

**The influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities
of school governing bodies in Church-owned schools in Lesotho**

by

NTOA DAVID NKANDA

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

in the subject

EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: DR TA OGINA

NOVEMBER 2017

DECLARATION

Name: **Ntoa David Nkanda**

Student number: **50091921**

Degree: **Master of Education**

Title of the dissertation: ***The influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of school governing bodies in Church-owned schools in Lesotho***

I declare that the above dissertation is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

I further declare that I have not previously submitted this work, or part of it, for examination at Unisa for another qualification or at any other higher education institution.



November, 2017

Signature

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I extend my sincere appreciation, gratitude and indebtedness to all people who contributed directly or indirectly towards completion of this study.

- My special thanks to my supervisor Dr Teresa Ogina who worked tirelessly to give me support and guidance that I needed throughout my study. If it were not for her patience, dedication, encouragement, and expertise, completion of this work could not have been a reality.
- My sincere thanks to the management and staff of St. Catherine's High School for their word of encouragement and support in my studies.
- My deepest gratitude to my wife, 'Mabongani Nkanda, and my two children, Bongani Nkanda and Lindiwe Nkanda, for their love, unwavering support, patience, and understanding.
- Most importantly, thanks be to Almighty God for giving me strength and wisdom to endure all pain and challenges that go with this kind of work.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family: my wife, 'Mabongani Nkanda; my son, Bongani Nkanda; and my daughter, Lindiwe Nkanda. They supported me during those times of my study.

ABSTRACT

The focus of this case study inquiry was to explore the influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of the School Boards (SBs) in church-owned secondary schools in Maseru. The samples consisted of SBs chairpersons, school principals, parents' representatives, and teachers' representatives in the SBs and educational secretaries from three church-owned secondary schools. Interviews were used to collect data. The findings of this study revealed that the perceived roles of proprietors were to develop the learners holistically including religious values and morals. The SBs managed human resources, physical infrastructure, and school funds, and policy implementation. The relationship between proprietors and SBs was both positive and negative. The proprietors influenced SBs through promoting religious values and morals and by ensuring achievement of their academic goals. The proprietors' sense of ownership and the desire for maintaining quality education motivated them to monitor the functions of SBs' in their schools.

Key concepts: church-owned schools, influence, relationships, religious values and morals, school board, school governance, schools in Maseru Lesotho, school management, school proprietor, roles and responsibilities.

ACRONYMS

ACL	Anglican Church of Lesotho
BOG	Board of governors
BOM	Board of Management
LEC	Lesotho Evangelical Church
LECSA	Lesotho Evangelical Church in Southern Africa
MOET	Ministry of Education and Training
PTA	Parents Teachers Association
RCC	Roman Catholic Church
RSA	Republic of South Africa
SASA	South African Schools' Act
SB	School Board
SBM	School-Based Management
SGB	School governing body
UNISA	University of South Africa

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1:	Biographical information of the participants.....	42
Table 4.2:	Research questions and interview questions.....	43
Table 4.3:	Research questions, themes and sub-themes.....	44

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACRONYMS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	4
1.3 Rationale and significance of the study.....	5
1.4 Purpose of the study.....	6
1.5 Research questions.....	6
1.6 Research methodology.....	7
1.7 Credibility and trustworthiness.....	11
1.8 Ethical considerations.....	12
1.9 Definition of key concepts.....	13
1.10 Summary of the chapter.....	14

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW ON SCHOOL MANAGEMENT, GOVERNANCE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction.....	15
2.2 Background history of Lesotho Education System.....	15
2.3 School-Based Management (SBM): Theoretical perspectives.....	18
2.4 The concepts of school governance and school management.....	20

2.5 Composition of school governing bodies.....	22
2.6 Roles and responsibilities of SBs.....	24
2.7 Core functions of school principal as a leader.....	27
2.8 Proprietorship roles.....	28
2.9 Summary of the chapter.....	32

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH APPROACH, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction.....	33
3.2 Research approach.....	33
3.3 Research design.....	34
3.4 Data collection.....	36
3.5 Data analysis.....	38
3.6 Piloting.....	39
3.7 Interview process.....	40
3.8 Summary of the chapter.....	40

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction.....	41
4.2 Biographical information of the participants.....	41
4.3 Research questions' themes and sub-themes.....	42
4.4 Research findings.....	45
4.5 Summary of the chapter.....	94

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction.....	95
5.2 Summary of findings.....	95

5.3 Conclusions.....	99
5.4 Recommendations from the findings.....	100
5.5 Limitations of the study.....	101
5.6 Delimitations of the study.....	103
5.7 Recommendations for future research.....	103
6. REFERENCES.....	105
7. APPENDICES.....	112
Appendix A: Request for permission from school principal	
Appendix B: Participant information sheet	
Appendix C: Schedule of principals interview questions	
Appendix D: Schedule of School Board interview questions	
Appendix E: Schedule of Educational Secretaries interview questions	
Appendix F: Letter requesting adult’s participation	
Appendix G: Request for permission from Maseru District Education Office	
Appendix H: Sample of transcribed interview	
Appendix I: Letter of permission from Maseru District Education Office	
Appendix J: Decision: Ethics approval	
Appendix K: Example of coding table	
Appendix L: Declaration of language editing	

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

In 1838, Christian missionaries started formal education in Lesotho (formerly known as Basutoland). The missionaries were Lesotho Evangelical Church (LEC), the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) and the Anglican Church of Lesotho (ACL) (Jobo, Khiba, Lefoka, Liphoto, Mapuru, Molise, Moeti, Moorosi, Nenty, Ntoi, Qhobela, Sebatane, & Sephelane 2000:2; Lekhetho, 2013:55). In addition, Matheolane and Seotsanyana (2014) assert that although the missionaries (churches) took the initiative of establishing schools in 1838, Lesotho showed interest in educational activities under the colonial rule which began in 1868 and ended in 1965. The colonial government allowed the missions to establish schools on a denominational basis. However, there was no integration of such education with the education of the Basotho in the Kingdom of Lesotho (Motaba, 1998:3).

In 1995, the Ministry of Education promulgated the law that established School Boards (SBs) in schools' governance and management for the first time through Education Act No.10 of 1995, section 22 (Kingdom of Lesotho, 1995). The idea, which had then become the law, permitted active participation and involvement of all stakeholders, especially parents, in the governance and management of all secondary and high schools in Lesotho, including those owned by the church. The Kingdom of Lesotho became an independent state in 1966. Since then, the country, like other independent states, was expected to run her education affairs without any foreign intervention.

In 2010, the new Education Act of 2010 repealed and replaced the Education Act No.10 of 1995. The new Act still maintained the same tone that schools must be governed and managed by the SBs, which were more representative than the previous School Committees (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010). The introduction of the SBs led to the removal of managers who were appointed by schools' proprietors (Matalasi, 2000). This study focuses on church-owned schools because the majority (90%) of schools in Lesotho is owned by different churches (Khama, 2000:38). The church is the biggest proprietor compared to government and community/private schools in Lesotho.

The administration and control of the education system in Lesotho has been a collective effort between the state, the church and the community (Jobo et al., 2000; Khama, 2000). At national level, the government is in charge of policies formulation, curriculum development, teacher training, national examinations, teachers' salaries and conditions of service, as well as planning and financing education. The church is a second partner whose responsibility is to provide classroom facilities and set school fees (Jobo et al., 2000; Khama, 2000). The churches also participate in high-powered government committees such as the Education Advisory Council and the Teaching Service Commission (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010; Jobo et al., 2000). According to the Lesotho Education Act of 2010, section 23 (2), the church, as a proprietor, appoints the nine members of the SB, two of which directly represent the proprietor. The third partner is the community, who are held responsible for funding the education of their children (Jobo et al., 2000). The community serves in the SB as parent representatives (three members), one area chief and one local council representative (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010).

School governance has been a concept that has existed over a period of time. Researchers such as Buckland and Hofmeyer (1993) and Potgieter, Visser, Van der Bank, Mothata, and Squelch (1997:11) describe school governance as an administrative act of formulating, adopting, implementing and monitoring policy and determining the structure, organizational level and monitoring system. According to Ball (2009), the nature of school governance is constantly changing owing to global trends and shifting academic goals. In more recent years, school governance is defined as the act of ensuring that schools are functional and able to provide high quality education and at the same time serving the needs of its community (Matshe, 2014).

School governance in Lesotho comprises elements of description of governance in the 1990s and more recent conception of school governance. The main function of SB's in Lesotho is formulation of school policies, strategic planning, devising supervision and monitoring tools, and ensuring implementation of policies (David & David, 2015:282). One of the most important functions of SB is to assist the principal and the teachers in the execution of their tasks by availing all resources to enable them to perform their school duties on a day-to-day basis (Van Deventer & Kruger, 2011:264; Marais & Meier, 2012:59). While the SBs chairpersons oversee the management functions of the school

principal, the principals also work in collaboration with SB members in performing their governance roles and responsibilities (Khuzwayo, 2007; David & David, 2015:282).

Although governance and management are different concepts and imply different responsibilities, they are interwoven. Shonhiwa (2006:16) defines management as a tactical operation, where the manager will make ultimate use of available resources, be they technology, machinery, hardware, finances or people, to achieve the organisation's objectives. Management is also described as a process in which people work together with an aim of achieving organizational goals (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson, 2001:8-9). The process of management involves planning, organizing, leading and controlling the human resource, financial and physical as well as other resources to reach the targets of the organization (Griffin, 1987). The most appealing definition, for the purpose of this dissertation, is that management is a social process in which the different stakeholders function within certain structures and processes to fulfil set goals (Khuzwayo, 2007). School governance is a different concept that requires specific governance members.

In Lesotho, the composition of the SB consists of nine members (Kingdom of Lesotho 2010, section 23: 2). The number is fixed for all schools regardless of the number of learners in the school and the type of school, whether government, community, church or privately owned. The composition includes two members nominated by a proprietor, one of whom is the chairperson, three members nominated by parents, one of whom is the vice chairperson, one teacher nominated by teachers in that particular school. Other members of the SB are a gazette chief or his or her representation under whose jurisdiction the school falls, a member of the local council or his or her representation under whose jurisdiction the school falls and the principal performs a dual role of being the secretary of the board and also functions as an ex-officio member.

The understanding behind the composition/representation of the SBs in Lesotho is that the representatives do not only stand on behalf of their various constituencies or groups in the SBs but also serve their members' interests and views (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010, section 23). It is noted with great interest that two nominees in the SB, one of whom is the SB chairperson, represent the proprietor. The SB chairpersonship is a high and an influential position on its own. As a result, the study may find it unavoidable to ignore the influence imposed or coming through the chairpersonship office.

In Lesotho, the roles and responsibilities of the SBs are contained in section 25 of the Education Act 2010 (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010). They (SBs) are expected to manage and administer the school for which they have been constituted, oversee the management, proper and efficient running of the school. In a public school, the SBs are responsible for recommending or advising the inspector of schools or a district education officer on the appointment, promotion, demotion, or transfer of teachers. In independent schools, the SBs appoint, promote, demote, or transfer teachers. They also recommend to the appointing authority or proprietor, as the case may be, a disciplinary action against a principal or head of department. In addition, they liaise with the relevant local authority on matters related to the development of the school. They are also accountable for managing the school finances. In addition, they are expected to ensure that the school account is audited before they submit the report to the school owners annually (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010).

This study was based on the assumption that school proprietors might have influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs in their schools. It was against this background that the researcher explored the influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of school governing bodies in church-owned secondary schools in Lesotho. In the context of this study, school proprietors are church authorities. According to the Kingdom of Lesotho Education Act of 2010, section 26, the school proprietors (church authorities) appoint educational secretaries who stand on their behalf in organising, co-ordinating and supervising educational work; liaising with the Ministry of Education and Training on management matters; and, performing duties assigned by the Minister of Education and Training.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There are limited recent studies carried out in Lesotho regarding the relationship between school proprietors and SBs as they work in collaboration at school level. Khalanyane (1995) studied power struggle between the churches and the government in the running and control of schools in Lesotho. His study showed that school governance was characterised by conflicts between the government and school owners. The study reported that while the government attempted to take full control of the governance and administration of schools, the churches were adamant that the administration of education must be a shared area between them and the state

(Khalanyane, 1995:90). In another study, Khama (2000) found that parents perceived the working relationship between the churches and the government as well as church and government officials to be less positive. In this study, there was lack of clarity and ambiguity on important administrative and management issues such as decision and policy making processes and control of teachers in church schools. Jobo et al. (2000) and Khama (2000:6) indicate that there was a growing concern that the government and the church appeared to have undue influence on the third partner, the community, despite the latest attempts to decentralise school governance and management in Lesotho. The current study was a follow-up to findings of the study by Khama (2000). It was based on the assumption that the lack of clarity on administrative and management issues might limit the role and responsibility of SBs of church-owned schools. It was, therefore, necessary for this study to explore the influence that the proprietors of church-owned schools had on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs in secondary and high schools in Maseru, Lesotho. In this study, the concept “influence” was assumed to be a neutral term that could be experienced as having a positive or negative impact on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs.

1.3 RATIONALE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

In Lesotho, education has always been a joint venture between the government, the church and the community (Jobo et al., 2000:2). In recent years, the government and the church seem to have undue influence on the community, the third partner, despite the latest attempts to decentralise the school governance and management in schools in Lesotho (Jobo et al., 2000; Khama, 2000:6). Since the implementation of the Education Act of 2010 (Kingdom of Lesotho 2010), little is known about the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs with regard to school governance in church-owned schools.

This study contributes to the Department of Education on the knowledge of factors that promote effectiveness of the SBs in church-owned schools. The study also brings awareness and understanding of the working relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs that enhance or inhibit the roles and responsibilities of the SBs. This provides insights that might inform policy-making and sound management of not only the church-owned schools, but may also be relevant to other schools that are experiencing same challenges though under different proprietorship. The study adds

knowledge and understanding to school governance and management and more particularly practices of church-owned schools in Lesotho.

1.4 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study set out to explore the influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs in church-owned secondary and high schools in Maseru, Lesotho. This study attempted to achieve the following:

- To identify the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors and SBs.
- To explore the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs with regard to school governance.
- To explore the views of the SBs on the influence of the school proprietors on their roles and responsibilities.
- To identify factors that contribute to the proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs.
- To establish the effects of the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs in school governance.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The primary question for this inquiry is: How do school proprietors influence the SBs' roles and responsibilities in church-owned secondary schools in Lesotho?

This study was based on the following sub-questions:

- What are the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors and SBs?
- What is the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs with regard to school governance?
- In what ways do school proprietors influence the roles and responsibilities of the SBs?
- What factors contribute to the proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs?
- What are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs in school governance?

1.6. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.6.1 Paradigmatic Assumptions

The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences, views and opinions of school proprietors and SB members with regard to school governance. The research was located within specific ontological and epistemological assumptions. Silverman (2013) states that the choice of research paradigm is based on the purpose of the study. Ontology deals with what is believed to be real knowledge, in other words, the reality of the phenomenon while epistemology is concerned with how knowledge is generated, understood and used (Wahyuni, 2012). The researcher in this study believed in multiple realities of the experiences and views of the participants. Knowledge generated in this study was socially constructed between the research participants and the researcher. Wahyuni (2012) asserts that the reality of a phenomenon can be determined by the perceptions and experiences of the participants involved in the study and knowledge is produced from the subjective meaning that the participants and the researcher attach to the social phenomenon.

Based on the stated ontology and epistemology, the methodological paradigm in this study is interpretive in nature. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) indicate that interpretive paradigm seek to make sense of the participants' experiences out of the multiple realities of the phenomenon. In this study, the researcher analysed the interviews from the participants to make sense of their reality and answer the research questions (Johnson & Christensen, 2012; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). The researcher presented "thick" descriptions from the interview data to make it possible for the researcher to relate the findings of the study to his/her own situation (Lichtman, 2012). Allocating the study within an interpretive paradigm improved the researcher's insights, views and knowledge of the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs regarding school governance.

1.6.2 Research approach

From the research question and sub-questions, the researcher believed that qualitative research approach would be suitable for obtaining data to answer the research questions in this study. Through qualitative research, the researcher is able to study a

phenomenon in its natural setting and how the participants make sense of their experiences of the phenomenon being studied (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The researcher engaged in qualitative approach is able to explore attitudes, behaviour and experiences of the participants using face-to-face interviews (Creswell, 2009). This is because qualitative inquiry looks at behaviour or an event as it occurs in its natural setting, without external constraints and control, and how people interpret their experiences (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The context of the study in qualitative research was considered important as it had influence on the behaviour of the participants. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) posit that the researcher collects data directly from the source and benefits from detailed narratives that provide an in-depth of behaviour or an event.

The advantage of qualitative approach is that the researcher is able to interpret the data to understand the experiences of the participants and the phenomenon (Merriam, 2002; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Lichtman, 2012). Qualitative research is based on the usage of words whereby the researcher describes, attaches meanings, interprets, or tells a story about a particular phenomenon (Johnson & Christensen, 2012; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003).

