Teacher Involvement in Decision Making: A Case for School Administration and Management in Zimbabwe

By

Wellington Samkange
Ameva Primary School, P.O. Box 173, Chegutu, Zimbabwe`

Abstract

A research was undertaken on the topic; Teacher involvement in decision making: A case for school administration and management in Zimbabwe. The study concentrated on decision making and school administration and management. The study aimed at establishing the extent to which primary school teachers in the selected primary schools were involved in decision making in various areas in their schools. To find answers to the main research problem, the researcher raised three research questions. A questionnaire was the main instrument used in the study. There were two different questionnaires; one for teachers and another for school heads. Major findings of the study show that almost all the teachers in the sample wanted to be involved in all areas of decision making identified in the study. These included financial management, conflict management, resource allocation, staff meeting agenda, teacher supervision, sports administration, syllabus interpretation and organizing school functions. The results of the study further show that whilst teachers were happy with their involvement in decision making in such areas as co-curricular, lesson planning, preparation and presentation, syllabus interpretation and organizing school functions, the same cannot be said about their involvement in such areas as finance, supervision, resource allocation and conflict management. At the same time, school heads were reluctant to involve teachers in decision making in such areas as finance, teacher supervision, resource allocation and conflict management. A plethora of issues emerged from the study. These include the leadership styles, motivational management style and supervision models used in some Zimbabwean schools today. The study recommends that the conflicting perceptions on school administration and management could be resolved by holding seminars for both school heads and teachers. Furthermore, school administration and management should become major components of the teacher-training programmes at colleges to prepare school heads and teachers for their changing roles in a democracy.

Keywords: *Involvement; Decision making; School administration and management; Democracy.*

1. Introduction and background to the study

One of the topical issues in education debate in Zimbabwe is the question of teacher involvement in decision making. Teachers are becoming more critical of the traditional bureaucratic and authoritative top-down method of administrating and managing schools. Teachers, like other citizens are becoming more and more aware of their rights. As such, teachers are demanding that they be involved in the decision making process, not only in their schools but in national education issues as well. Press reports have also shown the general dissatisfaction by teachers, school heads and the general public on issues of school administration and management, and decision making. An article by Chikwari in Teacher in Zimbabwe (1995) complained of autocratic tendencies in the administration and management of schools in Zimbabwe.Chikwari further notes that scientific management models are still being used and staff meetings are only held to announce what school heads want as there are no discussions to hear the views of other teachers (ibid). Teacher in Zimbabwe, July 1996 highlights a problem between teachers and a

school head, which ended up dividing the parents into two fighting camps with one supporting the teachers. There is evidence to show that Zimbabwe's education standards are declining. The Sunday Mail, November 8 1998 stated that, ''Zimbabwe's education standards seem to be declining and initial findings of the Presidential Commission of inquiry into the local education system are already pointing out the need to change.'' Such a decline affects social and economic developmental stagnation. The Sunday Mail, November 8 1998 also expressed the problem when it stated that one of the most pressing issues is the question of administration and accountability and teachers expressed their fears of victimization and abuse of power if all decisions are within the head.

At the same time, the Ministry of Education, Arts, Sport and Culture and the Zimbabwe Government in general have designed new in-service courses for teachers and school heads. The entry qualifications to teachers training have been raised, so as to attract high caliber teachers who will later move into administrative and management positions. The Ministry of Education, Arts, Sport and Culture has also initiated programmes for teachers and school heads to upgrade qualifications and be up to date with modern educational and administrative trends. One such example is the introduction of the Bachelor of Education, Educational Administration, Planning and Policy Studies, and the Master of Education in Educational Management at the Zimbabwe Open University. A good number of school heads have taken up this opportunity to advance their qualifications. The Zimbabwean government to demonstrate its concern set up a Commission of Inquiry into Education. Like most commissions, the results and recommendations will take time to be known by the public. Despite all these efforts to address the problem, conflicts involving school heads and teachers seem to be on the increase. Head on one hand accuse teachers of interference in school administration and teachers complain of being ignored on matters of concern. School heads on one hand are accusing teachers of demanding too much power, being arrogant and guilty of insubordination.

Statement of the problem
Involvement of subordinates in decision making in organizations has attracted major advocacy in modern day management. At the same time, involvement in decision making is viewed as a major component of democracy. As such, many questions have been raised as to the extent to which teachers can be involved in decision making, not only at school level, but national education policy issues. The present study addresses the question: To what extent are primary school teachers involved in the decision making process in their schools? In order to seek answers to the question, the researcher sought to investigate and find answers to the following three sub-questions.

