

The Primary School Deputy Head's Supervisory Role and its Effects on the Motivation of Teachers at Junior Level

T. Mhlanga*, N. Wadesango** and M. Kurebwa*

*Zimbabwe Open University, Midlands Region, Zimbabwe

**Walter Sisulu University, East London Campus, RSA

KEYWORDS Supervision. Effective Teacher. Role Model. Motivation. Frustration

ABSTRACT A study was conducted to assess the Primary School Deputy Head's supervisory role and its effects on the motivation of teachers. The study adopted the qualitative interpretive research methodology. A self-reported instrument in the form of questionnaires on the subject was the main instrument administered to all 20 junior teachers and four deputy heads from 4 Primary Schools in Mkoba suburb in Gweru. An interview schedule was also administered to all the school heads. Data was presented in form of tables and it was analyzed qualitatively. The findings showed that most junior teachers in the sample, perceived the deputy head's role to be focused on ineffective teachers and weaknesses of teachers. There was no consistent supervision. As far as the junior teachers were concerned their instructional performance could equally be effective with or without the deputy head's supervision. The results also showed that the Deputy Heads' supervisory perception concurred with that of junior teachers that supervision focuses on weaknesses and ineffectiveness of teachers. The study recommends that both Deputy Heads and junior teachers should be inducted on the Deputy Heads supervisory role. The heads and regional offices should support the deputy heads in order to make them effective.

INTRODUCTION

Soon after independence in 1980, Zimbabwe saw dramatic changes in its educational policies. The policy on mass education was launched and education was declared as a fundamental human right. This led to large expansion in schools both in rural and urban areas with enrolments doubling or even trebling. As a result, double sessioning was witnessed in most urban schools, thereby increasing the roles of the primary deputy head (D\H). At school level, a lot has to be done with regards to supervision as a way of promoting quality education and for the motivation of teachers. One of the models of supervision likely to be employed is Scientific Supervision. This model focuses on teacher rating, objective measurements in teaching, use of standardized tests and heavily relies on examinations to determine outputs. The other model is the Human Relations Supervision which emphasize on worker motivation and satisfaction at work. Human Resources Supervision focuses on the person's ability to use his or her talents. Lastly, Clinical Supervision involves planning together with the teacher (Bush 2003). The personnel who supervise at a primary school are: the head, deputy head (D\H) and the Teacher-In-Charge (T.I.C), hence the need

to staff develop them, re-orient and in-service them regularly. In Asia they have achieved economic development because they invested heavily in human resources in their initial stages of economic development programmes (Edwards 1998). In Zimbabwe, donors like the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and Swedish International Development Agency have contributed, much towards the improvement of administrator's management skills. Cogan (1995: 20) supports the idea of improved instruction when he says, "Supervision gives supervisors a responsible hope of accomplishing significant improvement in the teacher's classroom instruction."

The Concept of Supervision

Eder and Harris (1999) say that supervision is a process of facilitating the professional growth of a teacher, primarily by giving the teacher feedback about classroom interactions and helping the teacher make use of that feedback in order to make teaching more effective. From what has been said above, supervision can be viewed as a way of helping the teacher grow professionally by assisting him or her on instructional skills through immediate feedback after a lesson delivery. This can help the teacher improve on his or her area of weakness for effective teaching to be realized. Wadesango (2009: 45) defines supervision as: "A process of inter-

Address correspondence to:
Dr Newman Wadesango
Email: nwadesango@wsu.ac.za

action in which individuals work with teachers to improve instructions. The ultimate goal is to better student learning.” He further goes on to say that instructional supervision is a broad process which deals with teaching behavior, curriculum, learning environments, teacher utilization and professional development. From the definitions given above, supervision can be viewed as encompassing interaction to facilitate the professional growth of the teachers and effective teaching.

The study sought to establish whether the Deputy Head’s supervision promotes professional growth. The main function of supervision is to monitor and support teachers so that they can effectively and efficiently realize both school and individual goals. The supervisor may provide teachers with the means of curriculum implementation through time-tabling, classroom allocation, textbook allocation, syllabi and instructional material provision for effective supervision.