1.6.3 Research design

A case study design method was used in this study. A case may be a programme, an event, an activity, or individual experiencing a phenomenon within a set period of time and context (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Case study design is described as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context (Merriam, 2007; Creswell, 2009). A case study examines a bounded system, or a case, over time in depth, employing multiple sources of data found in the setting (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010; Creswell, 2009). According to Yin (2009), a case study enables the researcher to explore individuals or organizations, simple or complex phenomena, programmes and relationships in a logical manner with the aim of collecting detailed data for analysis. Researchers who do case studies often collect in-depth variety of data from a single case (Creswell, 2009). The purpose of a case study is to collect and provide unique examples of the experiences of real people in real situations which enable readers to understand the phenomenon being studied (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). This study was a multi-site case study (Merriam, 2007). The case that was

investigated in this study was the influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs in church-owned secondary/high schools in Lesotho. The study included several data collecting sites which were different church-owned schools and participants to be able to compare similarities and differences of the case across the different sites.

1.6.4 Research site

The study involved three secondary schools in Maseru belonging to the Roman Catholic Church, the Lesotho Evangelical Church of Southern Africa, and the Seventh Day Adventist Church. These church denominations were selected because they had played a role in Lesotho's education for a long time. Data collection was through semi-structured interviews. This case study was conducted in Maseru, the capital city of Lesotho. Maseru was chosen because the researcher believed that it had more church-owned schools than other parts of the country. More importantly, the residents of Maseru were also believed to be professionals who might have knowledge of what was expected from the SBs as school governors in Lesotho. Moreover, since the church schools in Maseru were nearer to the churches' headquarters, this made the city of Maseru the most conducive environment for this study. Therefore, there was a possibility of high proprietorship influence on SBs' roles and responsibilities at this area.

1.6.5 Research sample

Purposive sampling was used to identify the site as well as the participants to be involved in this study. Purposeful sampling requires a researcher to choose participants who have experienced the phenomenon and have the potential of yielding "rich" information about the study (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Creswell (2009) describes purposive sampling as a process in which the researcher chooses particular participants who have experienced the phenomenon under study. The researcher identified the schools in which the participants were selected for interview through snowballing or referral process. In this study, four secondary schools belonging to four different denominations were purposefully selected in Maseru. One school belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, another to the Lesotho Evangelical Church in Southern Africa. The other two belonged to the Anglican Church of Lesotho and the Seventh Day Adventist Church. The schools were chosen because they had the following

commonalities: they were all mixed schools. The learner academic performance in the selected schools ranged between 40 to 70%. The learner enrolment on average was about 800. The sample was also convenient because the researcher resided in Maseru and this made the process of data collection economical in terms of transport to and from the schools. It also made the study feasible with regard to time and mobility. Four participants were interviewed from each school, namely, the principal, the SB chairperson, the teachers' representative, one parents' representative. Two educational secretaries from the Lesotho Evangelical Church in Southern Africa and the Anglican Church of Lesotho were also interviewed. However, the Seventh Day Adventist Church did not have an educational secretary because it did not own more than 20 schools as dictated by the law (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010).

1.6.6 Data collection methods

In this study, the researcher generated data by using semi-structured interviews. Interviews were used because they enabled two-way conversation between the researcher and the participants and in the process (Maree, 2010). According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) by doing interviews, the researcher aims at seeing the world in which the phenomenon occurs by exploring the experiences of the participants. The purpose of interviews was to enable the participants to share with the researcher their lived experiences, thoughts, views to provide a clear picture of the phenomenon being studied (Merriam, 2005). The researcher decided to use face-to-face semi-structured interviews to collect data because the method is flexible in structure. The researcher used predetermined interview questions that were based on the research questions. Furthermore, the researcher used probing questions during the follow-up interviews for clarification and depth (O'Leary, 2010). A semi-structured interview was suitable for this study because it enabled the researcher to probe for in-depth responses from the participants and also ask follow-up questions for clarity during the interview process (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). The researcher also gave the participants the opportunity to discuss their experiences and concerns and express their points of view about the phenomenon (Creswell, 2003).

When conducting semi-structured interviews, the researcher started with biographical questions as an icebreaker to establish rapport with the participants. The interviews

then proceeded to open-ended questions that required in-depth information about the research topic. Furthermore, a tape recorder was used with the consent of the participants to record the interviews. Leedy and Ormrod (2010) argue that it is important to record verbatim responses of the participants for credibility of the study. Moreover, memo notes were also taken during the interview and used to draw follow-up questions. In this study, the researcher interviewed members of the SB: one principal per school, one chairperson per school, one teachers' representative per school, one parents' representative per school, and two educational secretaries.

1.6.6 Data Analysis

Data analysis in qualitative research is a methodical process with different steps such as coding, categorizing and grouping the different categories to make sub-themes and themes (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). The process of data analysis is not linear but involves going back and forth in comparing emerging categories and themes (Punch, 2009). The process includes arranging data from interviews transcripts, field notes and other materials to enable a researcher to present his/her findings (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). In this study, content analysis was the strategy used to analyse data from interviews. The researcher listened to the recorded interviews and coded data. The researcher then transcribed the interviews and the responses were organized according to the questions asked. The researcher read the data several times to be familiar with the information in order to assign codes to the data. The codes were grouped to form categories. The researcher merged groups of codes that spoke to one finding to form categories and themes based on the research questions (Creswell, 2007). The data from different sources and participants were triangulated. The researcher identified various ways in which the school proprietors influence the roles and responsibilities of the SBs.

1.7 CREDIBILITY AND TRUSTWORTHINESS

In qualitative research, researchers use words such as trustworthiness, conformability, verification and transferability instead of using quantitative terms like validity and reliability (Creswell, 2008). Researchers use various techniques to ensure that the

findings of the study are credible. Examples of such techniques include prolonged engagement in fieldwork, using multiple data collection methods and data sources, member checking and using verbatim recordings, among others (Schwandt, 2007).

Prolonged fieldwork during data collection provides the researcher with a chance to interrogate data and do follow-up interviews with the participants to confirm data and findings (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The researcher intended to use different data collection methods like interviews and document analysis to be able to compare the findings from the diverse sources (Schwandt, 2007; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:331). The tape recorder was used for accuracy in capturing the data and serving as a database for storing raw data (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:331).

The researcher in this study did member checking to ensure trustworthiness of the findings. Interview transcripts and drafts of analysed data were given to the participants for their comments. Member checking process involved enabling the participants to verify the collected data, the analysis of the data, the interpretations of the findings as well as the conclusions (Creswell, 2008). The researcher also gave detailed information about the research site to give the reader the context of the study. The researcher, in addition, provided an audit trail on the activities carried out during the data collection and data analysis process. The annexure on the last pages of this dissertation provides evidence of what was done (Briggs, 2007:115).

1.8. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

According to Creswell (2007), ethical considerations are about rules and behaviour expected of a researcher to adhere to when conducting a research. It includes the acceptable conduct when dealing with participants. Before going to the site to collect data, the researcher applied for ethical clearance from the Ethics Committee of the University of South Africa (Unisa). The researcher also sought permission to conduct research from the District Education Officer in Maseru and from the school proprietors, school boards and management teams of the four identified schools. More importantly, the introductory letter explaining the purpose of the study and its importance was given to the school principals. The letter stated the proposed participants to participate in the

study and clearly indicated their rights such as voluntary participation and freedom to withdraw from the study at any time without a penalty. They were assured that their names and those of their schools would be kept anonymous. Therefore, pseudonyms were used to protect the identity of the participants. Information that could lead to revealing the identity of the participants or the schools was excluded from the findings and the study as a whole (Creswell, 2007). All collected data remained confidential and was only used for the purpose of this study (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:338).

The researcher assured the participants that the study was not meant to cause any harm to any participant. Accordingly, the researcher indicated in the ethics application form that the highlights from the findings of the study would be shared with the participants. The participants were requested to give their consent by signing the consent letter developed by the researcher explaining the purpose of the study and the role of the participants (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Participation in this study was voluntary.

1.9. DEFINITION OF KEY CONCEPTS

School governance: a formal statutory authority whose work is to formulate policy and rules; develop strategic plans to ensure quality service to learners and community; and to device school supervisory and monitory tools (Buckland & Hofmeyer, 1993; Matshe, 2014). The focus of this study was on the governance role played by the School Boards.

School management: involves working as a team with other stakeholders to accomplish set goals in a planned and organized manner (Everard & Morris, 1990). In this study, school management is linked to the role of the principal and other staff members in management positions.

School leadership: involves inducing and motivating others to work towards achieving agreed upon goals of the school (Yukl, 2006). In this study, school leadership referred to principal's ability to influence stakeholders to work towards achieving the school's goals and objectives.

School board: the School Board is a legal entity that governs schools. School Boards were established under section 23 of the Lesotho Education Act of 2010. The members

of this Board include two nominees by proprietor, three nominees by parents, one teachers' representative, gazetted chief's representative, local council representative, and the principal as an ex-officio member.

School proprietor: a denominational church or religion-based body by which a school is established or to which an established school is transferred (Kingdom of Lesotho 2010, section 2).

Roles and responsibilities: are the functions that are supposed to be performed by a person holding a particular position. For the purpose of the study, the focus was on functions performed by the school proprietors and members of School Boards.

School: means any duly registered institution that provides formal education at secondary/high school level in Lesotho. In this study, the focus was on church-owned schools.

Principal: a teacher in charge of day-to-day management activities of a school or any teacher appointed to act in the position of a principal in his/her absence.

1.10 SUMMARY

In this introductory chapter, the researcher has presented the background and context of the study, the problem statement, rationale for the study, purpose of the study, and the research questions. The researcher has also described the research methodology that includes research approach, design, sampling, data collection methods, and data analysis. Credibility, trustworthiness and ethical issues were also briefly discussed. A list of key concepts is presented and the concepts are defined. In the next chapter, the researcher discusses literature review related to governance of church-owned schools.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW ON SCHOOL MANAGEMENT, GOVERNANCE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In the last chapter, the researcher provided the background and overview of the study. In this chapter, the researcher briefly highlights the background history of Lesotho education system. The intention is to help the reader to contextualise the role-played and the contribution made by the missionaries in Lesotho's education system and the power they possess as a result. The chapter goes on to give a brief explanation on how the School-Based Management (SBM) strategy brought about the idea of School Boards (SBs) worldwide. Based on this background, the chapter deals with relevant concepts such as school governance and management, and their relationship. The literature review also focuses on the composition of SB and their expected roles and responsibilities. The roles of school proprietors are also reviewed.

2.2 BACKGROUND HISTORY OF LESOTHO EDUCATION SYSTEM

The history of Lesotho's education system is categorised into three epochs, that is, the period before colonization, the period under colonial masters and the period after colonization/independence. In the first era (pre-colonial), indigenous education was offered, followed by colonial education in the second era, then post-colonial education in the third era.

2.2.1 Pre-colonial era

Pre-colonial was the era before 1868 when Lesotho (then Basutoland) became a British protectorate (education.stateuniversity.com). Long before 1868, the Basotho had their own way of imparting necessary knowledge, skills, attitude, and behaviour to their children. During this period, knowledge and skills were passed down generations through traditional/indigenous education that was deliberate and had a clear pattern and culture (Khama, 2000:15). The indigenous education in Lesotho during the pre-colonial era evolved around initiation schools teaching about societal principles, ethics and

values, and informing young people about their roots (Muzvidziwa & Seotsanyana, 2002:2; Motaba, 1998:2). Motaba (1998:2) further states that indigenous education was compulsory and the Basotho boys and girls were taught and trained separately for a period ranging from six months to one year. Despite slight differences observed in practices from one clan to another, the general aims and objectives of indigenous education were similar (Khama, 2000). According to Motaba (1998), the whole purpose of initiation school was to produce individuals who would be conscious about their roots and knowledgeable about different skills of communications used in their society. Another aim was to instruct initiates on how to defend their societies and territories and to make them proud of their culture and dignity (Motaba,1998).

2.2.2 Colonial era in Lesotho

Lesotho became Britain's protectorate in 1868 and this marked the inception of a colonial rule in Lesotho (Khama, 2000:18). The colonial era was a period between 1868 and 1966. Indigenous education in Lesotho was replaced by colonial education in 1838 when the first missionaries introduced it, that is, the French Protestant Christian missionaries (Lekhetho, 2013:55; Muzvidziwa & Seotsanyana, 2002:2). The Roman Catholic missionaries and the Anglican Church later joined the French Protestant Christian missionaries in 1860 and 1868 respectively (Jobo et al., 2000:2). The primary focus of those missionary schools had always been to impart writing and reading skills so that new converts could read catechism, conform to Christian principles and values, including adherence to ritual practices of the church (Muzvidziwa & Seotsanyana, 2002:2).

The control and power that the missionaries had over Lesotho's education system continued throughout the British rule which began in 1868 and ended in 1966 (Muzvidziwa & Seotsanyana, 2002:3). According to Motaba (1998:3), the colonial government allowed the missions to establish schools on a denominational basis and showed little interest in the education of the Basotho. Motaba (1998) further posits that the government never considered equipping the Basotho with necessary literacy and skills that would enable them to become engineers, education policy-makers and doctors but was interested in giving them education that would turn them into court interpreters, teachers and English translators.

2.2.3 Post-colonial era in Lesotho

The post-colonial era covers the period after Lesotho's independence in 1966 to date. In almost 100 years that Lesotho was under the British rule, the colonial masters never showed urgency in building schools of their own (Motaba, 1998). As a result, that gave the missionaries an environment conducive to build more schools and acquire authority in Lesotho education (Motaba, 1998:4). It is in this context that today the church in Lesotho is said to be the biggest proprietor, owning 90% of schools in the country (Khama, 2000:38). In the mid-1970s, churches in Lesotho, still played a prominent role in the education system and the Minister of Education by then commented that the government of Lesotho concluded to let the churches have a significant authority over education and wished to maintain the status quo in time to come. (Muzvidziwa & Seotsanyana, 2002:3). However, this scenario has changed and there is a move towards involving stakeholders such as parents, teachers, support staff, learners, and the community members in the governance and management of education in schools.

Donnelly (2000:166) asserts that notions like empowerment and consumerism, which were commonly linked with private companies, are now incorporated in government institutions' line of thought. Schools being public institutions are encouraged to involve parents in school governing bodies. Parents are persuaded to play an active role in their functions and responsibilities as members of school governing bodies (Donnelly, 2000:166). In light of governance responsibilities of parents, in recent years, there is a belief that the function of the church with regard to the education system has to be reviewed in order to attune to an improved role of government in school governance (Hughes, 1998:1). The challenge is that the inflexible, pecking order approach that was commonly used in the 20th century is facing a new change in the public sector (Hughes, 1998:1). The management style that has gained popularity in Lesotho is leadership working in partnership with all concerned stakeholders as provided for in Lesotho Education Act of 2010, section 23. However, in Lesotho, like in other parts of the world, there is lack of policy that formalizes parental partnership and involvement in education since most studies focus mainly on democratic principles, social justice and equity in education (Lemmer & van Wyk, 2010:208).

However, it is not only the stakeholders mentioned in the above paragraphs that face challenges in their involvement in education governance and management in Lesotho,

the government is also struggling to assume full control on how schools must be governed and managed, particularly church schools (Khalanyane, 1995). In trying to get things under control, the government enacted the Education Act No.10 of 1995 stating promotion of education as their main objective while in fact the Act had been initiated to remove churches from the school management in church schools (Motaba, 1998). This shows that in post-colonial era unlike in colonial era, the Lesotho government shows eagerness to get more involved in school governance and management. Nevertheless, it is frustrated by the amount of power and authority the church possesses. If the church has so much power and authority that frustrates huge stakeholders like the government, what is more with smaller role players with lesser financial muscle like parents? There is likelihood that the church would have influence on anybody involved in education in Lesotho, let alone in their schools.

2.3 SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT (SBM)

The researcher assumes that the SBM strategy used to decentralise school governance in Lesotho may be one of the main sources of proprietorship influence on the SB's roles and responsibilities. Matalasi (2000:2-3) sets a basis for this assumption. She argues that prior to the introduction of SBs through Lesotho Education Act of 1995, the proprietors' exercised exclusive control over their schools through their representatives (managers) who were fully responsible for daily running of their schools. She further states that, at that time, parents merely paid fees, provided a 'helping hand' when necessary and had little say in decision-making of their children's education. As a result, it is assumed the church proprietorship would not just let go of their grip to power and authority in their schools.

The discussion that follows provides a brief theoretical framework of School-Based Management (SBM) as perceived by different scholars. SBM has attracted varied definitions from different authors. Botha and Marishane (2011:14) define SBM as "a team that used decentralised approach of management where decisions on organizational matters are taken and there is certain authority regarding the use of resources". Caldwell (2009:55) refers to SBM as the organised and unchanging way of devolving power to school level of authority in order to enable the school to decide on important issues that affect the school within the parameters set by the central authority's guidelines. Similarly, Mojtahedzadeh and Sayadmanesh (2013:169) concur

with Caldwell (2009) indicating that SBM is the decentralisation of levels of power from the national administration to the school-site level. SBM can also be regarded as a formal change of governance structures, as a way of decentralisation that considers a school as an important single entity of improvement that depends on devolution of decision-making powers as the strategy that would encourage and perpetuate improvement (Mojtahedzadeh & Sayadmanesh, 2013:170).