- Do teachers feel that they should be involved in decision making in the school?

- In what areas do teachers feel they should be involved in decision making?

- What are the perceived effects of the involvement on school administration and management?

Significance of the study
There have been major investments in education in the developing world and Zimbabwe is no exception. Despite the investment, there have not been corresponding improvements in the quality of education. Major concerns have been raised on how best to improve the quality of education in developing countries. School administration and management need review if we are to contribute to the improvement of quality in education. The findings will help improve the theories of decision making, school administration and management. The study may form the basis on which staff development and training programmes can be designed, and thereby help in policy formulation in teachers training programmes and advancement and promotion procedures in the Ministry of Education, Arts, Sport and Culture. Furthermore, it adds another perspective in the discourse on the democratization of the education system.

2.   Literature Review

The Concept Decision Making

The concept decision making is very wide in scope and tends to be elusive. Before one gets into action, it is assumed that the individual has to make choices out of a number of alternatives. Carver (1980) defines decision making as the process of identifying a problem, creating a systematic alternative, testing the alternatives and selecting the best for implementation. Stoner and Freeman (1992) also note that " the basic process of rational decision making involves diagnosing, defining and determining the sources of the problem, gathering and analyzing the facts of the problem, developing and evaluating alternative and converting the alternative into action" (p 254). Musaazi (1982) concurs with the above definition of the concept decision making. For Musaazi (1982) decision making is a process which involves identifying and selecting a course of action to deal with the specific problem.

Drucker in Owens (1995) goes further to identify steps involved in decision making. These include:
- definition of the problem.
- analysis of the problem.
- developing alternative solution.
- deciding on the best alternative.
- convert decision into effective actions.

The steps outlined by Drucker presuppose that there is someone involved in each of the stages, though they do not clearly state who is involved. What stands out in our attempt to conceptualize the terms decision making are at least two issues. The first being that decision making is a process. Secondly, as a process it involves stages before action can be taken. If we are to adopt these views on decision making, involvement of subordinates in decision making would entail making them take part in the whole process before implementation of a project or programme. The major question though is the extent to which this can be allowed to take place in such organizations as schools, as education is at times perceived as a "sacred cow". There have been arguments that we cannot experiment with democracy at the expense of our children's future.

The Concepts of school Administration and School Management

In trying to explain the concept administration, Westhuizen (1991) defines administration in terms of its functions. These include the structural view of administration, the functional view of administration and a view of administration as administrative work (Westhuizen, 1991).When administration is viewed within the structural context, education is made possible through the existence of structures. This could be in the form of provision of legislation to support the education system (Nell, 1977) and the organization of different functions in the education system, the school and the class (Bekker, 1981).Within this context the role of the school head as an administrator is viewed as that of ensuring that regulations are followed. It enables the administrator to organize facilities for learning, at the same time ensuring that order is maintained within the school as an organization.

The functional view of administration on the other hand, deals with the functioning of the education system at different layers. These include the macro, meso, and micro levels of the education system (Westhuizen, 1991). These levels deal with high levels such as how government handles education matters, down to local authorities and schools. All these processes of trying to make the education system work are viewed as constituting the functional view of administration.

Another aspect of administration as noted by Westhuizen (1991) has much do with administration as administrative work. This view of administration has a lot in common with the other two alluded to. Further to that it views administration as involving such work as daily office routine, keeping of records, and any other related clerical work (Botes, 1975: Reynders, 1977).

Musaazi (1982) on the other hand concurs with the view that educational administration concerns itself most "with pupils, teachers and the rules, regulations and policies that govern the school system" (p 165).In that respect, Musaazi (1982) appears to agree with the view expressed by Westhuizen (1991) about the structural and function perspective of administration in schools. Further to that Musaazi (1981) in attempting to conceptualize administration explains it in terms of how the science of administration has evolved over the years. Administration can therefore be explained in terms of the classical organizational thought. This was based on Frederick Taylor's scientific management movement which emphasized the clear definition of daily tasks, the need for standardized conditions and appliances for the efficient accomplishment of tasks, and the need for staff to be trained (Musaazi, 1982). It can also be explained in terms of the human relations approach to administration and the behavioural approach to administration.