Models of Supervision

The Scientific Model of Supervision

Bush (2003) views scientific management as representing the classical autocratic philosophy of supervision. In this model, the focus is on teacher rating, objective measurements in teaching, use of standardized tests, scientific methods of teaching as well as relying heavily on examinations to determine outputs. Workers are also hired to do pre-specified duties in accordance with what management wishes. Control, accountability and efficiency are emphasized in an atmosphere of clear-cut boss-subordinate relationships. At school level, teachers are expected to plan and teach in a particular prescribed manner. It heavily relies on external forms of authority. It is built on the assumption that the supervisor is the source of all creativity. Its focus is on production which compels teachers to teach for the examinations.

The Human Resources Model of Supervision

In this model, the person’s ability to use his or her talents fully is highly valued. It emphasizes the full utilization of a person’s capacity for continued growth. Sergiovanni and Starrat (1998) view satisfaction as resulting from the

successful accomplishment of important and meaningful work and this sort of accomplishment is the key component of school effectiveness. There is shared decision making in this practice. Stoner Freeman (1992) argues that workers would strive to reach higher levels of effectiveness in the organization. Personal needs and organizational needs are integrated. This model emphasizes higher productivity as a prerequisite to higher satisfaction. Human Resources Model of supervision concentrates on talents and abilities which can lead to innovation and accountability.

The Human Relations Model of Supervision

The model emphasises on worker motivation and satisfaction at work to increase production. Sergiovanni and Starrat (1998) feel that in human relation, teachers are viewed as “whole” people in their own right rather than as packages needed, energy, skills and aptitudes to be used by administrators and supervisors. Supervisors work to create a feeling of satisfaction among teachers by showing interest in them as people. It assumes that a satisfied worker or staff would work harder and would be easier to work with. According to ZOU Module EA3DC103 (1993), Human Relations Model views an ideal school as one that has highly motivated workers who are committed to the goals of the school and there is mutual support. Teachers are involved in decision making and their personal needs are looked after, and a warm working climate prevails.

Clinical Supervision

Cogan (1995: 13) define clinical supervision as: “supervision focused upon the improvement of the instruction by means of systematic cycles of planning, observation and intensive intellectual analysis of actual teaching performance in the interest of rational modification.” According to the definition given above, clinical supervision involves planning together with teacher and making an observation and analysis which will help improve the teacher’s professional growth. Robbins (1987: 4) posits that: “Detailed observational data and face-to-face interaction between supervisor and teacher binds the two together into an intimate professional relationship.” From the definition given

above, it can be concluded that there is a face-to-face relationship. This can be attained when the supervisor and supervisee enter into a collegial relationship. That is the two enter into a discussion and advise each other on way forward so as to enhance teacher's professional growth.

Wadesango (2011) points out that the concern of clinical supervision process is the "teacher's" classroom behavior. In clinical supervision, the teacher interprets the syllabus, scheme, plan and use proper teaching methods so as to enhance effective learning. Thus study intended to find out which of the above models is dominant in the Deputy-Head's supervision.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a qualitative interpretive methodology because it allowed the researchers to get the data directly from the subjects themselves by sitting with the respondents and hearing their views, voices, perceptions and expectations in detail. This strategy contends that knowledge is subjective and ideographic, and truth is context-dependent and can only be obtained after entry into participants' reality. The researchers recognised several nuances of attitude and behaviour that could not have been noticed if other methods had been used. A case-study research design was adopted. A case study is described as a form of descriptor research that gathers a large amount of information about one or a few participants and thus investigates a few cases in considerable depth (Thomas and Nelson 2001). Data were collected from 4 primary schools in Mkoba suburb in Gweru. The population sample comprised of 20 primary school teachers and four deputy heads. In order to get an in depth of the analysis of the shared decision-making concept, a series of interviews were conducted over a 2 months period of time. To get further insights in the deputy head's supervisory role and its effects on the motivation of teachers, the authors administered a questionnaire.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows that the majority of the heads and deputy heads, 75% (3) each were married. No head was single and only 25% (1) deputy head was single. None of the heads was divorced

or separated. This has a bearing on supervision because teachers tend to respect more suggestions from married supervisors than single or divorced supervisors.

Table 1: Marital status of heads and deputy heads

Value label	Heads		Deputy heads	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentages
Single	0	0	1	25
Married	3	75	3	75
Divorced	0	0	0	0
Widowed	1	25	0	0
Separated	0	0	0	0
Total	4	100	4	100

Table 2 shows that the highest academic qualification for most heads and deputy heads was ordinary level. None of the heads nor the deputy heads had Zimbabwe Junior Certificate or ordinary level. Only 25% (1) graduate university while 50% (2) of the deputy heads had a graduate university. This implies that deputy heads had better academic qualifications than heads.