Botha and Marishane (2011:14) also state that decentralised education management enables dynamic and active involvement and participation of members of the school community such as principal, learners, teachers, and parents in the use of school resources. The key areas that need such attention, according to Botha and Marishane (2011:14), are teaching and learning of subject content, staffing matters, technology, and financial management in order to ensure effective and quality of education. De Grauwe (2005:2) views SBM as the process whereby the decision-making authority is delegated to the school management to apply on matters that are pertinent to the school. In an attempt to answer the question: 'Who, at the school, receives the authority?' De Grauwe (2005) refers to Caldwell's views. De Grauwe (2005) argues that Caldwell draws a difference between **school-based management**, where authority is transferred to professionals within the school (principal and teachers) and **school-based governance**, where authority is devolved to an elected school board who represents parents and the community. In other words, De Grauwe (2005) concurs with Caldwell's response that decentralised authority may either be transferred to school management teams (principal and teachers) or to school governing bodies, and that will always make a difference depending on the level at which the devolved power is directed.

Generally, SBM programmes devolve authority through a number of events, such as budgetary processes, employment of staff, curriculum development, educational aids procurement, infrastructure upgrading etc. (Mojtahedzadeh & Sayadmanesh, 2013:169). The views about SBM as reviewed in literature seem to be applicable to the situation in Lesotho. The expected worldwide roles and responsibilities of SBM seem to be linked to the roles and responsibilities of the SBs in Lesotho. In trying to understand how the SBM strategy functions in schools, school governance and school management are discussed in the next section.

2.4 THE CONCEPT OF SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

2.4.1 School governance

When David and David (2015:281) define governance from a corporate perspective, they adopt a definition by the National Association of Corporate Directors. The latter presents governance as a way of ensuring that long-term strategic objectives and plans are developed and appropriate management team is employed whose main work is to guarantee realisation of the set objectives and to hold high the organisation's integrity, reputation, and responsibility to its different membership. Much as the definition is suitable for the business world, it is also relevant in all aspects to a school as an organization. Numerous similarities may be observed as we continue to study and analyse various definitions presented by different authors in the following paragraph.

Potgieter et al. (1997:11) define school governance as an undertaking through which policy and rules that are used to organise and control the school are decided. Governance is also defined as an act of ruling a school to guarantee that it achieves its mandate of offering appropriate, uncompromised service to the learners and to the community it serves (Matshe, 2014:95). In addition, Buckland and Hofmeyer (1993:11) postulate that governance is not only about administration and control of education in a country, but it is about the process by which education policies are created, endorsed, executed, and supervised. They continue to say governance is not a matter of concern at national level only, but it is a critical subject at all levels of the system including the school. Governance also relates to school policy issues, the vision and mission of the school, and the promotion of quality education at the school by means of additional resources (Marais & Meier, 2012: 59). Ball (2009) describes governance as a dynamic concept that brings about changes in ideology and policy, giving way to new universal and international pressures.

From the above definitions and for the purpose of this study, school governance may be summarised as a formal statutory authority whose work is to formulate policy and rules; to develop strategic plans to ensure quality service to learners and community; and to device school supervisory and monitory tools.

2.4.2 School management

Many scholars attribute the similar definition to both governance and management while in actual fact the concepts have different meanings. For the purpose of this study, attention is paid to a few authors who draw a distinction between the two concepts. Shonhiwa (2006:16) defines management as a tactical operation, where the manager will make ultimate use of available resources, be they technology, machinery, hardware, finances or people, to achieve the organisation's objectives. According to Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson (2001:8-9), management is about working with people and people working together to achieve organizational goals. Griffin (1987) defines management as a system where an institution's human, financial, physical, and information resources are planned, organised and controlled in a way that the institution would meet its goals efficiently and effectively. Marais and Meier (2012:59) say management refers to the professional teaching activities of the principal and educators (the day-to-day teaching done by professionals).

Management is perceived to be a business domain that can be categorised into a number of areas. Strydom (2014:56) presents the following as eight areas of management: production and operations manager; logistics manager; information-technology director; financial controller; human resources administrator; marketing officer; public relations head; and administrative supervisor. In schools, unlike in other organisations, the major challenge is that all these areas are put under one manager, that is, the school principal (Nkobi, 2008). The school principal is expected to perform effectively and efficiently all the stated areas of management (Botha & Marishane, 2011:39). The most appealing definition, for the purpose of this study, is the one referring to management as a process that involves people interacting in a coordinated and structured manner to achieve the goals of their organization or institutions (Khuzwayo, 2007:9).

2.4.3 Relationship between governance and management

Considering the definitions of governance and management, one observes that even though the two concepts are somehow different but they are closely related. Since the SB's main focus is on policy formulation, strategic planning, devising supervision and monitory tools, what this means is that their work (SB's) is to oversee the management performing and ensuring the implementation of policies (Buckland & Hofmeyer, 1993:11; David & David, 2015:282). One of the most important functions of SB is to assist the

principal and the teachers in the execution of their tasks by availing all resources to enable them to perform their school duties on day-to-day basis (Van Deventer & Kruger, 2011:264; Marais & Meier, 2012:59). Governance responsibilities, therefore, are the areas of influence of the SBs and chairpersons who oversee its functions. The school principals are members of SB and they have to assist the SBs in the performance of their governance roles and responsibilities (Khuzwayo, 2007:9).

2.5 COMPOSITION OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES

Internationally, school governing bodies are conceptualised in different ways. The common references are School Boards (SBs), School Governing Bodies (SGBs) and Board of Management (BoM).

2.5.1 Composition of governing bodies - International practice

In Australia, the composition of the School Board (SB) of a public school is contained in the ACT Government, Education and Training Manual of 2015. According to this manual, the membership of the school board is as follows:

- The principal of the school.
- One member (the appointed member) appointed by the Director-General as the appointed member.
- Two members elected by the staff (the staff members) of the school and appointed by the Director-General.
- Three members (the parents and citizens members) elected by the parents and the citizens association of the school and appointed by the Director-General.
- The members (the board appointed members) (if any) appointed by the board under sub-section 6; and for a school prescribed under the regulations – two members (the student members) elected by the students at the school and appointed by the Director-General (ACT Government, 2015).

In Kenya, the composition of the Board of Management (BoM) is established in accordance with the Kenyan Basic Education Act No.14 of 2013, section 56. The BoM consists of maximum of 17 members: six elected by parents; one nominated by the County Education Board; one teachers' representative; three for the sponsor; one for special interest groups; one for persons with special needs; one for students' council.

The Act permits the BoM to co-opt any three persons with specialized skills and experience (Republic of Kenya, 2013).

In South Africa, the South African Schools' Act (SASA) of 1996, section 23, promulgates the establishment of the school governing bodies (SGBs). According to the Act, the SGB membership comprises elected members, the principal in his or her official capacity and co-opted members. The elected members consist of parents of learners at the school, educators at the school, non-teaching staff members, and learners in Grade 8 or higher at the school. The number of members in the governing body may differ from school to school, depending on factors such as the number of learners enrolled (Van Deventer & Kruger, 2011:262). Section 23(9) dictates that the number of parent members must comprise one more than the combined total of other members of a governing body who have voting rights (RSA, 1996).

2.5.2 Composition of governing bodies in Lesotho

In Lesotho, the composition of the SB consists of nine members as stipulated in the Lesotho Education Act 2010, section 23 (2). The number is fixed for all schools regardless of the number of learners in the school and regardless of the type of school, whether government, community, church or privately owned. The composition includes two members nominated by a proprietor, one of whom is the chairperson, three members nominated by parents, one of whom is the vice chairperson and one teacher nominated by teachers in that particular school. Other members of the SB include a gazette chief or his or her representation under whose jurisdiction the school falls, a member of the local council or his or her representation under whose jurisdiction the school falls and the principal of the relevant school who is the secretary of the board and an ex-officio member (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010).

2.5.3 Common and distinctive characteristics of governing bodies' composition

The background presented above conveys some common features that can be observed in the composition of governing bodies from different countries. What seems common in the four countries cited here is that the purpose behind forming a governing body is to ensure that all stakeholders are represented. In that representation, the

following members form an integral part of the governing body composition: principal, teachers' representative(s), parents' representatives, and proprietorship representatives.

It is not only the common features that can be observed in the composition of governing bodies; the distinctive characteristics are also very explicit. First, unlike in Australia, Kenya and South Africa, in Lesotho, learners are not represented in the governing body. Second, in Lesotho, people with special needs and non-teaching staff are not allocated space in the governing body. Lastly, the Lesotho Education Act of 2010 does not have provision for either nomination or co-option of persons with specialised skills and experience like it is the case in Kenya and in South Africa.

2.6 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SBs

Internationally, the roles and responsibilities of the SBs are well defined. In the United Kingdom (UK), the roles and responsibilities are contained in the Guide to Governor Roles and Responsibilities (UK Department of Education, 2012). The roles and responsibilities are classified into four major tasks, namely, strategic governance, corporate governance, promoting good governance, and the law. The strategic governance is a process that involves giving direction and vision and aims of the school followed by plans and policies that enable and facilitate achievement of the goals. The role of the school governance involves task issues and relationships that are established in the schools. Promoting good governance entails being a critical friend and supporting pupils, parents and staff. No performance is stated under 'the law'; it can only be assumed that the school governing body is expected to ensure that the school under their governance complies with all relevant legislation and statutory (UK Department of Education, 2012).

Another international example is the case of Australia. In Australia, the roles of the school board in public schools are provided for in the School Board Manual (ACT Government 2015). In the Australian context, SBs' responsibility is to give predetermined directions which serve as a guide in achieving the goals of the school. Curriculum and policies for the school are inclusive in the role of the SB. The body needs to manage all aspects of the school finances. The SBs monitor and control the use of school assets, including the formation of policies that gives guidelines of the operations of the school. However, the SBs are not expected to work in isolation but in

collaboration with the school community. They motivate and inspire parents to be involved in school matters. The SBs are also expected to communicate issues affecting the school to the director general of education (ACT Government, 2015:1).

Regionally, the roles and responsibilities of SBs are also well tabulated. In Kenya, BoM is expected to perform numerous roles according to section 59 of the Republic of Kenya Basic Education Act No.14 of 2013. Just to cite a few, the BoM is supposed to promote the best interests of the institution and ensure its development. It also has to promote quality education for all pupils in accordance with the standards set under the Act or any other written law. It is entrusted to ensure and assure the provision of proper and adequate physical facilities for the institution. It is expected to manage the institution's affairs in accordance with the rules and regulations governing the occupational safety and health. In addition, the BoM should advise the County Education Board on the staffing needs of the institution. Members of the BoM are to determine cases of pupils' discipline and make reports to the County Education Board. As part of their roles, they should administer and manage the resources of the institution. They also have authority to receive, collect and account for any funds accruing to the institution. Another important role of the BoM is to recruit, employ and remunerate such number of non-teaching staff as may be required by the institution in accordance with the Act (Republic of Kenya, 2013).

In South Africa, SASA of 1996, section 20 (1) stipulates the functions of all SGBs most of which are similar to the context of Lesotho. Their (SGBs) roles and responsibilities are to promote the best interests of the school and strive to ensure its development through the provision of quality education for all learners at the school. They adopt a constitution, a code of conduct for learners at the school and develop the mission statement for the school. Furthermore, they support the principal, educators and other staff of the school in the performance of their professional functions. They determine times of the school day consistent with any applicable conditions of employment of staff. They administer and control school's property, buildings and grounds occupied by the school, including school's hostels if applicable. They recommend to the Head of Department, the appointment of educators and non-educator staff at the school (RSA, 1996).

In Lesotho, the roles and responsibilities of the SBs are contained in section 25 of the Lesotho Education Act 2010. They (SBs) are expected to manage and administer the school for which they have been constituted. They oversee the management, the proper and efficient running of the school. In a public school, the SBs, in their own accord or on the advice of the inspector of schools or a district education officer, are responsible for recommending to the appointing authority (the Teaching Service Commission) the appointment, promotion, demotion or transfer of a teacher. Conversely, in an independent school, they appoint, promote, demote or transfer a teacher. They also recommend to the appointing authority or proprietor, as the case may be, a disciplinary action against a principal or head of department. In addition, they liaise with the relevant local authority on matters related to the development of the school. They are also accountable for managing the school finances and have to submit an audited statement of accounts of the school to the proprietor and the principal secretary within six months from the end of each school year (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010). The following paragraph highlights a few academics' views on SB's roles and responsibilities in Lesotho.

Matalasi (2000) and Motaba (1998) assert that recruitment of staff and relevant processes thereof should remain the responsibility of SBs. Matalasi (2000:24) believes that one of the things that could guarantee ownership and accountability in the SB is when they (SB) are fully involved in school activities such as disciplining teachers whose salaries are paid by the government. Much as Matalasi (2000) recognises the stated functions as SBs' responsibilities, she is worried about SB members who lack relevant awareness in educational matters and activities. In addition, Khama (2000) has identified lack of mutual trust between the church authorities and the government as the main challenge in governance and management in Lesotho education system.

The literature above shows the common trends and some differences in the roles and responsibilities of the SBs internationally and locally. Internationally, the SBs perform the following common functions: develop the school vision, aims and mission; set plans and policies; determine curriculum taught in their school; set, monitor and review performance measures; possess authority over employment of staff; manage finances and approve budgets; control assets and properties and support parents, pupils and staff. The SBs in Lesotho, according to the literature, seem to be performing fewer

duties compared to what the international SBs do. For example, they do not set vision, aims and mission and they do not develop or review curriculum. However, it is significant to note that what the literature reveals about local SB duties might just be the guidelines. Practically, the SBs in Lesotho might be performing more roles and responsibilities than what is contained in the literature.

2.7 CORE FUNCTIONS OF THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL AS A LEADER

The position occupied by the principal in the SB set-up is as crucial as that of the SB chairperson. In the case of Lesotho, the principal holds two most important positions in the SB, namely, the secretary and the chief accounting officer (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010). Among other equally important principal's duties stipulated in the same law, the principal is the school manager and responsible for daily operations of the school. This paves way for this study to briefly discuss the core functions of the principal as a leader.

Recently, there is a demand for quality leadership of the school principal and it is not only about effective management but also sound people relationships (Reynolds & Warfield, 2010:62). Successful principals are identified by their ability to make certain that education in their schools is of high standard despite challenges like diversity in the school stakeholders and managing power relations (Steyn, 2008:895; Reynolds & Warfield, 2010:61).

The seven core functions of a school principal as a leader are instructional, cultural, managerial, human resources, strategic, external development, and micro-political leadership (Portin, 2004:17). This section defines the core functions of the school principal. Instructional leadership function of the school principal is to ensure quality of teaching and learning by modelling teaching practices, supervising curriculum, and ensuring quality of teaching resources (Fancera & Bliss, 2011). Cultural leadership is about tending to the symbolic resources of the school such as its traditions, climate and history, which have an impact on quality of teaching and learning (Portin, 2004:17). The principal is also a manager who is expected to monitor and control school finances, facilities and the general teaching and learning environment (Nkobi, 2008). In terms of managing human resources, the principal leadership focuses on all aspects of human resources (Portin, 2004). Strategic planning is an important aspect of school leadership

that deals with giving directions in terms of what needs to be achieved in the school (Fancera & Bliss, 2011).

The school does not exist in isolation; it is part of the community. External development leadership looks into representing the school in the community, developing capital, tending to public relations, recruiting students, buffering and mediating external interests, and advocating for the school's interests (Portin, 2004:17). The school principal as a leader is expected to perform the multiple and interconnected roles to ensure the core function of the school, which is teaching and learning (Nkobi, 2008).

Now that principals' core functions have been discussed, there is a need to highlight an overview of proprietorship roles, internationally and locally. This sets a basis on which proprietors' roles in Lesotho could be examined and analysed.

2.8 PROPRIETORSHIP ROLES

This study departs from the premise that school leadership goes beyond the function of the school principal, especially in church-owned schools. Commenting on the history of education in Northern Ireland, Smith (2010) clearly conveys a message that church leaders would always want to have influence on how education must be run in their schools. According to Smith (2010:563), the schools in Northern Ireland were at one stage classified into two, namely, 'transferred/controlled schools' (predominantly belonging to the Protestant Churches) and 'voluntary maintained schools' (mostly belonging to the Catholic Church). The former category subscribed to the idea of non-denominational state schools that provided secular education while the latter were committed to the religious ethos within their schools and, as a result, were opposed to transferring their schools to the state. Of the two groups, one would expect the Protestant Church leaders to be willing to let go their grip to the government authorities, but that was not the case. They were still guaranteed rights of access and inspection of religious education, 50% representation in school management committees and considerable influence over teaching appointments to ensure that requirements for the provision of religious instruction could be met. (Smith, 2010:562).

Darmody and Smyth (2013:32) support the above sentiment by saying the denominational schools in the United Kingdom are likely to have emphasis on faith in their teaching and in their culture. The two authors further believe that BoM in Ireland is

answerable to the proprietor and are responsible for ensuring that the school culture is based on certain religious beliefs and doctrines as expected and stipulated by the school sponsors or owners.

In Kenya, school proprietors (sponsors) responsibilities have been explained in a number of literary works, some of which are discussed here. Muller and Ellison (2001) and Reginah and Wanyonyi (2012:785) posit that the main role of school sponsor is to provide stability and conducive school environment that may ensure that educational performance and development are enhanced. They argue that this can be done through appropriate stimulation of learners and teachers by encouraging them to show interest in educational performance and development.