A major component of the classical organizational thought was the emphasis on planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. Gulick as cited by Musaazi (1982) code named these seven administrative functions and actions as 'POSDCORD'. The different administrative actions as noted above do not appear to draw a clear distinction between the activities involved with management. This view might be premised on the assumption that the terms administration and management are synonymous, a position that is refuted by a number of scholars, as earlier on noted. What stands out though is that in doing administrative work school heads have to be guided by regulations and implement action according to these regulations. They also have to do administrative work such as record keeping, budgeting, planning and staffing among other responsibilities.

Management as noted by Everard, Morris and Wilson (2004) involves a number of activities, According to them, these can be classified as follows; firstly setting direction, aims and objectives. Secondly, there is need to plan for how the goals will be attained. Thirdly, they advocate for the need to economically and efficiently organize resources. Such resources include people, time and materials. Fourthly, they note that management involves controlling the process, setting and improving organizational standards.

Furthermore, Everard, Morris and Wilson (2004) note that management involves working with people, thus relations and reconciling these with results. Managing people therefore involves providing leadership, motivating people to achieve stated goals, decision making and managing conflict. The school head as a manager has to manage the organization, through team building, matching curriculum to need, managing quality and standards, and managing resources and the environment, and the change process within the organization (ibid).

Management can also be explained in terms of the bureaucratic theory. This is a theory of management based on Max Weber's perceptions of what management at the work place should entail. The major features of bureaucracy as noted by Bell and Bush (2002) are that there is a hierarchical authority structure, the organization has to be goal oriented, there should be division of labour, the use of rules and regulations to govern decisions and behaviour. The other features are that the decisions have to be made through a rational process and those in leadership should be accountable to external bodies (ibid).

The emphasis on rules and regulations and goals make the bureaucratic model of management share similar features with Fredrick Taylor's scientific management which Musaazi (1982) uses to explain administration. In that respect, if we were to accept Musaazi's view, administration would be perceived as synonymous with management. However, Westhuizen (1991) suggests that the similarities in the features between the two concepts should not mislead us into thinking that these two mean the same. Westhuizen (1991) further emphasizes management as achieving objectives, as series of consecutive actions, decision making, co-ordination and management as leading and guiding.

Mintzberg (1973) as cited by Westhuizen (1991) however, challenged the traditional view of management which focused on such functions as planning, organizing, co-coordinating, commanding, and controlling. According to Mintzberg management is characterized and distinguished by the roles that include interpersonal roles, information roles and decision making roles. These are further sub-divided into sub-roles that include being figure head, leader, monitor, negotiator, allocator of resources among others in the management process.

Theoretical Framework

A number of theories have been advanced to explain decision making, school administration and management. Such theories include the rational theory and the science of muddling through (Bowora and Mpofu, 1995). In addition to these, there are such theories as the rational comprehensive theory, the incremental theory and the mixed scanning theory (Anderson, 1994).They all attempt to address the issue of how managers and administrators make decisions in organizations. Bowora and Mpofu (1995) further note that "in a school the authority to make or direct the making of decisions is not vested on the head. As a complex structure, decisions in a school are achieved through committees, task forces, study groups and review panels". This brings in the notation of shared decision making in such organizations as schools.

Within the context of shared decision making, the process of decision making itself revolves around issues of participation in problem solving and making decisions (Owens, 1995). Participation is viewed as contributing to the achievement of organizational goals. Participation is defined as the mental and emotional involvement of a person in a group situation that encourages the individual to contribute to group goals and to share responsibilities (ibid). In that respect, shared decision making is perceived as contributing to the utilization of the manpower at the disposal of the school head. It also gives a sense of belonging and ownership of goals and responsibilities, as it is generally believed that workers' participation in planning and decision making raises morale and productivity (Chakanyuka, 1996).

Ngara in Teacher in Zimbabwe, January 1995 states that decision making is the problem that confronts the human being throughout life. There is need to develop the trait of a decision maker at an early stage in life, and this can be done in a democratic school environment (ibid). Stoner and Freeman (1992) concur that involvement of subordinates in decision making increases productivity and reduces resistance to change. These are contributions also noted by Adedeji (1990) and Zvobgo (1997).