Table 2: Academic qualifications of school heads and deputy heads

Value label	Heads		Deputy heads	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentages
Standard 6	1	25	0	0
ZJC	0	0	0	0
O Level	2	50	2	50
A'Level	0	0	0	0
Graduate University	1	25	2	50
Total	4	100	4	100

Table 3 shows that most heads, 50% (2) and deputy heads, 75% (3) had a professional qualification of certificate in education. On the other hand 25% (1) of the heads had diploma in education and also 25% (1) of the deputy heads. The table shows that most heads and deputy heads had certificate in education and diplomas except one head with T3. There are no T4, untrained or PTL heads and deputy heads.

Table 4 shows that all heads and deputy heads were above 35 years. The greatest number 75% (3) of the deputy heads were above 40 years. There were no young heads and deputy heads hence it means most heads and deputy heads were mature people.

Table 3: Professional qualifications of heads and deputy heads

Value label	Heads		Deputy heads	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentages
T4	0	0	0	0
Diploma in Ed	1	25	1	25
T3	1	25	0	0
Untrained	0	0	0	0
PTL	0	0	0	0
CE	2	50	3	75
Totals	4	100	4	100

Table 4: Ages of heads and deputy heads

Value label	Heads		Deputy heads	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentages
Under 25yrs	0	0	1	25
25-30yrs	0	0	0	0
31-35 yrs	0	0	0	0
36-40 yrs	1	25	1	25
Above 40yrs	3	75	3	75
Total	4	100	4	100

Table 5 shows that 50% (2) of the heads had a teaching experience ranging between 16-20 years and 50% (2), deputy heads 6-10 years. No head or deputy head had a teaching experience of less than one year. The table shows that heads had more teaching experience than deputy heads.

Table 5: Teaching experience of head and deputy heads

Value label	A		N	
	No.	%	No.	%
Under 1 year	0	0	0	0
1-5 years	0	0	1	25
6-10 years	1	25	2	50
11 – 15 years	0	0	0	0
16 – 20 years	2	50	1	25
Above 20 years	1	25	0	0
Total	4	100	4	100

Table 6 shows that the majority of the deputy heads 50% (2) had an experience of supervisory role for the period ranging between 6-10 years, 25% (1) had an experience of less than one year and none between the period ranging 16-20 years and over 20 years. Thus, deputy heads were fairly experienced in their supervisory role.

Table 7 shows that 45% (9) of the respondents were supervised once, 15% (3) were supervised twice and 30% (6) were never super-

Table 6: Experiences of deputy heads in supervisory role

Value label	No.	%	% cum frequency
Under 1 year	1	25	25
1-5 years	0	0	0
6-10 years	2	50	50
11 – 15 years	1	25	25
16 – 20 years	0	0	0
Above 20 years	0	0	0
Total	4	100	100

vised. This shows that the supervision is not consistent and deputy heads are not performing their supervisory role.

Table 7: Frequency of supervision for the past term

Value label	No.	%	Cum%
Once	9	45	45
Twice	3	15	20
Not at all	6	30	25
More than twice	2	10	10
Total	20	100	100

From the responses shown in Table 8; 75% (15) of the junior teachers were supervised during the mid-term, 25% (5) were supervised at the beginning of the term and none of the teachers was supervised at the end of the year.

Table 8: Time of the term teachers normally get supervised

Value label	No.	%	Cum%
Beginning of term	5	25	25
Mid – term	15	75	75
End of year	0	0	0
Total	20	100	100

From Table 9, 50% (10) of the teachers preferred to be supervised once a term, 10% (2) opted for more than twice and 25% (5) never wanted to be supervised. Thus the majority prefers to be supervised once.

Table 9: Teacher's preference on the number of times they would like to be supervised per term

Value label	No.	%	Cum %
Once	10	50	50
Twice	3	15	15
More than twice	2	10	10
Never at all	5	25	25
Total	20	100	100

Table 10 shows that 55% (11) of the teachers were neutral on the perception of the Deputy-Head’s supervisory role, 35 perceived it as objective whilst 10% (2) perceived it as subjective.