The study conducted by Mabeya, Ndiku and Njino (2010) in Uasin Gishu District in Kenya revealed that church sponsors of missionary schools contribute to the preservation of their religious beliefs and traditions. Mabeya et al.'s (2010) finding echoed Kerre and Gichaga's (1997) sentiment that the role of church sponsors was to ensure that the religious traditions of the founders were maintained. Furthermore, Njeru (2013) shared the same opinion by maintaining that the sponsor in Kenya had a responsibility to promote his religious traditions and faith in his/her institution. Njeru (2013) further asserts that this was done through teaching Christian religious education, pastoral programme and pastoral worship.

Mabeya et al. (2010) also indicated that sponsors have the power to decide on the suitable candidate to be appointment as the head teacher of the church-owned schools. They (sponsors) ensured that Religious Education was part of the school curriculum and failed to develop the school in other aspects (Mabeya et al., 2010). Kipkemboi and Kipruto (2013) and Onderi and Makori (2013) concur with what Mabeya et al. (2010) presented as they say that sponsors in Kenya participate in the following areas: appointment processes of head teachers; use of infrastructure and assets; curriculum implementation; school business, such as, meddling and destabilising instructional activities of the school system; and admission of students.

The participation of sponsors in governance and management activities in church schools in Kenya seems to have yielded both positive and negative results on governance and management activities in schools. Anyway, it is noticeable from

literature that few authors report positive impact that comes with sponsors' involvement in schools while negative impact is traceable in a bigger number of literary works. Muller and Ellison (2001) report that sponsors' involvement in schools improves academic performance. Moreover, Muller and Ellison (2001) found that religious parents seemed to have high expectations of academic achievement of their children. They underscore that such parents ensure there is communication between them and their children and this interaction motivates them to focus more on their education achievement by being involved in peer support initiatives, concentrate more in their studies and attend school regularly. Similarly, Mijungu (2015: 17) concurs with the two authors by declaring that sponsors' expectations on teachers and students and school operations in Migori County in Kenya are of positive effect, especially in relation to academic performance.

However, Mabeya et al. (2010) have identified several negative aspects in the relationship between church sponsors and those in governance/management of secondary schools in Kenya. Furthermore, Mabeya and others (2010) revealed that some sponsors do nominate ineffective representation in the BOG who on several occasions neither attend meetings nor evaluate school project initiated by the Parents Teachers Association (PTA). They purport that the school sponsors demanded to use school facilities for their own interests not necessarily for academic purposes. Some sponsors also demanded for admission of students to Form 1 even with marks below the regulated mark for the school (Mabeya et al., 2010:36).

The relationship between the school sponsors and those in management of schools in Kenya is characterised by conflicts and divisions (Kipkemboi & Kipruto, 2013; Regina & Wanyanyi, 2012). Kipkemboi and Kipruto (2013), Mabeya et al. (2010), Onderi and Makori (2013) and Regina and Wanyanyi (2012) assert that conflicts and divisions that are seen between sponsors and managements in various schools are a clear sign that school sponsors continue to meddle and interfere with school matters in Kenya. This study also notes Makokha's (2002) view that the rules of religious sponsorship are too difficult to follow. It is assumed that this may be another source of further conflicts between the two bodies. This discussion opens doors for the researcher to look into the Lesotho's situation with regard to the roles played by proprietors in secondary church schools' governance and management activities.

In Lesotho, the administration and control of the education system is shared among the state, the church and the school community (Jobo et al., 2000:4; Khama, 2000:35). The roles of school proprietors are stipulated in the Lesotho Education Act of 2010, section 26 (4). They are referred to as the functions of an educational secretary, a representative of a school proprietor. Firstly, the educational secretary is expected to manage the educational work of his/her proprietor. Secondly, he/she is authorised to communicate with the Ministry of Education regarding certain aspects of school management. Lastly, he/she may also execute other duties assigned to him/her by the Minister (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010).

At national level, the government is in charge of policies formulation, curriculum development, teacher training, national examinations, teachers' salaries and conditions of service, planning and financing education while the church, which is a second partner, provides classroom facilities and sets school fees (Jobo et al., 2000:4; Khama, 2000:35). What this means is that since school proprietors own school sites, there is a need for them to keep on developing the sites by erecting and maintaining buildings in which the envisaged education would take place.

The church leaders also participate in high-powered government committees such as the Education Advisory Council and the Teaching Service Commission (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010; Jobo et al., 2000:4). According to the Lesotho Education Act of 2010, section 23 (2), the church, as a proprietor, appoints the nine members of the SB, two of which directly represent the proprietor.

Another role of school proprietors in Lesotho is that they have a say in curriculum development, more especially in religious education (Mokotso, 2017:13). According to Mokotso (2017), the Christian churches have a representation in the National Curriculum Committee whose work is to approve curriculum documents produced by the National Curriculum Development Centre. It must be noted that Mokotso's view contradicts a common belief that in recent years the government of Lesotho, through the Ministry of Education and Training, is the only body in the educational partnership between the government, the church and the community which is responsible for curriculum development in Lesotho (Jobo et al., 2000; Khama, 2000).

In this paragraph, the researcher felt it was necessary to give a highlight on how the office of the Catholic Church Secretariat visualise their roles in the management of education on behalf of the Roman Catholic Church in Lesotho. The roles are listed on the website of the Lesotho Catholic Bishops' Conference (2015). The office sees its role as that of an intermediary between the Catholic Church and the government of Lesotho through the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET). It formulates policies, schedules and order of events for schools in accordance with the church's teachings. It employs teachers and offers them necessary trainings. It also verifies that their schools offer a curriculum that is holistic in nature and they build capacity of their management teams in schools. Another role of this office is to administer labour disputes and to ensure that penalties determined in disciplinary hearings are well executed. Lastly, the office inspects schools and distributes information to relevant bodies in the education sector. (www.lcbc.org.ls).

In conclusion, according to the literature presented, the roles of proprietors in Lesotho appear to be quite minimal compared to what transpires in other parts of the world. Nonetheless, the researcher would like to assume that the government of Lesotho works in consultation with and involves school proprietors on a number of other unstated issues. That is to say, what is presented in this study may be a true reflection of scarcity of relevant literature on this subject in Lesotho. The researcher has also taken note of some roles that are performed by the Catholic Church Secretariat which are in contravention of the Lesotho Education Act of 2010, sections 18 and 25. For instance, inspection of public schools, including church schools, is the responsibility of inspectorate under the Chief Inspector in MOET while employment of teachers falls under SB's jurisdiction.

2.9 SUMMARY

This chapter presented literature on background and the history of Lesotho's education system. Discussions on school management and governance were also presented and the role of school proprietors was reviewed. The next chapter explains the methodological framework of the study that includes the philosophical underpinning of the study, the research approach, design, data collection, and data analysis.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH APPROACH, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous two chapters laid a sound foundation for this study. This chapter focuses on the research approach, design, data collection, piloting, interview process, data analysis that the study applied. Firstly, the research approach is discussed followed by the research design. Secondly, the chapter outlines the research site selection, sample selection, data collection techniques, and how data were analysed. Lastly, piloting and interview processes are also presented.

3.2 RESEARCH APPROACH

The researcher believed qualitative research would generate relevant answers to the research questions of this study because the “how” questions were asked and the participants were given the opportunity to express their feelings and experiences (Baxter & Jack, 2008:545). In addition, the participants explained the conditions in which they experienced the phenomenon without manipulation of the researcher (Baxter & Jack, 2008:545). However, it was not easy to separate the phenomenon under this study (proprietorship influence on SB’s roles and responsibilities) from its context which is the schools (Baxter & Jack, 2008:545). Cresswell (2009:4) defines qualitative research as a data collection method that seeks to understand social and human problems by focusing on how the participants make meaning of their experiences.

Bogdan and Biklen (2007:274) describe qualitative research as a method used in social science to generate descriptive data in the context in which the phenomenon is experienced. The approach uses inductive thinking to analyse the views of the participants. Glesne (2011:283) looks at it from a slightly different point of view that focuses on the quality of the words said and what is observed, which leads to construction of knowledge.

Qualitative researchers strive to understand and interpret the experiences of their participants regarding the phenomenon being investigated (Merriam, 2009). Knowledge in qualitative research is co-constructed between the researcher and the participants who bring in their real life experiences (Merriam, 2009:5). There are different ways of approaching qualitative research, while some researchers may work within an interpretive paradigm, others may be focused on critical, or postmodern stance (Merriam, 2002:6).

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

The researcher intends to use a case study design method in his study. It must be said right at the beginning that scholars have varied definitions of a case study because they do not agree on what constitutes a case study (Merriam, 2007:26). In the following paragraphs, an attempt to define case study has been made.

Creswell (2009) defines a case study as a research design or inquiry method that explores a particular programme, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals. Case study design investigates current real life phenomenon in the context in which it is experienced and have set boundaries (Merriam, 2007; Yin, 2008; Creswell, 2009). In doing a case study, the researcher focuses on exploring a phenomenon happening or that happened within a certain time period and context (Creswell, 2007). The design involves collecting in-depth data from multiple participants and different data collection methods such as observations, interviews, artefacts, and documents and reports (Creswell, 2007).

Researchers that choose to use case study design are often interested in generating knowledge from insights gained from the participants and not to proof a theory or test hypothesis (Merriam, 2009:42). According to Merriam (2009:43), case study design enables researchers to be descriptive, particularistic and heuristic. Being descriptive means that detailed data should be collected, which have the end product of a case study with “rich” or, “thick” details of the phenomenon under study. When a case study focuses on specific situation, event, programme, or phenomenon, it is referred to as particularistic. On the contrary, heuristic case studies improve the understanding of a situation or a phenomenon and may lead to the creation of new knowledge.

A case study, like any other research design, has advantages and limitations (Merriam, 1998:40). Merriam (2009:50-51) highlights case study's strengths, which she argues, outweigh its limitations. Case studies researchers are able to investigate a multifaceted social phenomenon through exploring many aspects for better understanding of the case being studied (Merriam, 2009). Since they are anchored in real-life situations, they result in rich and holistic account of a phenomenon (McLeod, 2008; Merriam, 2009). Another advantage of case studies, according to Merriam (2009), is that they offer insights and illuminate meanings that expand their readers' experiences. McLeod (2008) shares the same view by saying case studies provide insight for further research. Merriam (2009) also observes that case studies are appealing designs for applied fields of study such as education. McLeod's (2008) additional and last contribution is that case studies permit investigation of otherwise impractical (unethical) situations. Human experiences, thinking and behaviour can be studied using case study design as it allows exploring different data sources to gain in-depth information about the phenomenon being studied.

Merriam (2009:51) presents the following limitations of case studies. Much as they provide rich and detailed data, the researcher spends more time to collect the data and the data collection maybe an expensive process. When there is adequate time to collect data, case study design is appropriate design to be used in understanding a phenomenon. The researcher doing case study design needs to be sensitive to the situation of the participants and the phenomenon being studied and truthful in the relationship established between the researcher and the participants. McLeod (2008) cautions that findings from case studies may not be generalised to other contexts and population because the case is context-specific. The researcher is also likely to be subjective and this may have an effect on the interpretations of the research findings. Another limitation of case study design is that it is time consuming and owing to the particular context in which the study is conducted, it is problematic to replicate the study. (Merriam 2009).

This study was a multi-site case study (Merriam, 2007) involving four secondary schools in Maseru belonging to the Roman Catholic Church, the Lesotho Evangelical Church of Southern Africa, the Anglican Church of Lesotho and the Seventh Adventist Church. These church denominations were selected because they had played a major role in

Lesotho education for a long time, particularly the first two. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews. The study involved collecting and analysing data from several sites and participants. Data collected from different church-owned schools were compared to identify the similarities and differences across the cases. This strengthened the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings from the interviews and document analysis.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION

3.4.1 Site selection

Selecting an inquiry site is an essential aspect of a case study. This is when a researcher engages in a gaining access to the research site after obtaining permission from the relevant authorities to use the site for research (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:351). The researcher usually obtains information in advance through informal channels regarding the site and its potential suitability is obtained from a variety of sources like documents, prior associates and public information (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:351).

This case study was conducted in Maseru, the capital city of Lesotho. Maseru was chosen because it was believed to be occupied by the most educated community in the country. The residents of Maseru were believed to be professionals who might have a better understanding of their roles and responsibilities in SBs than residents of other parts of Lesotho. Moreover, since the church schools in Maseru were nearer to the churches' headquarters, this made Maseru the most conducive environment for this study in that there was a possibility of high proprietorship influence on SBs' roles and responsibilities at this area. The church schools in the rural areas might experience lower influence because they were not easily accessible such that the proprietor's office might find it challenging to keep in touch with such schools. As a result, such church schools, particularly their SBs, might find themselves spending more time, a year or more, doing governance and management business on their own.

3.4.2 Sample selection

A researcher normally selects a research site that has a population from which he or she can select participants who have the potential of providing information to answer the

research questions (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:129). The participants selected to participate in the study are drawn from a particular population that has experienced a relevant phenomenon being studied (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:129). Since sampling is of different techniques and types (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010), this study engaged in purposeful or purposive sampling to identify sites and participants who took part in it. Creswell (2009:178) advocates this type of sampling by saying: Purposive sampling is often used in selecting the research participants in a qualitative study.

Leedy and Ormrod (2010) describe purposive sampling as an approach in which a researcher selects participants with the potential to give the researcher more information on the phenomenon being studied. Creswell (2009) and McMillan and Schumacher (2010:138) share the same view. Furthermore, McMillan and Schumacher (2010) underscore that when making this selection, the researcher uses her/his judgment based on the knowledge s/he has regarding the information needed to answer the research questions.

Duan, Green, Hoagwood, Horwitz, Palinkas, and Wisdom (2013:534) reiterate the definition of purposeful sampling given above. They further note that this type of sampling has numerous approaches. The sampling approaches include selecting extreme or defiant (outlier) cases with the intention of studying unusual or unexpected aspects of the study. Other approaches entail choosing a sample with maximum variation to include homogenous cases and the different dimensions of data for the purpose of reducing variation, simplifying analysis and facilitating group interviewing (Duan et al., 2013).

In this study, four secondary schools belonging to four different denominations were purposefully selected in Maseru. The schools included one belonging to the Roman Catholic Church; another to the Lesotho Evangelical Church in Southern Africa; the next to the Anglican Church of Lesotho; and the last to the Seventh Day Adventist Church. The schools were chosen because they had the following commonalities: they were mixed schools; they were not best performing schools in Maseru (they range between 40 and 70% pass rate); their student-roll is about 800; their leadership consists of female principals. Moreover, the sample is also convenient because the researcher resides in Maseru and this will make it affordable and feasible to collect data in terms of time, cost and mobility.

3.4.3 Data collection techniques

Creswell (2009) describes qualitative interviews as the face-to-face interaction between the researcher and the participants when gathering data. This interaction can also be through telephone conversation or in a group of participants. The interviews can be unstructured, semi-structured or structured (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). In this study, the research generated data using semi-structured interviews. Qualitative interviews were used to collect data in this study.

In doing semi-structured interviews, the researcher started with biographical questions done as an icebreaker to establish rapport with the participants. The interviews then proceeded to open-ended questions that required in-depth information about the research topic. A tape recorder was used with the consent of the participants to record the interview. It is important to record verbatim responses of the participants for credibility of the study (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Memo notes were also taken during the interview and were used to draw follow-up questions. In this study, semi-structured interviews were conducted with members of the SB, namely, SB chairpersons, school principals, parents' representatives, and teachers' representatives. Educational secretaries recognised as such by the Lesotho Education Act of 2010, section 26, were also interviewed.

Apart from interviews, this study had intended to analyse documents to produce data. The data from the documents would have been used to add on to and crosscheck interview data. Document analysis as another way of data collection strategy was well defined in Chapter 1 of this study.

3.5 DATA ANALYSIS

Qualitative data analysis is described as an organised and methodological process that includes coding, categorising, developing themes, and interpreting data to provide explanations of the phenomenon being studied (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). It involves arranging data from interviews transcripts, field notes and other materials to enable a researcher to present his/her findings (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). In this study, content analysis was done using data from interviews. The researcher listened to the recorded interviews and coded data. The codes were then grouped to form categories and themes based on the research questions (Creswell, 2007). Thereafter, the data

from different sources and participants were triangulated. The researcher identified various ways in which the school proprietors influenced the roles and responsibilities of the SBs.

A more elaborated account of data analysis is captured under Chapter 1, sub-section 1.6.6.

3.6 PILOTING

Piloting is done before the starting of the main process of data collection to ascertain the credibility of the data collection instrument (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). In conducting qualitative interviews, the researcher may check the clarity and the understanding of the research question by piloting the interview using the predetermined interview schedule (Yin, 2009). McMillan and Schumacher (2010) further posit that the interview schedule contains the questions directly related to the objectives of the study to be orally asked with appropriate probing questions. After the questions have been written, a pilot test is necessary (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:206).

Piloting had the following benefits for this study:

- To be done in order to improve the content (interview questions) and the procedures to be followed in data collection process (Yin, 2009:92).
- To check for bias in the procedures, the interviewer, and the questions (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:206).
- To help the researcher to identify ambiguous questions and any other question that may cause the respondent uncomfortable (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:206).
- To enable the researcher to estimate the length of time for conducting an interview and give her/him some idea of the ease with which the data can be summarised (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:206).

Based on the above information, before conducting the actual interviews, the researcher tested his questions for interviews in a short pilot study. The pilot study was administered in one high school in Maseru which was not far away from the researcher's home. The main criteria for selecting this school were convenience, accessibility and geographic proximity (Yin, 2009:93).