However, there is also literature to suggest that teacher involvement has its own problems and limitations. One such problem is that not all teachers would want to be involved in decision making at school level. Some teachers may be frustrated by being involved in areas that they have no proper training and knowledge. On the other hand, it has to be noted that time is valuable; as such subordinates should only be involved when the benefits are greater than the likely costs in time, money and frustration (Stoner and Freeman, 1992). There is also the issue of jurisdiction. Individual schools and teachers have jurisdiction only over those decision making areas that are assigned to them by design or omission (Owens, 1995).

3. Research Design and Methodology

The study dealt with views and opinions which are qualitative dimensions of social phenomena. Such dimensions can be sourced through the use of interviews and questionnaires. The case study design was found to be the most appropriate. The study focused on seven randomly selected primary schools in Chegutu Education District of Zimbabwe. The school heads of the randomly selected schools consequentially became respondents. Further to that, stratified sampling was used to select the thirty seven teachers who responded to the questionnaires. Stratified sampling was used to cater for the differences in age, gender, qualifications and experience.

4. Discussion of Findings

The first sub-question was stated as; do teachers feel that they should be involved in decision making in the school? The study made an attempt to find answers to this question by raising pertinent questions about the willingness of school heads to involve teachers in decision making and if teachers wanted to be involved in different areas of the school curriculum and school administration and management. All the seven school heads indicated that their teachers would want to be fully involved in decision making. As for teachers, 97.3 percent indicated that they would want to be fully involved in decision making and only 2.7 percent indicated that it was not part of their responsibilities. The results agree with Adedeji (1990) who concluded that people generally wanted to be involved in decision making in areas that affect them in their daily lives and at work. This also gives credence to Nias (1980) who in the study of motivational management styles in Britain observed that teachers were often frustrated because of lack involvement, and the prevalence of dictatorial tendencies within schools (Makado,1993). As such, teachers in the study supported positive leadership that promoted teacher involvement in decision making.

The second research question was stated as: In what areas do teachers feel they should be involved in decision making?

Table 1: Areas of teacher involvement in decision making; school heads' perspectives

N= 7

Area	level of involvement			
	Never %	Always %	Very Often %	When I feel its necessary %
Planning the programme for the year	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3
Financial management	0.0	28.6	14.3	57.1
Development projects	0.0	28.6	71.4	0.0
Organizing school functions	0.0	57.1	14.3	28.6
Co-curricular activities	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0
Resource allocation	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1
Conflict management	14.3	14.3	0.0	71.4
Lesson planning & preparation	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0
Teacher supervision	14.3	14.3	42.9	28.6
Syllabus interpretation	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0
Staff meeting agenda	0.0	14.2	42.9	42.9
Introduction of new syllabi	0.0	28.55	42.9	28.55

The responses by the seven school heads as indicated above showed that 28.6 percent of them always involved teachers in planning the programme for the year, 57.1 very often involved them and 14.3 involved them when they felt it was necessary. In financial management 28.6 percent noted that they always involved teachers, 14.3 percent very often involved them and 57.1 percent indicated that they involved them when they felt it was necessary. In the area of organizing school functions, 57.1 percent always involved teachers, 14.3 percent often involved them and 28.6 involved them when they felt it was necessary. When it came to the area of co-curricular activities, 57.1 percent indicated that they always involved teachers and 42.9 percent very often involved them. In the area of resource allocation, 14.3 percent of the school heads noted that they always involved teachers, 28.6 percent very often involved them and 57.1 percent involved them when they felt it was necessary. As for conflict management, 14.3

percent noted that they never involved teachers, another 14.3 percent always involved them and 71.4 percent involved them when they felt it was necessary. In lesson planning, 57.1 percent always involved teachers and 42.9 percent very often involved teachers in the area. In supervision 14.3 percent indicated that they never involved teachers in decision making, another 14.3 percent always teachers, 42.9 percent very often involved them and 28.6 percent when they felt it was necessary. As for syllabus interpretation, 57.1 percent indicated that they always involved teachers and 42.9 percent very often involved in the area. In the area of deciding staff meeting agenda 14.2 percent always involved teachers and 42.9 percent very often involved teachers and another 42.9 percent involved them when they felt it was necessary. As for the introduction of new syllabi 28.55 percent indicated that they had always involved teachers, 42.9 percent very often involved them and 28.55 percent only when they felt it was necessary.