Table 10: Teachers’ perception of the deputy-head” supervisory role

<i>Value label</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Cum %</i>
Objective	7	35	35
Neutral	11	55	55
Subjective	2	10	10
Total	20	100	100

In Table 11, 40% (8) of the respondents indicated that only ineffective teachers were to be supervised, 30% (6) said that only inexperienced teachers should be supervised while 10% indicated that very experienced teachers have to be supervised. In the same vein, 20% (4) said that only new teachers should be supervised. This shows that the majority of the teachers perceived supervision of very experienced teachers as unnecessary.

From the responses given in Table 12, 75% (3) of the deputy heads felt that their supervision improved teacher’s instructional skills, 50% (2) said that their supervision focused on weaknesses, 75%(3) said that they maintained an open channel of communication.

Table 13 shows that 75% (15) of the junior teachers acknowledge that the deputy head’s

Table 11: Type of teachers to be supervised by the Deputy- Head

<i>Value label</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Cum %</i>
Inexperienced teachers	6	30	30
Very experienced teachers	2	10	10
Ineffective teachers	8	40	40
New teachers at school	4	20	20
Total	20	100	100

supervision improved their instructional skills while 90% (18) said that the deputy head never assisted them in lesson planning and also 55% (11) were neutral. This implies that teachers perceived the deputy head’s supervision as constructive but the deputy head’s supervision as constructive but the deputy head himself or herself did not spare time to plan with the teachers.

Table 14 shows that 50% (2) of the heads perceived the deputy head’s supervision as subjective. In the same vein, 25% (1) perceived it as objective and 25% (1) were neutral. This implies that heads are not content with the deputy head’s supervision.

DISCUSSION OF DATA

Teacher’s Perception of the Deputy-Head’s Supervisory Role

This study found that 15% of junior teachers were aged between 31 – 35 years while 75%

Table 12: Deputy heads’ perception on his/her supervision

<i>Value label</i>	<i>A</i>		<i>N</i>		<i>DA</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Improvement of instructional skills	3	75	1	25	0	0
Encouragement of creativity	1	25	2	50	1	25
Assistance in lesson learning	1	25	1	25	2	50
Focus on weakness	2	50	0	0	2	50
Focus on strength	1	25	3	75	0	0
Maintenance of open channel of community	3	75	1	25	0	0

Table 13: Teachers’ perception on deputy-head’s supervision

<i>Value label</i>	<i>A</i>		<i>N</i>		<i>DA</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Improvement of instructional skills	15	75	5	25	0	0
Encouragement of creativity	2	10	6	30	12	60
Assistance in lesson learning	2	10	0	0	18	90
Focus on weakness	10	50	2	10	8	40
Focus on strength	5	25	11	55	4	20
Maintenance of open channel of community	12	60	10	50	8	40

Table 14: Heads' perception of deputy-head's supervision

<i>Value label</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Cum %</i>
Objective	1	25	25
Neutral	1	25	25
Subjective	2	50	50
Total	4	100	100

of the deputy heads were above 40 years and 55% (11) of the junior teachers were between the age range 36 – 40 years. This shows that they were mature people who had respect for each other and their deputy heads. Another finding of this research was that the deputy heads considered teaching experience and instructional needs of teachers to determine the frequency of supervision. Table 5 showed that 45% (9) of the teachers had a teaching experience ranging from 16 - 20 years. This means that deputy heads valued experience as the best teacher. On the other hand 25% (5) of the junior teachers from Table 9 showed that they never wanted to be supervised at all. None had trained to teach infants only. This showed that they despised their deputy head's supervisory role and thought that they now know all the requirements in the teaching field hence no need to be supervised. This contradicts with what Colorado Department of Education (1997) say. They say that the process of supervision is seen as working on teachers and materials which in turn affect the process of instruction to improve learning. He goes on to say that supervision works with and through others to achieve its goals of improving teachers so that they may improve pupil learning and pupil results.