3.7 INTERVIEW PROCESS

The researcher secured appointment in time and place with each prospective participant. The researcher informed the participant about his/her rights before the anticipated interview. The participant was told that his/her participation in the study was voluntary and did not have any penalty or loss of benefit in case s/he decided to decline to participate. Before the interview, the participant was asked to fill in a consent form to declare that s/he agreed to be interviewed and/or tape-recorded and was made aware that the interview was going to take approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Thereafter, the researcher asked open-ended questions one-by-one and gave the participant chance to answer. While recording took place, the researcher was writing notes of collected information to help him realise where follow-ups were needed (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:338).

3.8 SUMMARY

This chapter has exposed the researcher's feeling that qualitative research was appropriate for this study. Pilot testing preceded the semi-structured interviews and document analysis, which were intended to be used to collect data. One's feeling was that site observation would not yield desired outcome because observing proprietorship influence on SBs' roles and responsibilities might be impractical. Lastly, the chapter highlighted significant points related to data analysis and interpretation.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter defined qualitative research and how it was suitable for this study. This chapter focuses on the findings and discussions of this study. Data collection was conducted through semi-structured interviews where three secondary schools belonging to three different church denominations participated in the study. SB members were identified to yield rich data aimed at contributing to this study. The SB members that participated in this study were principals, teachers' representatives, parents' representatives, and SB chairpersons. Educational secretaries also formed part of participants.

The interviews took 30 to 45 minutes. They were conducted at participants' workplaces or homes at a time convenient to both a participant and the researcher. All participants gave consent to interviews and permission to record such interviews.

4.2 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION OF THE PARTICIPANTS

This section presents biographical information of principals, teachers' representatives, parents' representatives, SB chairpersons, and Educational secretaries who participated in this study.

Table 4.1 Biographical information of the participants

School	Participant	Gender	Portfolio in SB	Service/Experience
A	Principal A	Female	SB secretary	3 years
	Teacher A	Female	Teachers' rep	8 years
	Parent A	Male	Parents' rep	3 years
	Educational secretary 1(Proprietor)	Male	Educational secretary	>7 years
B	Principal B	Female	SB secretary	9 years
	Teacher B	Male	Teachers' rep	1 year
	Parent B	Female	Parents' rep	1½ years
	Chairperson B	Male	SB chairperson	1 year 1 month
	Educational secretary 2	Male	Educational secretary	3½ years
C	Principal C	Female	SB secretary	7 years
	Teacher C	Female	Teachers' rep	5 years
	Parent C	Male	Parents' rep	2 years

4.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS THEMES AND SUB-THEMES

- What are the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors and SBs?
- What is the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs with regards to school governance?
- In what ways do school proprietors influence the roles and responsibilities of the SBs?
- What are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietors and SBs in school governance?
- What factors contribute to the proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs?

Table 4.2 Research questions and interview questions

<p>What are the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors and SBs?</p>	<p>2. What do you think are the roles and responsibilities of the school proprietor in relation to governance/ management activities in this school/ in your schools?</p> <p>3. What are the roles and responsibilities of the SB in relation to governance and management activities in this school/ in your schools?</p>
<p>What is the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs with regards to school governance?</p>	<p>1. Can you describe to me how you as a member of the SB interact directly or indirectly with the school proprietor?</p> <p>5. What would you say are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietor and the SBs in your school(s)?</p>
<p>In what ways do school proprietors influence the roles and responsibilities of the SBs?</p>	<p>6. In your view, does the school proprietor have influence on the SB's roles and responsibilities in this school/ in your schools?</p> <p>7. What areas of governance/management attract a lot of influence and why?</p> <p>8. In what ways does the school proprietor of your school influence your SB's roles and responsibilities?</p>
<p>What are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietors and SBs in school governance?</p>	<p>9. What effect does the influence have on your performance as a member of the SB?</p> <p>4. What can you say about the role of the school proprietor and the performance of the SB?</p>
<p>What factors contribute to the proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs?</p>	<p>10. In your view, what factors contribute to the school proprietor's influence on your roles and responsibilities as members of the SB?</p>
	<p>11. What is your view about the school proprietor, school governance and management in your school?</p>
	<p>12. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me about school proprietors and SBs?</p>

Table 4.3 Research questions, themes and sub-themes

<p>What are the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors and SBs?</p>	<p><i>Theme 1 : The roles and responsibilities of school proprietors and SBs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities of school proprietors • Roles and responsibilities of SBs
<p>What is the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs with regards to school governance?</p>	<p><i>Theme 2: The relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs with regards to school governance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interaction between SBs and proprietors • Ownership relationship • Boundaries • Relationships between school proprietor and SBs
<p>In what ways do school proprietors influence the roles and responsibilities of the SBs?</p>	<p><i>Theme 3: How school proprietors influence the roles and responsibilities of the SBs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting and maintaining religious values and morals • School proprietor influences the operations • Areas that attract school proprietors influence on role and responsibilities of SBs
<p>What are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietors and SBs in school governance?</p>	<p><i>Theme 4: The effect of the influence of proprietor on the performance of SBs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect on behaviour of SB members • Effect of the expectations of school proprietor on SB members • Support and guidance
<p>What factors contribute to the proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs?</p>	<p><i>Theme 5: Factors that contribute to the proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of ownership • Goals and objectives of the proprietor

4.4 RESEARCH FINDINGS

In this section, the researcher presents research findings followed by discussion of the findings. The findings are supported by verbatim quotations from the interviews with the participants. The findings are aligned and presented in themes that answer the research questions.

4.4.1 Theme 1: The roles and responsibilities of school proprietors and SBs

This theme reports on the views of principals, teachers' representatives, parents' representatives, the SB chairpersons and educational secretaries on the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors and SBs. The participants were asked what they thought were the roles and responsibilities of the school proprietors and SBs in relation to governance/management activities in their schools.

This section consists of two sub-themes: (a) roles and responsibilities of school proprietors and (b) roles and responsibilities of SBs. Under sub-theme (a) the following factors are discussed: religious teaching and values and holistic development. Factors that are discussed under sub-theme (b) are human resource management, physical infrastructure, financial management, managing conduct of learners and teachers, policy implementation, academic performance of learners, and curriculum issues.

4.4.1.1 Roles and responsibilities of school proprietors

This part sought to address perceptions of participants on the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors in relation to governance/management activities in their schools. The findings indicate that the school proprietors' roles and responsibilities are to maintain religious teaching and values and to ensure holistic development of learners in their schools.

In this current study, the perceptions of the principals about school proprietors' roles were that their roles were to see to it that Religious Studies was taught in their schools. They wanted to ensure that all learners were taught about God in accordance with the religious culture and practices that were pursued by their (proprietors') churches. One of the principals said:

The church ensures that religion as a subject forms part of the school curriculum and is compulsory to all learners. They want someone who belongs to the Roman Catholic Church. (Principal A)

Teachers' opinions concurred with the views of principals on the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors. They perceived the school proprietors as a body whose work was to determine the kind of curriculum that must be followed in schools, the most important aspect of those being to impart knowledge and to strengthen learners' faith in the Supreme Being. This was a shared and common perception of the role of the proprietors in the schools that were involved in this study. Teachers' representative B had this to say:

Our school has certain pillars that are set by proprietor and one of them is that you teach a child holistically: You teach him/her about God; teach him/her subjects in order to prepare him/her for life out there. The base for this is that the child should be able to draw power from God. This one I know the proprietor is paying attention to it. (Teacher rep B)

Parents also observed that one of the key roles of school proprietors in schools was to make a positive change in learners' religious lives. They ensured that learners followed their church practices and maintained religion of the school by making them attend church services. Parent representative C made the following observation:

The chief role of the proprietor as I have observed, since ours is a church school, he impacts a lot on religious matters. He has a lot of impact on children's religion present at our school. He also ensures that every child who stays on school compound goes to church every Sunday. (Parent rep C)

These responses indicated that in the schools that participated in this study, school proprietors' major interest or role in school governance and management seemed to be upholding religious practices and values of their churches. They took this role seriously and they did not want to let their grip to any authority in this regard as it was the case in Northern Ireland where church authorities, regardless of their schools' classification, did not want to compromise their right of access and inspection of religious education (Smith, 2010:562).

This finding also relates to the study by Mabeya et al. (2010) that explored the role of secondary school sponsor and its influence on school achievement in Uasin Gishu in Kenya. Mabeya et al. (2010) found that the main interest of the church sponsor was to sustain their religious culture, traditions and principles rather than academic performance.

The findings on the role of school proprietors in the current study may imply that governance and management in schools are likely to put more emphasis on what the proprietor took as a top priority, namely, church practices and values. This would mean other areas of governance and management were likely to be affected. For example, teaching-learning time would be compromised and give way to school schedules that accommodated slots for religious traditions and doctrines. This would, in the long run have influence on the academic achievement of learners in such schools.

The role of proprietors in ensuring religious grounding of the school might have implications on recruitment of staff and admission policies of schools. Church authorities (proprietors) would wish to employ only teachers who belonged to their church denominations because they believed they would teach and preach the religious practices and doctrines without any resistance. They would like the majority of learners admitted in their schools to come from their church denominations because they would easily advance the interests of the proprietor. Principal A highlighted this view saying that the proprietors wanted someone who belonged to their church.

Some participants believed that another role of the school proprietors was to ensure that their schools offered a kind of education that was holistic in approach. This kind of education benefited or addressed four aspects of life, namely, physical, social, intellectual, and spiritual. The highest aspect of life to be fulfilled was spiritual. SB chairperson B presented his/her opinion like this:

We also believe that, as a church we are very firm on this, education is not total, is not holistic unless a person is educated spiritually as well and so our responsibility is to make sure that physically, socially, mentally/intellectually, as well as spiritually, the citizenry of this country are educated. And we pick that through the responsibility of ensuring that everyone who comes there is exposed

to the truth of God that would help lift the person useful in this world for service as well as in the kingdom to come. (SB chairperson B)

Teachers' representative B in a quotation highlighted earlier also alluded to a need for education that was holistic in nature. The teacher explicitly said schools should teach learners about God; they should also provide learners with education that exposed them to secular knowledge and skills that would help them cope with life in general.

The above finding shows that for any proprietor to say that his/her school is functioning well it must offer education that addresses all spectra of life. Putting too much emphasis on one spectrum may compromise other aspects of education. This may result in an institution that somehow loses relevance and focus. Proprietors should ensure that in their attempt to address the spiritual aspect, they do not neglect other aspects of life. This means that people responsible for governance/management activities in schools need to strike a balance in a manner in which they would work towards realising their roles and responsibilities.

Teachers' representative A was not aware of the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors. The teacher made the following comment:

To be honest with you, unless someone provides me with a written document that stipulates their (school proprietor's) roles and responsibilities, I don't have an idea about them. (Teacher rep A)

The statement above shows that some members of SB are not aware of any documentation that defines school proprietors' roles and responsibilities in church-owned schools. The statement may be interpreted in one of these two ways: (a) that there is no formal or official document that defines proprietors' roles and responsibilities in church-owned schools or (b) that if such document exists, the teacher is ignorant about its existence; therefore, the teacher is not aware of its contents. This leaves more to be desired bearing in mind that Teachers' representative A has served in the SB for eight years.

4.4.1.2 Roles and responsibilities of SBs

This sub-theme sought to convey participants' views on the roles and responsibilities of SBs in relation to governance/management activities in schools. The participants were

asked what they thought were the roles and responsibilities of SBs in relation to governance/management in their schools. This sub-theme is informed by international and local literature on the roles and responsibilities of the SB. In Lesotho, the roles and responsibilities of SBs are to manage and administer schools; to oversee management, the appropriate and well-organized running of the school; to recommend appointment, promotion, demotion or transfer of a teacher; to recommend a disciplinary action against a principal or head of department; and they are also accountable for school finances (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010).

The following factors will be discussed under this sub-theme: human resource management, physical infrastructure, financial management, managing conduct of learners and teachers, policy implementation, academic performance of learners, and curriculum issues.

The participants' responses in this study regarding the roles and responsibilities of SBs indicated that one of the responsibilities of the SBs was to engage in employing teaching and non-teaching staff. Educational Secretary 1 narrated:

They recruit staff; they follow all the process of employment. They identify suitable candidate(s) and recommend them to education (Teaching Service Commission). Formulation of policies: Their work is to formulate policies and not implement them. They leave them for principal to implement. (Educational Secretary 1)

Principals' perceptions concurred with the view that staff recruitment was one of the responsibilities of the SBs. They believed that when the SB selected staff for employment, they should look for people with relevant credentials to fill vacant posts. Principal B supported this by saying:

The SB has to draw strategic plan, support principal, ensure that hiring of quality staff is done at school, and ensure that all stakeholders at school are working together. (Principal B)

Principal C added to this by saying the SB's role was to set the stage, meaning that it was their duty to ensure that all relevant resources were available at school, including

human resources. The principal was of the opinion that SBs were given authority to hire, fire, demote, and promote.

Teachers' representatives shared the same view that one of their main functions as members of the SB was to employ staff. They believed that the SB performed this role collectively as a team. Teachers' representative C highlighted a critical point by saying their work did not end with recruitment; it went beyond that. The teacher put emphasis on ensuring teachers' welfare while they simultaneously maintained high standards of discipline and professionalism on teachers' part. The teacher made the following comment:

I take my role as that of having the interest of a teacher and making sure that there is that good governance in relation to the teacher. That is, the welfare of a teacher must not be undermined; on the other hand the teacher should not be out of order. (Teacher rep C)

Parents' representatives A and C also believed that they had a role to play in staff employment. Conversely, parents' representative B was not sure whether this was their role or not. This was because ever since the parent became a member of SB, they neither talked about any vacant post of a teacher nor had they engaged in a discussion about how to employ or terminate a teacher's contract.

According to literature, internationally, the roles and responsibilities of SBs are, among others, to oversee human resource matters (UK Department of Education, 2012), to endorse the appointment of educators and non-educator staff to the Head of Department (RSA, 1996). In Lesotho, the law stipulates that the role of the SBs in a public school is to recommend to the appointing authority the appointment, promotion, demote or transfer of a teacher (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010).

In the United Kingdom, for instance, SB roles and responsibilities are classified into four major tasks, namely, strategic governance, corporate governance, promoting good governance, and the law (UK Department of Education, 2012). In South Africa, the roles and responsibilities of the SGB are to ensure that learners' interests are promoted; the constitutional expectations are fulfilled; there is monitoring of school facilities and infrastructure, and handle personal matters among other responsibilities of governance (RSA, 1996).

The participants' responses are in agreement with what the law dictates in that they show staff employment as one of the most important roles of the SB. This means the SB is the only body that should participate in the preparations and the actual appointment of staff in a school. This includes all processes involved in recruitment such as advertising a vacant post, receiving applications and administering a sifting process, holding interviews, and selecting appropriate candidates.

This implies that all staff employed in a school is accountable to the SB. The SB has authority to change employment status of an employee in a school. In addition, the SB has control over employment procedures and processes and it is the only body authorised, in terms of the law, to oversee governance and management of human resource.

The study has established that human resource management is purely the responsibility of the SB. Only SB should have a say in the employment processes of teachers and non-teaching staff in church-owned schools in Lesotho.

Internationally, it has been established that the SBs are responsible for school physical infrastructure. In Australia, for instance, one of the roles of the SB is to establish policies for the efficient and effective use of school assets (ACT Government, 2015). In South Africa, SGBs administer and control schools' properties, buildings and grounds occupied by the school, including schools' hostels if applicable (RSA, 1996). In Lesotho, the Lesotho Education Act of 2010 is silent about the roles and responsibilities of SB in this regard. Anyway, the general belief of the participants who took part in this study is that SBs are responsible for ensuring that infrastructure and relevant equipment are there and they are accordingly improved. Principal C's opinion concurred with this by saying:

But the SB, theirs is a bigger role. To make sure that resources are there is the bigger responsibility, you cannot expect teachers to come and organise resources of the school but it is the responsibility of the SB with their secretary, the principal, to see to it that infrastructure is there and is improved... (Principal C)

Though teachers' representatives' views did not come out clear on this role, parents shared principals' view that it was part of SB's duty to look after school buildings and refurbish them from time to time. Parents' representative B explained:

When it comes to infrastructure such as buildings and maintaining present buildings, there is a certain group that has just been established between parents and teachers in our school for the very purpose of ensuring that we improve our school from time to time. (Parents' rep B)

Educational secretary 1 concurred that physical infrastructure was the responsibility of the SB saying that:

The SB is responsible to erect and maintain buildings on school compound. Stability: The SB must ensure there is stability at school. They must manage conflicts whenever they are there. (Educational Secretary 1)

Educational secretary 2 at first seemed not to agree that physical infrastructure was the role of the SB. The secretary said it was the role of everybody, proprietor and government, because they were in partnership. The secretary said:

The SB should be concerned when the buildings were falling or when there are no buildings. Indeed physical infrastructure is part of the job and the responsibility of SB members. (Educational secretary 2)

In other countries like Australia and South Africa, physical infrastructure and all other resources are clearly the responsibility of the SGB. In Lesotho, it is not clear as to who is responsible for the physical infrastructure in schools because the law that directs all stakeholders on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs is not explicit about it.