Table 2: Areas of teacher involvement in decision making; teachers' perspectives N= 37

Area	Level of Involvement			
	Very much %	To a limited extent %	Rarely %	Never %
Planning the programme for the year	10.8	29.7	24.3	35.2
Financial management	0.0	5.4	13.5	81.1
Development projects	24.3	24.3	35.2	16.2
Organizing school functions	32.4	21.6	27.1	18.9
Co-curricular activities	46	40.5	13.5	0.0
Resource allocation	13.5	24.3	5.4	56.8
Sport Administration	32.4	46	16.2	5.4
Lesson planning & preparation	56.8	13.5	18.9	10.8
Teacher supervision	10.8	16.2	27.1	45.9
Syllabus interpretation	32.4	27.0	13.6	27.0
Staff meeting agenda	35.2	32.4	21.6	10.8
Introduction of new syllabi	13.5	24.3	18.9	43.3

The responses by the teachers appeared to concur with those of school heads in many respects. In the area of planning the programme for the year, 10.8 percent of the teachers noted that they were very much involved, 29.7 percent were involved to a limited extent and 24. 3 percent were rarely involved and 35.2 percent noted that hey were not involved at all. On financial management, 5.4 percent were involved to a limited extent, 13.5 percent were rarely involved and 81.1 percent were never involved. When it came to sports administration 32.4 percent noted that they were very much involved, 46 percent were involved to a limited extent, 16.2 percent were rarely involved and 5.4 percent were never involved. As for school development projects, 24.3 indicated that they were very much involved, another 24.3 percent indicated that they were involved to a limited extent, 35.1 percent were rarely involved and 16.2 were never involved. On school functions 32.4 percent noted that they were very much involved in organizing them, 21.6 percent were involved to a limited extent and 27.1 percent were rarely involved and 18.9 percent were never involved in the first place. In co-curricular activities 46 percent were very much involved, 40.5 percent were involved to a limited extent and 13.5 percent were rarely involved. In the area of resource allocation an distribution, 13.5 percent indicated that they were very much involved, 24.3 percent were involved to a limited extent, 5.4 percent were rarely involved and 56.8 percent were never involved. In lesson planning, preparation and presentation, 56.8 percent noted that they were very much

involved, 13.5 percent were involved to a limited extent, 18.9 percent were rarely involved and10.8 percent were never involved. When it came to supervision of fellow teachers 10.8 percent were very much involved, 16.2 percent were involved to a limited extent, 27.1 percent were rarely involved and 45.9 percent were never involved. On syllabus interpretation 32.4 percent indicated that they were very much involved, 27 percent were involved to a limited extent, 13.6 percent were rarely involved and 27 percent were never involved. On staff meeting agenda 35.2 percent noted that they were very much involved, 32.4 percent were involved to a limited extent, 21.6 percent were rarely involved and 10.8 were never involved in the area. On introduction of new syllabi 13.5 percent indicated that they were very much involved, 24.3 percent were involved to a limited extent, 18.9 percent were rarely involved and 43.2percent noted that they were never involved.

The study shows that the degree of teacher involvement differed from area to area and in some instance from school to school. Furthermore, the findings appeared to suggest that at times school heads and teachers had different perceptions of what they referred to as "teacher involvement". Whilst all the school heads noted that they always or very often involved teachers in such areas as school development projects, co-curricular activities and lesson planning, preparation and presentation, the same could not be said about the teachers' assessment of their involvement in the same areas. For instance, it was observed that the few teachers who indicated that they were involved in supervision had some time acted as deputy school heads or that they were teachers in charge of the infant department.

The third question sought to find out the school heads and teachers' perception on involvement of teachers in decision making and its contribution to school administration and management. Among the school heads 28.6 percent agreed that involving teachers in decision making motivated them, and 71.4 percent strongly agreed. All the school heads agreed that involving teachers in decision making had motivational effects. This they noted, had the effect of enhancing goal attainment, giving them a sense of belonging and recognition. However, on the same note 14.3 percent of the school heads expressed the view that teachers were not well trained or experienced to make decisions on administrative and management issues, whilst 85.7 percent disagreed with this view. On a similar note, 85.7 percent agreed and 14.3 percent strongly agreed that the level of teacher involvement had to be controlled by the school head. Furthermore, 42.9 percent agreed and 57.1 strongly agreed that, the achievements at their schools could be attributed to teacher involvement in decision making.

