
Provision of Refreshments during meetings	
Re-imburement of transport costs to and from SGB meetings	
Subsidy for your child's transport costs	

17. Are you ever involved in playing a leading role in the school's budget and drafting of policies?

NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS

18. Do you agree that the relationship between parent representatives and the school's management requires improvement?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

19. If you have agreed to the question in 18 above, indicate from the table below what aspects of the relationship require improvement. You may select more than one answer.

AREA REQUIRING IMPROVEMENT	YES	NO
Trust		
Respect		
Communication		
Openness		
Transparency		
Courtesy		
Helpfulness		

20. Would you agree that the role of the parent as a governor is to promote the best interests of the school?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

21. Would you agree that parents are reluctant to participate in the activities of the school, including becoming members of a school governing body?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

22. If you have agreed to the question in 21 above, what are the reasons for such non-participation? (Provide your response in the space below).

---



---



---

**D. EFFECTIVENESS OF CURRENT LEGISLATION:**

(Under this section you are required to mark the option that best suits your opinion with an "X")

23. How would you describe your understanding of the functions and duties of the school governing body as stipulated in the South African Schools Act?

POOR	FAIR	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT

24. How did you become aware of the constitution, powers and duties of school governing bodies for LSEN schools?

FROM THE INTERNET	SCHOOL BOOKLET	WORKSHOP FOR SGB	OTHER

25. How would you describe existing legislation relating to the constitution, powers and duties of school governing bodies for LSEN schools?

TOO COMPLEX	EASILY UNDERSTOOD	NEEDS TO BE SIMPLIFIED



26. If you are aware of the functions of the SGB, can you outline at least one such function in the space below?

---

27. Are you aware that an LSEN school SGB is different from that of a normal school?

YES	NO	NOT SURE

28. Do you think that the existing policy for the election of parents on a governing body should make provision for a certain percentage of parents to be elected on the basis of:

	Yes	No	Not sure
Qualifications			
Experience in financial management			
Experience in human resource management			
Experience in health and safety			
Experience in minute taking			

29. If you have responded yes to 28 above, what percentage of parents should be elected on the basis of qualifications and experience?

%	TICK ONE COLUMN
5	
25	
50	
75	

**E. GENERAL**

(Mark the appropriate response with an X)

30. How would you describe the quality of training that is offered for parents to perform their duties as a governor?

POOR	FAIR	GOOD	VERY GOOD	DO NOT KNOW

31. How would you describe your experience to manage the school's finances?

POOR	FAIR	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT

32. Do you agree that the school governing body is playing a meaningful role in the administration of the school?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

## APPENDIX 5

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

## THE INACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF PARENTS AS GOVERNORS AT LSEN SCHOOLS

(Uma ufisa ukuthola lelipheshana lemibuzo ngolwimi lwesiZulu, sicela uthintane nomcwaningi)

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENT WHO ARE NOT MEMBERS OF THE SGB

## SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

(Mark appropriate column with X)

## 1. SEX:

MALE	FEMALE
------	--------

## 2. LANGUAGE

Is English your family language?

YES	NO
-----	----

## 3. AGE:

20 to 30	30 to 40	40 to 50	50 to 60	Over 60
----------	----------	----------	----------	---------

## 4. OCCUPATIONAL STATUS:

UNEMPLOYED	EMPLOYED	AT HOME FULL TIME	SELF-EMPLOYED
------------	----------	-------------------	---------------

## 5. EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS:

PRIMARY	SECONDARY	DIPLOMA	DEGREE
---------	-----------	---------	--------

## 6. FOR WHAT PERIOD HAS YOUR CHILD BEEN ATTENDING A LSEN SCHOOL?

1 to 5 years	5 to 10 years	More than 10 years
--------------	---------------	--------------------

## YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL GOVERNANCE:

(Mark with a cross where applicable)

## 7. If elected as a member of the SGB, what times are most suitable for you to attend meetings?

Weekdays (am)	Weekdays (pm)	Saturdays (am)	Other
---------------	---------------	----------------	-------

--	--	--	--

8. What mode of transportation will you use to attend meetings of the SGB?

Walk	Bus	Taxi	Own Transport	Other
------	-----	------	---------------	-------

9. How would you describe your present mode of transport to attend school activities?

Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unreliable
------	--------------	------	------------

10. How many parents' meetings have you attended during the past 12 months?

NONE	1 to 5	5-10	More than 10
------	--------	------	--------------

11. If you have not attended any meetings or if you have attended less than 5 meetings, can you explain in the space provided below the reasons why?