However, the information collected from various participants as reflected in the previous paragraphs above, shows that physical infrastructure is another important role that SBs are expected to perform in schools in Lesotho. It has been observed that although some representatives did not mention this as their responsibility in their responses but the majority, namely, principals, parents and educational secretaries, did view physical infrastructure as part of the role of the SBs. Although a difference in views was observed between the two educational secretaries, it is important to note that they ultimately agree that SB is responsible for any building found in the schoolyard and maintenance thereof.

The findings indicate that SB is responsible for physical infrastructure and all other resources that belong to a school. It has been established that in relation to

governance/management activities in a school, the SB has authority over all school buildings, properties and other equipment belonging to the school.

Financial management is another important area of responsibility for governance/management in schools worldwide. The SBs in Australia are, among others, commissioned to develop policies on financial management, including the school budget and the use of school property (ACT Government, 2015).

According to the Lesotho Education Act of 2010, section 25, the SBs are expected to audit their accounts and submit a report annually to the proprietor and the Principal Secretary. Section 21 of the same Act spells out duties of a principal. The principal should act in the position of the chief accounting officer in monitoring the use of school funds. What this implies is that the SB in Lesotho, like in other parts of the world, is charged with the responsibility of overseeing financial management in a school.

The perceptions of the principals interviewed in this study are consistent with what the literature says is being practiced in other parts of the world as stated in the previous paragraphs. The literature says the SBs' work is to administer and manage school finances (ACT Government, 2015; Republic of Kenya, 2013). Their views are also in line with the dictates of the Lesotho Education Act of 2010, section 21 referred to in the previous paragraph. They believe that they have authority to oversee school budgets and any other plans that may appear to have financial implications in their schools. Principal B said:

They (SB) make sure that budgets are properly adhered to; the budgets and plans are done. (Principal B)

Teachers' representatives held firm the same view that as members of the SB, they had authority to scrutinise financial statements and to authorise schools' budgets. Teachers' representative B made the following observation:

Yes, we are given financial statements. Then we make their analysis to see whether we are still performing well or not. We also have authority to authorise budgets, we actually decide that this project can be done this way. (Teachers' rep B)

From the above verbatim quote, the reader will realise that according to the participant, the SB's role goes beyond scrutinising financial statements and authorising budgets. There is need for accountability on the use of finances.

Educational secretaries shared the same view that financial management was the role of the SB in their schools. Just as principals and teachers had observed, they perceived SBs as overseers of school funds and as a body that was authorised to approve or disapprove budgets. Educational secretary 1 made the following comment:

...financial management: They must ensure that school funds are well managed. Budgets are to be drawn by management and be approved by SB. (Educational secretary 1)

Educational secretary 2 was in agreement with perceptions of other participants with regard to SB's role and responsibility in financial management. The secretary stated:

Financial management is their role according to the law and I believe it has to remain that way. If you are managing/governing an institution, you should be able even to account on financial issues. Because some management issues will require you to produce some money to deal with them, so you should be able to budget for them. You should be able to budget for the things you want to employ in the school. (Educational secretary 2).

Educational secretary 2 also felt that the current state of affairs where the SBs oversaw financial management in schools should be maintained.

It has been observed that globally financial management forms an integral part of the roles and responsibilities of the SB where governance powers are devolved to schools' sites (ACT Government 2015; Republic of Kenya, 2013). In the same way, in Lesotho, SBs are directly delegated powers to manage funds in schools (Kingdom of Lesotho 2010). All groups of interviewees subscribed to the notion that financial management directly fell under the SBs' roles and responsibilities.

It is noted with great interest that Educational secretary 2 felt strongly that SBs should continue overseeing financial management in schools. This will be discussed further under the areas of governance/management that attract more influence.

The study has established unequivocally that the SBs have authority to oversee financial issues in schools in Lesotho. The SBs, among other things, must approve or disapprove school budgets, endorse or reject any requisitions that may have financial implications.

In South Africa, SGBs adopt school constitutions and codes of conduct for learners (RSA, 1996). The researcher's assumption is that if SGBs have power to adopt code of conduct for learners, they therefore have authority to manage learners' conduct. The same legislation is silent about SGBs adopting code of conduct for teachers. Nevertheless, it must be noted that giving SGBs power to adopt a school constitution is a bigger role than just adopting a code of conduct. Bearing this in mind, it can be argued that since the school constitution informs other school policies and codes, it is clear that by virtue of having powers to formulate and adopt the constitution, SGBs assume powers to deal with teachers' behaviour as well.

In Lesotho, the SBs recommend a disciplinary action against a principal or head of department to the appointing authority or proprietor (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010). The legislation is silent about the SB's role in managing conduct of learners and teachers. However, if the same legislation authorises the SB to recommend disciplinary action against a principal or head of department, it is assumed that they automatically have the same authority to recommend a disciplinary action against their (principal's and heads' of departments) subordinates.

Principals who took part in this study believed that SB had a role to play in learners' disciplinary cases when learners were likely to face harsh punishments like suspension or expulsion. The understanding is that for any lesser sanctions, teachers and school management are at liberty to administer and implement them. Principal A narrated:

With regard to learners' discipline, we involve the School Board when we have decided to dismiss a learner from school. They are involved in teachers' discipline; for example, they have opened a disciplinary case against a teacher and an office secretary who are alleged to have embezzled school funds.
(Principal A)

From the above verbatim quote, it is realised that principals also have a strong feeling that SB must participate in teachers' disciplinary cases, especially those that are criminal in nature.

Teachers echoed the same view. They perceived that SB had a role to play in the disciplinary cases of both learners and teachers. Teachers' representative B presented the following views:

Another role has to do with disciplinary of teachers. The disciplinary of students is administered by teachers; we only come in where the disciplinary matter involves dismissal of a learner. Once teachers decide to dismiss a student that involves the Board because a letter that informs the Ministry of Education about that decision should be written by the Board. (Teachers' rep B)

Parents were in agreement with the feelings of other participants. Parents' representative A believed it was her responsibility as SB member to ensure that the school principal maintained regular attendance of learners at school. The parent said:

The first one is to maintain that the principal, acting on behalf of the School Board, he/she uses his/her powers to ensure that students do attend school and do not leave before school out. It is my responsibility to ensure that teachers are performing their duties well, failing which it is within my right to register my discontent with the Board or give my advice to that effect. (Parent rep A)

Educational Secretary 2 held the same view that SBs had or should have powers to discipline teachers. The secretary commented:

In fact, every governing body should have authority of disciplining its subordinates. It would be unheard of for a board that is not given chance to discipline its subordinates. I think it is proper that they are given chance to discipline the teachers. (Educational Secretary 2)

As per the argument made earlier on based on the contents of the SASA of 1996, section 20 and the Republic of Kenya Basic Education Act No.14 of 2013, section 59, managing learners' conduct directly falls under SB's jurisdiction. Interviewees' opinions were in line with the findings of literature. They believed teachers and the school principal had power to discipline learners on lesser faults, but they must seek SB's

endorsement on serious disciplinary cases that might lead to either suspension or dismissal of a learner.

When it comes to managing teachers' conduct, the literature (ACT Government 2015; Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010; Republic of Kenya, 2013; RSA 1996; UK Department of Education, 2012) is not quite explicit about SBs' role. Anyway, since it is made clear in the literature (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010; Republic of Kenya, 2013; and RSA, 1996) that teachers and non-academic staff were employed by the SB or through the recommendation of the SB, the researcher shares the participants' views that SBs have authority to manage teachers' and support staff's conduct. If they have power to employ or to recommend their appointment, they surely have power to manage their behaviour in the workplace.

This study shows clearly that another role and responsibility of the SB is to manage learners' and teachers' conduct. Anyway, it must be noted that this depends on the nature of behaviour or misbehaviour of either a student or a teacher. There are disciplinary cases that can be handled by a school management, principal and his/her teachers, while others may be directed to a higher body, the SB.

Another role of SB is managing school policies. In the United Kingdom, SBs are also expected to develop schools' plans and policies (UK Department of Education, 2012). The same applies to Australia where SBs are mandated to develop, maintain and review policies, among other duties (ACT Government, 2015).

In the case of Lesotho, the Education Act of 2010 is silent about policy formulation and its implementation by the SB. However, some of the participants in this study felt that SBs had a role to play in policy implementation in schools. They believed SBs needed to discuss policies and strategies for their implementation. This was to be administered by the principal and his/her team. Teachers' representative B views were as follows:

We engage at decision-making at SB level. Another thing is if there is a policy, its execution is being discussed at Board. We deliberate on how to implement a policy and then take it down to a teacher's level where it will be handled by the school administration. (Teacher rep B)

It is not only teachers who felt strongly about their role as policy formulators and implementers. SB chairperson B supported the above perception saying that:

Basically, I would say ours is to ensure that policies are formulated that are consistent with the law of this country in terms of education. (SB chairperson B)

The above verbatim implies that SB members must be conversant with all legislations and statutes that regulate governance and management in schools because they have to align their policies with them.

Educational secretary 1 concurred with the sentiment stated above by saying:

Their work is to formulate policies and not implement them. They leave them for principal to implement. (Educational secretary 1)

It must be noted that Educational secretary 1 drew a distinction between who should formulate policies and who should implement them. According to the secretary, SBs' role was to formulate policies and not to implement them. Implementation of policies was the function of the principal and the staff. The perceptions of the participants highlighted above indicated that policy formulation was the responsibility of SBs. This finding is in line with the dictates of literature (ACT Government, 2015; UK Department of Education, 2012). This will give the SB chance to supervise how implementation is being done and give necessary assistance and support on time.

It has been revealed in this study that policy formulation is the responsibility of the SB while policy implementation is the function that must be performed by the school management.

The literature reviewed did not explicitly state academic performance of learners as a responsibility of SBs. For instance, in South African context, SASA of 1996 only implies that SGBs have a role to play in academic performance of learners and they should try to provide quality education at the school (RSA, 1996). More often than not, quality education offered in a school is measured by academic performance of learners. That is to say quality education and academic performance of learners are inextricable.

From collected data, parents' representatives perceived academic performance of learners as a role of the SB. According to Parents' representative B, SB must work

towards attainment of quality education and production of good academic results. The parent expressed her opinion:

It is a bit difficult. But in my view, is to ensure that children obtain quality education. They must ensure that the school runs smoothly so that the school produces good results. (Parent rep B)

Parents' representative C went further to say the SB in their school investigated circumstances that led to their school to underperform and they sought ways to address possible contributory factors. He/she presented his/her view in the following manner:

There are certain steps that we take as a way of trying to find out what could be a source for unsatisfactory performance in our school. These steps include engaging in talks with students and their teachers and this impacts positively in their lives. (Parent rep C)

Though only one participant perceived academic performance of learners as a SB role and responsibility, the researcher feels inclined to share this view. The most important question to ask is: What is the ultimate goal for having SBs in schools? If a school is running smoothly, academic performance will be affected positively; likewise, if governance is experiencing many unresolved challenges, the academic results will be negatively affected. In short, whatever the SB is doing in a school, its ultimate goal is to impact positively on the academic performance of learners. Academic performance of learners somehow remains the responsibility of SB. Muller and Ellison (2001) support this finding as they found that the role played by the school sponsor was to create a school environment that was friendly, encouraging and established in supporting the teachers and the learners. The study has found out that, although only parents hold this perception, academic performance of learners falls under SBs' roles and responsibilities.

Internationally, curriculum planning and review forms part of SBs' duties (ACT Government 2015; UK Department of Education 2012; Perry 2011:9). In the case of Lesotho, the Lesotho Education Act of 2010 is silent about this role. It did not come as a surprise, therefore, when the researcher realised that a good number of participants did not commit themselves on this role. The only people whose views came out very clear were educational secretaries. They perceived a SB as a body that had a role to play in curriculum issues. Educational secretary 1 presented his/her views as follows:

Curriculum: They are responsible for curriculum in their school though they are not experts in this area. If the principal and teachers want to make some changes in the subjects offered, they must present that to the SB for approval or disapproval. (Educational secretary 1)

Educational secretary 2 concurred and argued the matter further:

In my view, they must have a role in curriculum. In fact, that's my argument. They really must have a role because the SB is mainly gathered from the community around the school. That means they are the people who know what is best for the community there. So, the curriculum of the school should answer the needs of the community. (Educational secretary 2)

The findings of this study suggest that there is need for the SB members and teachers to work together on curriculum issues. This will ensure that every school offers curriculum that addresses the needs of their community.

Another role and responsibility of SBs includes establishing structures and rules that will serve as guidelines for governance and management in schools. The SBs should also draw school mission statement and vision that will direct all activities of a school. Teachers' representative B said:

They should also formulate rules or structures that govern that institution. They should also provide direction in which they want their school to follow so that the driver or whoever is involved just ensures implementation. (Teacher rep B)

The study has revealed that school proprietors want to see the teaching of religion and its values in their schools. It means their purpose for owning schools is not just to educate the child but also an avenue to propagate religious beliefs and values. The finding concurs with Darmody and Smyth (2013:32) where they underscore that the denominational schools in the UK are likely to have emphasis on faith in their teaching and in their culture. Mabeya et al. (2010) also support this when they say church sponsors in Uasin Gishu in Kenya focused on promoting and preserving their religious practices and principles.

Another finding is that school proprietors would like to ensure that their schools offer education that is holistic in approach. It supports Mabeya et al. (2010) who advocate for

the attention of the school sponsor to be on a more diverse school curriculum that is holistic and sensitive to the needs of the learners' personal growth and development. In addition, Darmody and Smyth (2013:41) maintain that the school governing board should be held accountable for creating the school culture and climate which is inclusive of their religious values and norms as well as the attainment of educational goals.

Although the findings reveal that school proprietors' roles are to be defined in view of the two highlighted areas (upholding the teaching of religious values and morals; and ensuring holistic education for learners), a deeper examination of the situation in Lesotho suggests that this is a superficial notion. Proprietors actually engage themselves in governance and management activities in schools without any restraint. Moreover, proprietors in schools under this study come to schools under the pretext that their role is to perform the said roles while in actual fact they position themselves in such a way that they will easily find themselves influencing the SBs' roles and responsibilities in schools.

The study has also discovered that some SB members are not aware of any official or legal document that defines school proprietors' roles and responsibilities. This confirms what Matalasi (2000) observed that SB members lack relevant awareness in educational matters and activities. The lack of awareness of what is expected of SB could contribute negatively to their effectiveness in performing their expected roles and responsibilities.

The participants in this study also indicated that SBs are responsible of human resource management. This is in line with the provisions of the Lesotho Education Act of 2010. Matalasi (2000) and Motaba (1998) assert that recruitment of staff and relevant processes should remain the area administered by SBs. This aspect of the role of SB increases their authority, accountability and a sense of ownership (Matalasi, 2000).

The collected data depict physical infrastructure as yet another responsibility of SBs. This is in agreement with what is happening in Australia and in South Africa where SBs or SGBs must establish policies to ensure efficient and effective use of school assets (ACT Government, 2015) and administer and control school's property, buildings and grounds, including hostels (RSA, 1996).

According to the findings, financial management also forms part of SBs' roles and responsibilities. This is in line with the Lesotho Education Act of 2010. Van Deventer

and Kruger (2011:264) and Marais and Meier (2012:59) allude to this though they present it in a general manner. They argue that one of the most important functions of SB is to assist the principal and teachers by availing all resources to enable them perform their duties.

Another role of the SBs' is to manage the conduct of teachers and learners. Internationally and locally, legislation that directs and regulates SBs' roles and responsibilities does not pronounce itself clear enough on this (ACT Government, 2015; UK Department of Education, 2012; RSA, 1996; Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010). However, Matalasi (2000:24) believes that one of the things that could guarantee ownership and accountability in the SB is when they (SBs) are fully involved in school activities such as disciplining teachers whose salaries are paid by the government.

The study has revealed that policy formulation is the role of SBs while policy implementation is the work of the school management. Some legislations are silent about this issue (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010; Republic of Kenya, 2013), but internationally this is a trend (ACT Government, 2015; UK Department of Education, 2012). This finding aligns itself with Perry (2011) who identifies setting the school's plans and policies in Northern Ireland as one of the statutory duties that are supposed to be performed by SBs.

4.4.2 Theme 2: The relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs with regards to school governance

This theme conveys perceptions of SB members, namely, principals, teachers' representatives, parents' representatives and SB chairpersons on the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs with regard to school governance. The participants were asked the following questions:

- Describe how you as a SB member interact directly or indirectly with the school proprietor?
- What are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietor and SBs in their schools?

Different members of the SB seemed to have different levels of interaction with the school proprietors. Some SBs members experienced negative relationship with the

proprietors while others described a harmonious relationship that was based on trust and respect. The following sub-themes illustrate the different perceptions held by the SBs: interaction between proprietors and SBs; ownership relationship; boundaries; and relationships between school proprietors and SBs.