When it came to teachers, 91.9 percent strongly agreed and 5.4 percent agreed and 2.7 percent strongly disagreed that involving teachers in decision making enhances goal attainment. However, 48.6 percent of the teachers strongly agreed, 32.4 percent agreed, 2.7 percent disagreed and 16.2 strongly disagreed with the statement that school heads felt threatened by teachers who wanted to be involved in decision making at their schools. Whilst noting that teachers wanted to be involved in decision making at their schools, the findings show that they were mixed views among the teachers as to which areas they could be involved. For instance, 5.4 percent strongly agreed, 56.8 percent agreed, 29.7 percent disagreed and 8.1 percent strongly disagreed that teachers cannot be involved in all decisions in the school. On the motivational effect of involvement of teachers in decision making, 86.5 percent agreed, and 13.5 percent strongly agreed that involving teachers in decision making motivates them. On training on school administration and management, 8.1 percent strongly agreed, 13.5 percent agreed, 54.1 percent disagreed and 24.3 strongly disagreed that teachers needed training before they can be involved in school administration and management issues. In as much as the teachers would want to be involved in decision making at their schools, they expressed different views on whether they would want to be involved in all the decisions at their schools. For example, 10.8 percent strongly agreed, 40.5 percent agreed, and 48.6 percent disagreed that they should be involved in all decisions made in the school.

Emerging issues

27

The results of the study brought to the fore a number of issues not only about decision making in such organizations as schools, but issues of administration and management of schools in Zimbabwe. A plethora of issues have emerged. These include management and leadership styles in schools, motivational management styles, supervision styles in schools and behavioral systems in organizations.

Leadership styles

Leadership styles appeared to determine the extent to which school heads involved teachers in different areas of the curriculum and school management and administration. As such, leadership styles tended to influence the level of involvement and such involvement could be explained in terms of different forces at play. On the part of the leader (school head) there are factors to do with forces in the manager, forces in the subordinate, forces in the situation and the pressure of time (DuBrin, 1995). Within this context, some school heads did not have confidence in the capabilities of their teachers and as such, did not grant them power in the decision making process in some areas. Similarly, others felt comfortable sharing decisions with their teachers and such leaders demonstrated that they were emotionally secure and therefore more comfortable releasing decision making powers to lower levels such as teachers (ibid).

On the other hand, there were also forces to do with the teachers themselves that inhibited the extent to which the teachers could be involved in such areas as financial management, supervision, resource allocation and management of conflict. Such forces had much to do with the teachers' competencies on one hand and the extent to which they are able to identify with organizational goals on the other. At the same time it should be noted that involving subordinates can be time consuming

Involvement as a motivational strategy

Involvement in decision making could be used as a motivational management style. Involving teachers in decision making was viewed as contributing to "ownership" of organizational goals (Dessler, 1986). This was prevalent in areas such as co-curricular activities, syllabus interpretation and organizing of school functions. In such areas, participation in decision making helped the teachers to be "ego-involved" with their work practices (Dessler, 1986). Participation and involvement can be viewed as strategies that can be used to motivate staff. Maslow explains motivation in terms of drives that have to be satisfied before the next higher need is met (Gibson, 1980). These needs are categorized into five. These are the physiological, safety, social, ego, and self-actualization needs (ibid). Participation and involvement of subordinates in decision making could be viewed within the context of relating to the developing of ego needs and self-actualization.

Supervision in schools

School heads and teachers noted that teachers were not involved in decisions to do with supervision at their schools. In that respect, the school head as the manager played the major role in the supervision of subordinates such as teachers. Indications are that supervision based on the principle of scientific management seemed to be the order of the day in most schools. The scientific management approach as advocated by Fredrick   Taylor is based on at least fourteen principles of management. These included division of work, authority and responsibility, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction centralization, remuneration of personnel among others (Dessler, 1986). It is a supervision model through which the subordinates have to conform to the rules with very little or no room for creativity. Its assumption that there is one best way of performing a job acts as a hindrance to innovation and creativity within an organization.