---



---



---

12. Have you have tried to raise any matter in a school meeting?

YES	NO
-----	----

13. If you have responded yes to question 12 above, indicate in the space below, what topic(s) were raised.

---

14. Do you know the names of the current parent governors of the school you child is attending?

YES	NO
-----	----

15. If you have responded yes to question 14 above, list the names of these governors in the space below.

---



---



---

16. Have you ever raised a matter with the parent governors?

YES	NO
-----	----

--	--

17. If you have responded yes to question 16 above, what matters were raised?

---

18. Do you have any difficulty in communicating in English at parents meetings or with members of the SGB?

VERY EASY	EASY	NOT INVOLVED	DIFFICULT	VERY DIFFICULT

19. Are there any new matters you think the SGB should be concerned with?

---



---



---

20. Have you ever been elected to serve as a member on the SGB:

YES	NEVER

21. If you have never served as a member of the SGB, please explain below why you have not.

---



---



---

22. Do you think that you can be easily influenced by the school's management if elected as a member of the SGB?

NO	NOT SURE	YES

23. If you have responded yes to the question 23 above, indicate in the space below why you believe the management can influence you in the decision-making process?

---



---



---

24. If appointed as a member of the SGB, would you attend meetings regularly if provided with transport by the school?

YES	NO	NO COMMENT
-----	----	------------

25. Imagine yourself as a school governor. Are you qualified to accept the position of secretary or treasurer of the SGB?

YES	NO	NOT SURE	YES, IF TRAINING IS PROVIDED

26. Will you attend meetings of the SGB regularly, if you are offered by the school any of the following: (Mark with a cross whichever is applicable)

DESCRIPTION OF THE OFFER MADE BY THE SCHOOL	Mark with a cross only one block in respect of the choice you make
Provision of Refreshments during meetings	
Re-imburement of transport costs to and from SGB meetings	
Subsidy for your child's transport costs	

27. Do you agree that the relationship between parents and the school's management requires improvement?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

28. If you have agreed to the question in 27 above, indicate from the table below what aspects of the relationship require improvement. You may select more than one answer.

AREA REQUIRING IMPROVEMENT	YES	NO
Trust		
Respect		
Communication		
Openness		
Transparency		
Courtesy		

Helpfulness		
-------------	--	--

29. Would you agree that the role of the parent as a governor is to promote the best interests of the school?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

30. Would you agree that parents are reluctant to participate in the activities of the school, including becoming members of a school governing body?

STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NOT SURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

31. If you have agreed to the question in 30 above, what are the reasons for such non-participation? (Provide your response in the space below).

---



---



---

#### EFFECTIVENESS OF CURRENT LEGISLATION:

(Under this section you are required to mark the option that best suits your opinion with an "X")

32. How would you describe your understanding of the functions and duties of the school governing body as stipulated in the South African Schools Act, 1996?

POOR	FAIR	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT

33. How did you become aware of the constitution, powers and duties of school governing bodies for LSEN schools?

FROM THE INTERNET	SCHOOL BOOKLET	SCHOOL MEETING	I AM NOT AWARE

34. How would you describe existing legislation relating to the constitution, powers and duties of school governing bodies for LSEN schools?

TOO COMPLEX	EASILY UNDERSTOOD	NEEDS TO BE SIMPLIFIED	NOT APPLICABLE

35. If you are aware of the functions of the SGB, can you outline at least one such function in the space below?

---

36. Are you aware that a LSEN school SGB is different from that of a normal school?

YES	NO	NOT SURE

37. Do you think that the existing policy for the election of parents on a governing body should make provision for a certain percentage of parents to be elected on the basis of:

	Yes	No	Not sure
Qualifications			
Experience in financial management			
Experience in human resource management			
Experience in health and safety			
Experience in minute taking			

38. If you have responded yes to 37 above, what percentage of parents should be elected on the basis of qualifications and experience?

%	TICK ONE COLUMN
5	
25	
50	
75	



## APPENDIX 6

## CHI-SQUARE TEST

## Crosstabs

## Case Processing Summary

	Valid		Cases Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Period of service * Influence by management	25	89.3%	3	10.7%	28	100.0%

## Period of service \* Influence by management Crosstabulation

			Influence by management			Total
			No	Not sure	Yes	
Period of service	1 to 3 ywears	Count	9	6	2	17
		% within Period of service	52.9%	35.3%	11.8%	100.0%
	3 to 6 years	Count	3	3	0	6
		% within Period of service	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	More than 6 years	Count	1	1	0	2
		% within Period of service	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	13	10	2	25
		% within Period of service	52.0%	40.0%	8.0%	100.0%

## Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.244 <sup>a</sup>	4	.871
Likelihood Ratio	1.835	4	.766
Linear-by-Linear Association	.085	1	.771
N of Valid Cases	25		