4.4.2.1 Interaction between SBs and proprietors

This sub-section explored the participants' perceptions on the interaction between school proprietors and SBs in relation to governance/management activities in their schools. In this study, the participants' responses indicated little or no interaction between SBs and proprietors. From teachers representatives' perspective, it was apparent that there was minimal interaction between SB and proprietors. The teachers said:

As a member of the School Board, I have never been in a position where I find myself interacting with the school proprietor. (Teacher rep A)

I think that is not direct. The school itself belongs to Lesotho Evangelical Church in Southern Africa (LECSA) and there is no way LECSA can interact directly with me except that I represent teachers in the SB. (Teacher rep C)

Parents' representative B held a different view. In his/her view, the interaction between the two bodies was direct. This is what he/she said:

We do work with them directly because we hold meetings with them where we talk about what should and what should not happen. We talk about changes in the school and we give advices on things that are not running properly. (Parent rep B)

Other participants who believed that there was interaction between members of SB and the school proprietors echoed his /her view. They explained as follows:

I do interact with the school proprietor but that happens occasionally. Let me tell you that in the SB, there is a priest who stands on behalf of the school proprietor; so, the easiest way of interaction is through the priest who is working as a link between the SB and the proprietor. (Parent rep C)

In relation to the school, I interact basically through my position in the SB and also work together with education secretary to see implementation of the school policy. (SB chairperson B)

It must be noted that according to participants from schools A and C, there was no direct interaction between proprietors and SBs in their schools. In a case where interaction might be said to exist, it was indirect and occasional. Participants from school B believed that there was direct interaction between the two bodies. The researcher suspects that the two participants, Teachers' representative B and Parents' representative B, confused proprietor and the two nominees representing proprietor in the SB. To say they met during SB meetings gave one an impression that they were actually referring to proprietors' nominees who were members of the same board. This might imply that there was completely no SB-proprietorship interaction in this school like it was the case in other two schools.

4.4.2.2. Ownership relationship

This sub-theme sought to explore participants' views on the effects of the relationship between the school proprietors and SBs with regard to school governance in church-owned secondary schools. This study has established that there are conflicts between SBs and proprietors in church-owned secondary schools that participated in this study. This, on one hand, seemed to be owing to the proprietors' ownership and power in the management of their schools. On the other hand, the relationship was strained by misconceptions of the role of the SBs and the role of the school proprietors. The two factors highlighted here are discussed in the following paragraphs.

According to Principal A, a poor relationship existed between the SB and school proprietors in his/her school. The Principal claimed that whenever the proprietor was not in good terms with the SB, he/she withdrew all the support and assistance that he/she was supposed to give to that particular school. She/he stated her/his view as follows:

The school proprietor will decide not to support the concerned school because he/she is at loggerheads with the SB. Even when there are grants that are supposed to be awarded to schools, other schools would be overlooked because they are not in good terms with the school owners. It's like proprietors are not

clear about the law that directs governance in schools so much that any resistance from the SB causes friction between the two. (Principal A)

Principal C agreed that there were times when the relationship between the two bodies was not conducive. Principal C presented his/her opinion like this:

Sometimes it is not nice because sometimes you will find that [the] proprietor sends a priest to chair the SB and I have seen it has negative impact. What they are trying to do maybe is to ensure ownership showing that this is their school. (Principal C)

The responses from the schools that participated in this study showed that proprietors wanted their schools to be run by SBs who were submissive in their governance dealings in their schools. This is an indication that SBs are also struggling to assume full control on how schools should be governed and managed. The finding also shows that proprietors' nominees in the SB are people who are not necessarily sent to ensure good governance and management in their schools but those who are going to uphold the interests of the church. As they pursue this, they are likely to overlook good governance and management in their schools.

There was a strong feeling from some participants that relationship between SBs and proprietors was actually strained by misinformation that was spread to SBs on who owned the schools. This matter created unnecessary confusion that resulted in conflicts between SBs and proprietors. The Educational secretary 2 presented his/her opinion on this matter as follows:

The SBs once they know how to relate with the proprietors you find the running of the schools becomes very smooth. Sometimes these SBs are fed wrong things about the school proprietor. In fact, I don't know, just to get out of the topic a bit. Some SBs are told by some government officials during some workshops or school visits that they own these schools, the schools belong to them. They (SBs) take themselves to be sole proprietors of those schools. (Educational secretary 2)

The proprietor in this case seemed to be sceptical in his/her dealings with the SB because he/she suspected that SBs were influenced by government officials to rebel

against him/her in his/her schools. To say schools belong to SBs is open to a number of interpretations. The first one may be literal, meaning SBs actually own such school sites and buildings. However, a question would remain as to whether SBs could claim ownership of schools without any title deed in their names and possession? Secondly, to say schools belong to SBs may simply mean they (SBs) are to enjoy unrestrained authority in their performance of governance in schools. Meaning, they have powers to direct their school(s) in any direction they deem fit, as far as that is done in the best interest of the school and other stakeholders.

4.4.2.3 Boundaries

This sub-theme sought to explore responsibility boundaries between school proprietors and SBs. The sub-theme is based on sections 25 and 26 (4) of the Lesotho Education Act of 2010. Section 25 stipulates the responsibilities of the SB while section 26 (4) spells out the functions of an educational secretary, representing the proprietor. Briefly, the law authorises the SB to perform all governing activities in the school while the educational secretary must organise, co-ordinate and supervise the educational work of his/her proprietor. It has transpired that another reason why the relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs is very low is because of lack of respect for responsibility boundaries. This issue is discussed further in the following paragraphs.

Principal A felt that the main reason for poor relationship between school proprietors and SBs was lack of respect for responsibility boundaries. School proprietors went to schools with an attitude that they owned schools and therefore, the SBs must take instructions from them and obey them. When SBs realised this kind of attitude, they became too legalistic in their approach and this caused serious conflict between the two bodies. Principal A presented his/her opinion on this issue like this:

The relationship is not good because proprietor comes here because he owns the school. When the SB is aware of the depth and parameters of their jurisdiction and the proprietor's legal boundaries/limitations (the powers they have as contained in the legislation) that causes arguments. (Principal A)

Principal C was in agreement with this. He/she further said the attitude that proprietors showed when visiting schools impacted negatively on the principal's work. In his/her words, he/she made the following observation:

But when he is here you will find that sometimes he goes beyond his boundaries because he believes the school is his. You find that you, as a principal, are being micro-managed which [is] not a good thing and it causes unnecessary conflicts.
(Principal C)

This sub-section has reported that proprietors somehow do overstep their mark in their dealings with SBs in church-owned secondary schools that participated in this study. While they do this, they expect SBs to play a sub-servient role, a position SBs are not ready to be reduced to. Consequently, this study exposes lack of respect for responsibility boundaries as one of the main causes of conflict between school proprietors and SBs in church-owned schools. This implies that probably the roles and responsibilities of proprietors and SBs in the legislation (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010) are not clearly defined or understood as intended.

4.4.2.4. Relationships between school proprietor and SBs

This part sought to explore participants' views on whether the relationship between school proprietors and SBs could be said to be beneficial. Muller and Ellison (2001) inform the sub-theme where they assert that the main role of school sponsor is to provide stable and friendly school environment where educational performance and development are well nourished. The research has established that much as there are negative aspects observed in the relationship between proprietors and SBs in church-owned schools, the relationship also had positive aspects as indicated by some participants. The following paragraphs discuss positive points identified by some participants.

According to Teachers' representative B, working relationship between proprietors and SBs was conducive. The favourable atmosphere made implementation of proprietor's mandate easier. The teacher said:

There is a working relationship between the Board and proprietor and that in itself leads to a situation where execution of what proprietor is looking to, his mandate, becomes easier. When the Board is putting across its mandate, nobody is getting angry; when proprietor says he/she wants things to be done this way or that way, nobody queries. (Teacher rep B)

Teachers' representative C supported the above sentiment. She/he presented her/his opinion as follows:

All in all, harmony exists because they trust people they have given responsibility to run their schools. As a result, it helps SBs to be active, and well performing SBs to figure out what to do in order to improve their performance or decide to underperform. (Teacher rep C)

This warm relationship that existed between proprietors and SBs was also echoed by Parents' representative B. She/he made the following observation:

I believe the relationship between the school proprietor and the SB is good.
(Parents' rep B)

This sub-section expresses positive aspects observed by some participants in the relationship between proprietors and SBs. The researcher has noted that while there were numerous cases of negativity reported in the said relationship, there were SB members who viewed this from a different point of view. They saw the affair characterised by conduciveness and harmony, which translated into efficient and effective fulfilment of proprietors' mandate in schools.

The study has found that there is no direct interaction between school proprietors and SBs in the schools under this study. It has been established that conflicts exist between school proprietors and SBs owing to ownership power abuse and misinformation on who owns schools. Kipkemboi and Kipruto (2013) also reveal that there were conflicts in the relationship between sponsors and managements in sponsored schools in Kenya. The only difference is that the factors that contributed to the conflicts in their study were religious differences, academic performance, funds embezzlement, and favouritism executed by some school administrators. Regina and Wanyanyi (2012) contend that conflicts and divisions that exist in some sponsored schools are a clear indication that school sponsors continue to meddle in school matters. In the current study, the SBs seem to be struggling to assume full control of governance in church-owned schools.

It is established that at times proprietors nominated people to SB who were going to perpetuate proprietors' emotional motives in schools, for example, ensuring that other stakeholders were always reminded that the school belonged to his/her church and no

one else's. Such nomination was not based on competence and knowledge that the nominee might have. The finding concurs with the study of Mabeya et al. (2010:36) who found that some school sponsors manipulate the selection of the BoG members who fail to perform their expected roles.

The study has also revealed that the relationship between proprietors and SB was strained by misinformation as to who owned the school. The study confirms what Khama (2000) once stated saying there was no mutual trust in the church and government partnership in Lesotho. That mistrust is witnessed today between proprietors and SBs in schools. It has transpired that another cause for poor relationship between proprietors and SBs is lack of respect for responsibility boundaries. Conversely, another important discovery is that the proprietorship-SBs relationship has also brought about positive results that lead to efficient and effective fulfilment of proprietorship mandate. This finding is in agreement with Mijungu (2015:48) where he reported about sponsor expectations in Migori County in Kenya. According to Mijungu, sponsor expectations were of better administration that would yield good performance in national examinations.

Further analysis of these findings shows that in actual fact there are many incidents of unhealthy relationship between proprietors and SBs in schools under this study. The participants who expressed harmony and conduciveness in this relationship are few. The researcher argues that the positivity or harmony claimed to be existent in the relationship between the two bodies is contingent and temporary.

4.4.3 Theme 3: How school proprietors influence the roles and responsibilities of the SBs

This theme reports on the participants' views on how school proprietors influence the roles and responsibilities of the SBs. The participants were asked the following questions:

- Does the school proprietor have influence on the SB's roles and responsibilities in your school(s)?
- What areas of governance/management attract a lot of influence?

- In what ways does the school proprietor of your school influence your SB's roles and responsibilities?

This section is made up of three sub-themes which are aligned with the sub-questions.

The sub-themes include the following:

- Promoting and maintaining religious values and morals.
- School proprietors influencing the operations.
- Areas that attract school proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of SBs.

Under the first sub-theme, the following factors are discussed:

- School proprietors' influence in promoting their own values and morals.
- Their (school proprietors') influence in maintaining their religious faith and identity.
- Their influence on religious/spiritual issues.

Factors that will be dealt with under the second sub-theme are

- School proprietors giving directives of how certain things need to be done.
- The positive influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SB.

The third sub-theme addresses proprietors' influence on the following factors:

- Curriculum issues
- Academic performance
- School culture and climate
- Recruitment of personnel
- School finances
- School buildings and properties

4.4.3.1 School proprietor influence in promoting their own religious values and morals

In this study, the responses of the participants suggested that the school proprietors were determined to maintain their religious faith and identity and had varied ways of influencing the activities in the school to uphold their faith. Principal C felt strongly that school proprietors did influence how things were done in schools by ensuring that their church values were observed. She/he believed that the said values were upheld even when they contradicted with the national education policies. Principal C made the following submission:

And sometimes..., I am not happy to say this thing but it happens. Sometimes the influence of the proprietor clashes with the influence of the policy-maker, which is the government. For example, government policy says 'education for all'. Only that sentence says a lot. It means even if my child is pregnant, she has to come to school. Our proprietors here have their own values, which sometimes clash with the policy of the bigger policy holder, which is the government. (Principal C)

One of the teachers' opinions was that school proprietors' influence came in the form of maintaining their religious faith and identity in their (proprietors') schools. She/he said regardless of one's denomination or belief, working at her/his school would make an employee feel that she/he was working in a school that cherished a certain faith and identity. The situation set would coerce an employee to follow whatever trend set in the school. Teacher representative B had this to say:

Besides the fact that I am an Adventist myself, even if I were someone belonging to another denomination, if you are working here you are given a situation where you must feel that you are working in an Adventist institution. So, if you get a certain position like that of a Board member, surely in the Board you are going to drive their agenda more than any other thing. (Teacher rep B)

Educational secretaries shared the same view that their influence was based on ensuring that religion was taught in their schools. Educational secretary 2 went on to say teaching religion in their schools would help in producing people whose conscience(s) were founded in the knowledge of God. In her/his own words, Educational secretary 2 said:

Now the influence, as you ask, of the proprietor in the governance and management of schools is so crucial. It is crucial in the sense that, in fact, when

the schools were established in this country it was for the purpose of making these Basotho people, people who will know God. After the knowledge of God they would be able to be ruled; they are rutable; they are people who abide by the law. Those churches are there to make sure that the children in the schools as they are taught all these other things but also they are taught religion.
(Educational secretary 2)

Parents who are SB members in this study perceived the proprietors' influence from a slightly different point of view. According to the parents, school proprietors' influence on SBs' roles and responsibilities came as a result of proprietors trying to dictate to their employees on how they should dress as a matter of religion. Parent representative B narrated:

I am saying that the influence is there because most of the time at our school the expectation is that the school must not be run outside the parameters of the law of the church. That means teachers and students should all the time do things that align with the church's faith and practices. For example, as a parent I have noticed that I am the only one who wears earrings in the SB meetings and in other gatherings where we meet with teachers. No one wears them except those who come from outside (parents' representatives from other denominational churches). (Parent rep B)

Parent representative C had a feeling that proprietors had influence even in the way their employees and learners should pray and sing. She/he said:

Yes, the proprietor has a big influence in that even the way of prayer and the way of singing hymns; they try by all means to ensure that they draw a difference between their school and the rest of other schools from different denominations.
(Parent rep C)

In addition to the two points discussed in the preceding paragraphs, there was also a feeling that school proprietors in School B had influence on what kind of food to eat in their schools. Parent representative B presented her/his view in the following manner:

True enough I know the school belongs to Seventh Day Adventist but so far when we meet in our meetings there is a church representative. You will find that, I

remember when we discussed the issue of opening a tuck-shop for fund-raising after it was requested by the principal; the principal had suggested fat cakes and sausages (also known as russians) among items to be sold. They right away queried the selling of 'russians' because they said it violates their belief because of the ingredients used in the production of 'russians'. So, that is why I am saying there is a great influence because from time to time the proprietor would like to know what is happening in the school. (Parent rep B)

With regards to the aspect of spirituality, Principal B said school proprietors in her school ensured that every person's spiritual life was stimulated and perpetuated. In her/his own words, Principal B made the following submission:

Spirituality: because it is a church school. They want to make sure that everyone's spiritual aspect is vibrant. It is their responsibility; they want to be sure of what's going on. (Principal B)

This sub-section has revealed that school proprietors influence SBs' roles in various ways. Firstly, their influence comes in the form of endless effort to promote church values and morals in their schools. This shows that the priority of the proprietors is to use schools as a vehicle for sustaining their religious beliefs through passing it down to generations. The role of the SBs, therefore, is influenced to uphold certain values and morals, religious faith and identity and spiritual issues even if they contradict the expectation of the national education policies and statutes. The expectations of the school proprietors and the Department of Education when not aligned seem to create a dual role for the SB, which at times may be contradictory and confusing. It raises an issue of loyalty to the proprietors or to the Department of Education.

This sub-theme has established that school proprietors influence SBs' roles and responsibilities by ensuring that their religious values and morals are promoted and maintained in their schools. This confirms what is happening in sponsored schools in Kenya. According to Njeru (2013), the sponsor in Kenya is entrusted with the freedom of promoting his religious traditions and faith in the sponsored institution. Furthermore, Njeru (2013) reports that this is done through teaching Christian religious education, pastoral programme and pastoral worship. In an earlier study, Kerre and Gichaga (1997) revealed that the role of church sponsors was to ensure that the religious traditions of

the founders were maintained. This clearly defines the main purpose of the schools as perceived by the proprietors.

4.4.3.2 School proprietor influences the operations in the school

This sub-theme explores participants' views on how school proprietors in church-owned schools influence school operations. The researcher identified the influence as (a) giving directives of how certain things needed to be done; and (b) through giving the SB the mandate to work on as they wish. The two views are going to be discussed further in the following paragraphs.