One form of supervision that could be used in schools to involve teachers is clinical supervision. The study noted that school heads indicated that they were not involving teachers in supervision. At the same time teachers also noted that they were not involved in decisions on supervision. Such responses tended to suggest that clinical supervision as a strategy was not being used in the schools. Clinical supervision has to involve the teacher and the supervisor at all the different stages. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) view clinical supervision as an in-class support system designed to deliver assistance directly to the

teacher in order to bring about the necessary changes in classroom and teacher behaviour. In that respect clinical supervision is viewed as contributing to staff development and thereby organizational development. It is also credited with focusing on improving instruction through " systematic cycles of planning, observation and intensive intellectual analysis of actual teaching performance in the interest of rational modification" (Richard Weller in Acheson and Gall, 1987:13). Clinical supervision includes several stages in which the supervisee and the supervisor have to involve each other. These include establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship, the supervisor and the teacher planning a lesson together, planning strategy for observation, analyzing the teaching-learning process, planning the strategy of the supervisor-teacher conference, conducting the supervisor-teacher conference and renewed planning encompassing agreed changes in the preceding conferences (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1983).

5.   Conclusions and Recommendations

The study made the following observations about involvement of teachers in the various areas identified:

- That most teachers in the study felt that they should be involved in decision making in major areas in their schools.

- That teachers in the study were not fully involved in decision making in the core areas. This was further supported by the conflicting views expressed by the school head and teachers in some instance.

- That teachers would want to be involved in decision making in a variety of areas which include planning and interpretation of curriculum, finance, budgeting, organizing school functions, class allocation, teacher supervision and staff development.

- That school heads involved teachers mostly in areas of routine decisions such as planning, syllabi interpretation and co-curricular activities, but involving them less and at times not at all in areas that they considered to be purely administrative or management such as supervision, finance and budgeting.

6.   Recommendations

The findings of the study led the researcher to make the following recommendations about the administration and management of schools in Zimbabwe:

- Educational administrators and managers should hold seminars for school heads and teachers to clear some conflicting perceptions on school administration and management and the extent to which teachers can be involved in such areas as financial management and supervision.

- School administration and management should be a key component of teachers' training programme att teachers' colleges in Zimbabwe. The curriculum should include courses such as decision making, financial management, supervision and personnel management. This is essential because involvement of subordinates in decision making in organizations should be viewed as a natural extension of democracy which school heads should be prepared to accept and teachers made aware of its limits for good school administration and management.

References

Acheson, K.A. and Gall, M.D. (1987). Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers Pre-service and In-Service Application. London, Longman.

Adedeji, A. (1990). Putting the People First. ENECA Conference

Anderson, J.E. (1994). Public Policy Making: An Introduction. New York, Houghton Miffin Co.

Bennett, N., Glatter, R and Levacic, R. (Ed) (1994). Improving Educational Management Through Research and consultancy, London. SAGE Publications

Bowora, L.C. and Mpofu, D.A. (1995). Managing Schools: Module EA3DC102A. Harare, Centre for Distance Education, University of Zimbabwe.

Bush, T, and Bell, L (Ed) (2002). The Principles and Practice of Educational Management, London, SAGE Publications.

Carver, J.C. " Establishing a Mis" In Journal of Syllabus Management. New York, Harper Row.

Chakanyuka, S.C. (1996). Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness: Module EA3AD301. Harare, Centre for Distance Education, University of Zimbabwe.

Dessler, G. (1986). Organization Theory, Integrating Structure and Behaviour (2nd Edition). New York, Prentice Hall.

DuBrin, A. J. (1995). Leadership; Research Findings, Practice and Skills. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company.

Everard, K.B., Morris, G. and Wilson, I. (2004). Effective School Management (4thEd),London, SE Publications.

Gibson, J. T. (1981). Psychology for the Classroom. 2nd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice- Hall, Inc.

Hoy, W. K and Miskel, C. G (2005). Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice, Boston, McGraw-HILL.

Makado, R.K. (1993). Teachers' Views of Motivational Management Styles Employed by Primary school Heads in Chirumanzu District. Harare, University of Zimbabwe.

Musaazi, J.C.S (1982). The Theory and Practice of educational Administration, Oxford, Macmillan.

Owens, R.G. (1995). Organizational Behavior in Education. Eaglewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

Sergiovanni, T. and Starrat, R. (1983). Supervision. New York, McGraw-Hill.

Stoner, J.A.D. and Freeman, R.G. (1992). Management (6th Edition). Eaglewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

Teacher in Zimbabwe, January 1995. Harare, Zimbabwe Publishing House. The Sunday Mail, November 8 1998. Harare, Zimpapers.

van der Westhuizen P.C (Ed) (1991). Effective Educational Management, Cape Town, Kagiso Tertiary.

Zvobgo, R.J. (1997). The State, Ideology and Education. Gweru, Mambo Press.