It emerged that most deputy heads 50% (2) were new at their present schools as deputy heads with a period of less than 1 year. This could adversely affect the value the teachers place on the deputy head's supervisory. Being new, there was likely to be conflict with teachers in trying to introduce anything new because teachers used to do things in their old ways. This is supported by Edwards (1998) who asserts that change is a process, not an event. Eder and Harris, (1999) say that what happens at one stage strongly influence and affects subsequent stages. There were also some teachers who had better academic qualification than deputy heads. It also emerged that some teachers had "A" levels and others were university graduates. That alone could contribute to teachers despising the supervision of the deputy heads. The junior

teacher's perception showed that most deputy heads supervised the weak teachers. The teachers were not valuing the deputy head's supervisory role at all. Stoner and Freeman (1992: 1) see supervision as: "A process of interaction in which individuals work with teachers to improve instruction. The ultimate goal is to better student learning"

In Tables 9 and 10, 25% (5) of the teachers said that they never wanted to be supervised at all. 55% (11) were neutral on their perception on the deputy head's supervisory role. The deputy heads were also not planning with the teachers which, also contributed to teachers viewing deputy head's supervisory role as less important. Ninety percent (18) of the teachers said that the Deputy assisted them in lesson planning. This implies that the deputy heads do not apply Clinical Supervision. Robbins (1987: 4) explains clinical supervision saying that:

Given close observation detailed observational data, face to face interaction between the supervisor and teacher, on an intensity of focus that binds the two together in an intimate professional relationship.

From the definition given above, it can be concluded that there is a face-to-face relationship which can be attained when the supervisor and the supervisee enter into a collegueship. Cogan (1995) echoes the same sentiments when he says that clinical supervision involves planning together with the teacher and professional growth. According to study's findings, junior teachers postulated that the deputy head's supervision does not encourage any creativity, hence demotivating teachers. Robbins (1987: 207) asserts that motivation is the willingness to do something which is conditioned by the action's ability to satisfy some need for the individual. Without motivation teachers cannot reach their self actualization stage.

However there was room for the teachers who need assistance to see the deputy head as teachers said that deputy heads maintained open channels of communication. Most of the junior teachers felt that they could perform their professional duties equally effective with or without deputy head's supervision. The logical conclusion that can be drawn is that, whilst junior teachers are satisfied with their deputy head's professionalism and support, they do not seem to attach importance on the supervisory role of a deputy head.

Deputy Head's Own Perception on His/Her Supervisory Role

The study found that most deputy heads conceived their supervisory role as one that improved teacher's instructional skills. It was established in this study that 75% of deputy heads supported this notion and 75% of the junior teachers felt the same. Most deputy heads focused their supervision on weakness only and teachers expressed the same sentiments. At the same time 90% of the teachers said that deputy heads never assisted them in lesson planning and 50% of the deputy heads agreed to that. However, ZOU Module EA3DC103 (1995) says that the supervisor is expected to work with the teacher in lesson planning, preparation, presentation and evaluation. It goes on to say that the emphasis in supervision is to discover the strengths and build on them, and if there are weaknesses, to help the teacher overcome them. Unfortunately this might be the reason why teachers continue to perform poorly without the deputy head's assistance. Deputy head's general focus on teachers' weakness during supervision seems to contradict the essence of motivating teachers.

In Table 9, 25% of junior teachers preferred never to be supervised and Table 7 showed that 30% of the junior teachers were never supervised in the past term or previous term. This implies that the deputy heads dance to the tune of their teachers. The inconsistency in the deputy head's supervision reveals that deputy heads do not value their supervisory role. However, Musaaazi (1992) in his research on class visits and supervision concluded that:

It is always important for deputy heads to make follow up class visits to check if suggestions given in the previous class visit were implemented as some teachers do not implement some suggestions easily.

National Association of Independent Schools (1992) concurs with Musaaazi (1992) when he sees the supervisor as a curriculum worker whose main emphasis is writing and revision of materials, preparation of units and teaching materials, preparation of units and teaching materials. Thus, if the Deputy heads have to value their supervisory role, they have to adhere to what Musaaazi and Cogan (1992) have suggested or echoed.

Head's View on the Deputy Head's Supervisory Role

The study revealed that 50% of the heads perceived the deputy head's supervision as subjective. However, 25% perceived it as objective and 25% were neutral (See Table 14). The sentiments expressed showed that the heads did not appreciate deputy head's supervision possibly due to inferiority complex. Most deputy heads had better academic qualifications than their heads (See Table 2). As a result heads viewed deputy heads as threats to their posts despite that they have legitimate posts and legitimate powers. Twenty-five percent of the heads had standard 6. This is also quite surprising that heads of such low academic qualifications are still managing schools. Deputy heads can despise Head's suggestions because the two live in two different worlds where one still uses the old methods of supervision. Actually most old heads inspected teachers instead of supervising them. This resulted in conflict between the head and the Deputy head.

Table 3 also shows that there was a head who still had a professional qualification of T3. This has an effect on the way the head perceives the deputy head's supervisory role and is revealed by 25% of the heads who were neutral on the deputy head's supervisory role. With such a low professional qualification, one is also likely to feel insecure and may result in a lot of conflict. However, Table 5 shows that more than 50% of the heads had teaching experience of more than 15 years. Experience helps because the longer one is in the classroom, the more one is likely to be able to identify the problems faced in the classroom.

Effects of the Deputy Head's Supervisory Role on Teacher Motivation

The researchers' findings have shown that most teachers perceived their deputy head's supervisory role as considerably effective. In the same vein, 75% of the junior teachers perceived the deputy head's supervisory role as effective and this is a testimony. They said that the deputy head's supervision improved their instructional skills. It was rather disturbing to note that about 40% of the junior teachers perceived their deputy head's supervisory as ineffective. Such a high proportion cannot be ignored but calls for further exploration to find possible answers to this

perception. With (5) of the junior teachers remaining neutral about the deputy head's effectiveness, one would be obliged to think that there is a role conflict between deputy heads and their subordinates. Perhaps, teachers' perception is biased on the irregularity of the Deputy Head's supervision. This study has also noted a positive aspect of the deputy head's supervisory role. It also emerged in this study that most junior teachers felt that they received the necessary instructional support from the deputy head. North-West Regional Educational Laboratory (1999) stresses on the provision of support to ensure consistency of standards and teacher's expectations.

CONCLUSION

The study found that most experienced teachers did not value the deputy heads' supervisory role. They felt that supervision must be directed at ineffective and inexperienced teachers. Some of the junior teachers agreed that their feeling was a bit negative towards the deputy heads supervisory role. The study also observed that some of the junior teachers preferred to be supervised once a term and others preferred never to be supervised. This shows that the deputy heads supervisory role did not motivate the junior teachers. It was established that the deputy heads are qualified to supervise teachers under their leadership. While most teachers have a positive attitude towards deputy heads' supervisory role, they preferred that the deputy heads should supervise inexperienced teachers more frequently than experienced ones. It emerged that most deputy heads adopted the Human Relations Management Theory. The success of this theory in improving instructional activities depends on the maintenance of warm and friendly relations between the supervisor and the teacher.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the conclusions that unfolded in the study, the following recommendations are made:

- That both junior teachers and deputy heads should be inducted on the supervisory roles of the deputy heads. This is to make the deputy heads aware of their supervisory roles and the junior teachers to value the deputy heads' supervisory roles.
- The Heads and Regional officers should ensure that deputy heads perform their supervisory roles effectively by providing staff development programmes

REFERENCES

- Bush T 2003. *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management*. 3rd Edition. London: Sage Publications.
- Colorado Department of Education 1997. *Guidebook to Colorado Charter Schools: Key Issues for Start-up and Implementation of Charter Schools*. UK: Denver, CO.
- Cogan ML 1995. *Clinical Supervision*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Eder RW, Harris MH 1999. *The Employment Interview Handbook*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, C.A.
- Edwards MA 1998. The school administrator. *Professional Development*, 55(11): 34-36.
- Musaazi JC 1992. *The Theory and Practice of Educational Administration*. London: Macmillan Publisher Ltd.
- National Association of Independent Schools 1999. Principles of Good Practice. From <www.nais.org/nais/princ/srprin.html> (Retrieved on 12 April 2012).
- Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory 1999. *Charter Starters: Governance and Management*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Robbins SD 1987. *Management Concepts and Practices*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall-Inc.
- Sergiovanni TJ, Starrat RJ 1998. *Supervision: A Redefinition*. 6th Edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Stoner AF, Freeman RE 1992. *Management*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Thomas JR, Nelson JK 2001. *Research Methods in Physical Activity*. 4th Edition. London: Champaign.
- Wadesango N 2009. The impact of teacher participation in decision-making in schools. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 8(4): 69-88.
- Wadesango N 2011. Groupwork: Myth or reality in school based decision-making. *Groupwork*, 21 (1): 59-82.
- ZOU Module EA3DC101 1993. *Educational Leadership and Supervision*. Harare: ZOU.
- ZOU Module EA3DC401 1995. *Guidelines for the Research Project*. Harare: ZOU.