The teachers' representatives who took part in this study believed that school proprietors influenced SBs in their schools through giving them directives on how certain things should be done. They posited that educational secretaries, working on behalf of proprietors, gave instructions to SBs as though they were instructing a minor or somebody who did not possess any authority in the school. Teachers' representative A made the following observation:

I now realise they have influence because while the SB is using relevant legislation to guide their operations, they still receive directives/influence from the proprietor from time to time. ... This creates a situation whereby an education secretary would be instructing the SB to do things in a certain way, just like a teacher gives instructions to students. (Teacher rep A)

Teachers' representative B supported the sentiment that proprietors gave directives on how their schools should be managed on a day-to-day basis. He went on to say, proprietors had drawn lines of demarcation within which SBs must operate. Teachers' representative B expressed his views as follows:

I think they do have influence based on how they want their school to be run. When one is in the Board, they have drawn parameters/rails and they expect one to move along those rails with a bit of expansion on an idea or strategy but the baseline has already been provided by them (proprietor). The decisions that one makes are in part based on how they (proprietor) perceive the situation. (Teacher rep B)

Other teacher participants believed that proprietors gave directives or instructions to the SBs and expected them to perform within drawn parameters; parents' representative A held a different view. She/he admitted that at times the proprietor did tell them (SB) what to do but they never complied because they were aware of the legislation that governed their operations and they followed it. She/he presented her/his views in the following manner:

No, he has never passed a decision to us. Nonetheless, there are a few cases where he would tell us that we must do this and that. Anyway, I have seen that our Board is not easily swayed because before they could consider whatever comes from the office of the educational secretary; they familiarise themselves with the contents of the law. We actually check if whatever we are told to do is in line with the law. (Parent rep A)

Another important aspect of the interview was how the proprietors ensured that their directives or instructions reached the SBs in their schools? The participants who answered in proposition said proprietors' directives were passed through distributed manuals, meetings with the SBs and physical visits to schools. Teachers' representative B said:

Most of the time, they give us manuals that guide us as the Board, showing us lines we must work within. Other than that, they hold meetings through which they try to drive their own mandate. They come physically to our school to communicate whatever intentions they have about this school. (Teacher rep B)

Educational secretary 2 said their influence was passed on to SBs through holding sessions with teachers and through holding workshops for both teachers and SBs. In her/his own words, she/he said:

Some things that we do as school proprietors, we hold sessions where we advise teachers on the do's and don'ts in the teaching fraternity. We tell them, please, be disciplined. We workshop them on the best performances in the teaching profession for the good performance of a school. We workshop teachers, we workshop the SB. (Educational secretary 2)

Another important element observed under this sub-theme was the proprietor simply giving his mandate to the SB members to implement at their own discretion. SB chairperson B made the following submission:

I don't think so. When I say I don't think so is because since I became a member of the Board, the proprietor has never called me to say 'do this' or 'do that'. I am just given a mandate and that's it. How we achieve that is left to the Board because it was made clear to the Board, this is the direction we want to go. (SB chairperson B)

Educational secretary 1 shared the view that their influence in schools was positive in nature. Their work was to support SBs to ensure proper governance and management in schools. They identified areas that posed challenge to SBs and sought means to empower SBs in those areas. Educational secretary 1 aired his view like this:

The proprietor influences the SB to ensure that the school under their governance is running smoothly. Their (proprietor) work is to offer training, to help the SB with managerial skills. In fact, the school proprietor identifies areas where SB is lacking in and capacitates them with trainings. (Educational secretary 1)

When the proprietor gives directives on how certain things should be done in schools, there is likelihood that SBs are, more often than not, feeling undermined in their ability and authority to govern school activities. Because of this, SBs find themselves in a position where their power and authority to govern the school is limited. They simply take orders without much discussion or negotiation of what they think is best for the school. This leaves SBs in a state where they do not have a final say in the way their schools are governed and this may lead to compromised independence and autonomy of SBs in schools.

Looking at the positive influence alluded to earlier, this may be necessitated by one thing. There could be a possibility that the proprietors have realised some shortcomings or weaknesses in some members of the SB and feel obliged to give directives to achieve the set goals for their schools. For example, the Lesotho Education Act of 2010 does not state a minimum qualification requirement for a person to be a member of a SB. This may lead to a SB consisting of members who are all not competent and conversant with governance and management matters. On account of this, the school

proprietors may find themselves duty-bound to seek ways to capacitate SB members in their schools; otherwise, they would be risking imminent downfall of their schools.

Under this sub-theme, it is revealed that proprietors' influence on SBs' roles and responsibilities is through proprietors giving directives of how certain things should be done and some of those directives may not be easy to obey. This supports Makokha's (2002) view that the rules of religious sponsorship are too difficult to follow. This creates a situation where SBs find themselves resisting proprietors' orders and developing a hostile attitude towards proprietors. The current study also noted that some proprietors just give a mandate to SBs and let SBs to seek appropriate ways of executing their mandate without any prescription. Proprietors have also identified areas that pose challenges in governance and management in schools and engage in capacity building trainings. This is in line with Reginah and Wanyonyi's (2012:785) findings that indicated the expectation that the school sponsor should ensure that the school environment is conducive for teaching and learning by creating a school culture and climate that support all the stakeholders.

4.4.3.3 Areas that attract school proprietors influence on the roles and responsibilities of SBs

This sub-theme examined participants' perceptions on areas that attract school proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs. The responses to this question showed that proprietors focused on curriculum, recruitment of personnel and school buildings and properties. The proprietors were also attracted to academic performance, school culture, school climate and school finances. These areas are discussed in detail in the following paragraphs.

The participants believed that the first area that attracted the most influence was the curriculum. They said proprietors would always want to ensure that religion was taught in their schools. They wanted it not only taught but to be part of the subjects offered at school. Teachers' representative B made the following assertion:

The first area is curriculum, especially Religious Studies as a subject. They want Religious Studies taught against all odds. (Teacher rep B)

Principal A reiterated the same feeling that proprietors kept a close eye in ensuring that religion was taught in their schools. She/he made the following submission:

Curriculum: Because they want religion to be taught in their schools in order to prepare learners for church practices and maintain religion of the school.
(Principal A)

Much as other participants also shared the same view that proprietors concentrated more on the curriculum, they held differing views in the issue of making Religious Studies compulsory in school curriculum. Others said much as proprietors wanted schools to have children with a sound background in religion, they did not force schools to offer Religious Studies as a subject. Principal C said:

They are not putting it as an imperative option that we should teach Religious Studies but they are just encouraging. Since it is a church school, they want learners who are moulded in that way, know the Bible and certain values. They are encouraging that the subject should be there but there are still some other LECSA schools which do not offer Religious Studies because I have not heard them outspoken about that, they are just encouraging. (Principal C)

The study has established that proprietors do not only look at Religious Studies as a subject when dealing with curriculum issues in schools. They also make critical decisions on what form of curriculum each school should offer. They tell schools to produce learners equipped in a certain learning field. Principal C made the following submission in this regard:

Sometimes you will find that proprietor wants the school to produce learners who are equipped in certain fields. Let's say in the commercials, they come and tell us that these commercial subjects are compulsory here. Like ours, we are inclined to sciences and we have made them compulsory. Even this one which is optional, Biology, here is not optional because we want to produce a scientist in totality. (Principal C)

Other participants believed the main reason for proprietorship influence in their schools was to ensure that schools were performing well academically. They said proprietors took pride from well performing schools. They wanted to do all in their power to help schools to obtain good academic results at the end of the year. Principal B presented her/his view in the following manner:

Performance: Our school represents the church, so the results matter very much. When results are bad, everybody fumes. That is the key factor that they are looking into. Even the leader (principal) who is leading here sees to it that he/she is influencing this area. When performance is bad even support goes, people are just thinking you are there to make students fail. (Principal B)

Educational secretaries were also of the opinion that the proprietors were interested in academic performance and paid attention to it. The academic performance seemed to be a yardstick through which proprietors and other stakeholders measured their success and growth compared to other schools under different proprietorship. Educational secretary 1 made the following assertion:

Another area that attracts influence is academic performance. The proprietor would always want to know how his/her schools are performing compared to national performance and performance from other proprietors' schools. (Educational secretary 1)

With regard to school culture and climate, some participants felt very strongly that proprietors' influence was noticeable because proprietors would like to uphold and maintain their schools' culture and climate. This suggests that whatever proprietors do in their schools, including hiring of principals, was aimed at keeping and enhancing the already existing culture and climate of the school. Principal A aired her/his opinion as follows:

Another influence is in recruitment of leadership: It is still about religion because they want to employ someone who will be able to promote the church's belief and practices. (Principal A)

Parents' representative A concurred with the above view, and continued to cite a specific example of a church practice that was observed on monthly basis in her school. Parents' representative A made this claim:

And for that matter the school considers an individual's church denomination or religion; all learners do it as a subject. To support this, there is what we call 'holy Friday' in the Roman Catholic Church. This is the first Friday of the month where

we expect everybody to attend a church service because the proprietor (the Bishop) assigns a priest to administer that service. (Parent rep A)

Hiring 'proper' leadership seemed to be perceived to be one way that enabled the maintenance of existing school culture and climate. Some participants believed that this matter did not only affect leadership, it also affected teachers. Teachers, just like principals, were entrusted to uphold the school's culture and climate and, therefore, they found themselves forced to support leadership in this regard. Parents' representative B made the following statement:

Other than that, I have realised that even teachers who do not belong to the school's denominational church are made to practise and follow traditions of this church. (Parent rep B)

Educational secretaries supported the perception held by other participants on this matter. Educational secretary 1 argued as follows:

Proprietor wants to ensure that people employed to work at his school will pursue church ethos. Working relations become warm and harmonious when you work with people who share the same religion with you. (Educational secretary 1)

The majority of participants mentioned recruitment of personnel, particularly academic staff, as another area that attracted an overwhelming influence from proprietors. According to participants, proprietors would always want to employ teachers who religiously belong to their church denominations. They would pursue that even when it was clear that a candidate from their church did not have suitable credentials. They would do this cognisant of the fact that they contravened certain clauses and articles of the national policies and laws that governed recruitment and employment procedures in schools. Principal C made the following observation:

Sometimes when we hire teachers, the proprietor would like teachers who are hired to be of the church, church members, so that they would improve the church because they would have input in the church. They will attend the church and be very strong members and teachers. Sometimes you find that you don't find a suitable candidate like that (who is a church member)... And you look at our constitution, it is totally against that. It will be saying you are discriminating if

you say somebody belongs to a certain church, then you can't employ even if he/she qualifies and has passed the interview. (Principal C)

Parents' representatives shared the above opinion. According to them, proprietors' stance on recruitment became even tougher when a selection process involved appointment of a school principal. Proprietors were said to be monitoring recruitment processes more closely to ensure that their preferred candidates managed their schools. Parents' representative A posited:

I would further say, even in the selection of a school principal, the proprietor is clear that whoever is selected must be someone belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. We are not supposed to employ a person from any church to that position, even if he/she is a Christian. The proprietor's eye is fixed on that, there is no way he can miss that. (Parent rep A)

School finances were another area that was believed to be attracting more influence from proprietors. From the collected data, it was observed that there were two reasons that led to proprietors' influence in this area. The first one was said to be the eagerness of the proprietor to ensure that school finances were well managed. Principal A put her/his view as follows:

Finances: they want to see whether finances are run properly. (Principal A)

The second reason was depicted from Principal C's answer. Principal C put an emphasis on the point that proprietors would always want to ensure that school funds were well spent and accounted for. She/he made the following remarks:

Really, when it comes to funds, they are so particular. I think it is natural. People when there is money somewhere everyone wants to know about it. Even when you are delivering a report as a principal, they may sleep while you are reading other things but when you come to the money issue, everyone becomes awake. (Principal C)

Educational secretaries who took part in this study held differing views on this issue. Educational secretary 1 denied that finances attract their influence in the SBs' roles and responsibilities. This is what she/he said:

Finances do not attract influence because the proprietor does not collect money from schools. (Educational secretary 1)

Nonetheless, Educational secretary 2 believed that finances attract influence from proprietorship. This is how she/he substantiated her/his view:

Of course, finances attract influence. Like I said, you are not going to say you have full management of any entity if you are not able to manage the finances of that institution because you will plan things and when it comes to financing them you will struggle because the other one who will be managing the finances will say, 'No, I am not ready to finance that proposal of yours.' (Educational secretary 2)

According to collected data, another reason for proprietors' influence on school finances is mismanagement of funds by proprietors themselves. Parents' representative A made the following statement:

When you are a member of the School Board here, you will notice there are some bank accounts that clearly belong to the school. One of them we are told belongs to the school but someone who has access and control over it is the school proprietor as the school belongs directly to the church. There is an account that is controlled by the church, but the account itself bears the school name. (Parent rep A)

Apart from finances, another area that was said to be attracting influence from proprietors was school buildings and equipment. From the interviews, it became clear that in some schools, proprietors still had direct control over some buildings and properties that were found on school compound. The proprietor, not the SB, completely and directly managed such buildings and properties. Parents' representative A presented her/his views as follows:

What we are told is that the buildings do not fall under the school; they belong to the church. There are buildings here that you will find they are occupied by a priest and nuns. When they (priest and nuns) have left the buildings, you will find them occupied by ordinary people who did not seek [the] Board's permission.

When you inquire, you will be told that that area is under the church's prerogative [jurisdiction]. (Parent rep A)

From the finding presented above, it shows that there are several areas of governance and management that are directly influenced by proprietors. Moreover, this finding suggests that the autonomy, power and authority of the appointed governing body (SB) in this school(s) is limited. The proprietors in this incident seem to influence and dictate how governance and management issues should be handled in that particular school. Furthermore, emphasis on a particular religious culture and practices may violate religious freedoms and rights of other stakeholders such as teachers and learners. Furthermore, the recruitment processes also appear to be characterised by discrimination based on the preferences of the proprietors. A positive influence seems to come from the proprietors' financial management practices, which help to reduce financial malpractices or mismanagement of funds by the SBs. This further shows proprietors' lack of trust on SBs' capacity to manage and account for the financial expenditures as part of their responsibilities.

The sub-theme identified curriculum issues, academic performance, school culture and climate, recruitment of personnel, school finances and school buildings and properties as areas that attract influence from proprietors. This finding can be compared to the findings in Kenya where literature shows that sponsors participate in the following areas: appointment processes of head teachers; use of infrastructure and assets; curriculum implementation; school business, such as, meddling and destabilising instructional activities of the school system; admission of students (Kipkemboi & Kipruto, 2013; Mabeya et al., 2010; Onderi & Makori, 2013). Although the reviewed literature does not explicitly underscore that these areas attract influence from sponsors in Kenya, one has noted that many studies conducted in Kenya reveal informants' discontent about what they call meddling on the part of sponsors. This meddling and interference result in conflicts between sponsors and management in various schools (Kipkemboi & Kipruto, 2013; Mabeya et al. 2010; Onderi & Makori, 2013). However, the scenario is different in Lesotho. School finances seem to be attracting proprietors' influence while in Kenya, from the reviewed literature, that is not the case. A deeper examination of this finding shows that proprietors of the schools under this study influence all role areas of SBs. The fact that there is no single area that SBs perform without proprietors' influence gives

the researcher an impression that proprietorship influence on SBs' roles in these schools is indeed enormous as purported by Principal C. This is also supported by a claim made earlier on that educational secretaries or proprietors treated SBs like people who did not have legal authority to run schools for which they were chosen. They (educational secretaries/proprietors) tossed the SBs around just like a teacher is giving instructions to learners as Teachers' representative A bluntly put it.

4.4.4 Theme 4: The effect of the influence of proprietor on the performance of SBs

This theme explored participants' perceptions on the effects of the influence of proprietors on the performance of SBs. The participants' views were raised in an attempt to answer the following question: What effect does the proprietors' influence have on your performance as a member of the SB?

This part is made up of three sub-themes:

- Effects on behaviour of SB members.
- Effects on the expectations of school proprietors on SB members.
- Support and guidance.

Under the first sub-theme, the following factors are examined:

- Guarding against unethical behaviour.
- Protecting the reputation of the principal.
- Encouraging commitment to hard work.

Under the second sub-theme only one factor will be discussed which is: conflicting expectations in carrying out expected roles and responsibilities. The third sub-theme also presents only one factor to be discussed and, that is, giving support and advice. The following paragraphs present discussions on the stated sub-themes and their relevant factors.

4.4.4.1 Effect on behaviour of SB members

In the current study, some principals held the view that proprietors' influence was of great help in their schools because it was guarding against unethical behaviour from different stakeholders. Principal B made this submission:

I think by now if it was not because of that influence, I could have been destroyed. For example, there was a meeting held by the proprietor where somebody just stood and said to me as the principal I can sign M80,000.00 cheque on my own and I am the only signatory. He said I have never seen that kind of corruption and it was a lie. So, if it was not because of the president's support, I would have been destroyed. (Principal B)

The proprietors' influence was also seen as of good effect in that it helped in protecting the image and reputation of the school principal. As a result, it enabled principals to perform their duties with confidence. Principal B asserted:

Some were even saying that I behave as if this place is mine. I don't allow church people to come here and the president stood up in that meeting and said I have always been coming to this school; I have never been chased away here. So, I think that kind of positive influence is key to the function of the principal. So I have confidence; I work in my school; I know there is somebody who supports me. I don't know if there will be another Pharaoh who would come and behave otherwise, but at the moment I am happy. (Principal B)

Another positive aspect about proprietors' influence, according to some participants, was that it encouraged commitment to hard work among the principal and his/her team. It was actually viewed as some form of motivation to staff members at large. Principal C made the following comment:

It has a big effect because you will have to work hard if you see your boss wants to see performance indicators. What do you have to show that you are there? People are working hard. (Principal C)

Principal C further commented that commitment to hard work could also be witnessed in the performance of the SB. The SB performance was high because they (SB) knew that the proprietor was keeping a close eye on their work. This is what she/he said:

If the school proprietor was not eager to see to it that his/her school is performing well, the SB would be just relaxed. The SB knows its responsibilities and they are ready to execute them each time they have to because the proprietor is serious about what he/she wants and needs; asking what about my school, I am concerned. So, the SB has to stand on its toes. (Principal C)

The findings in this section show that some participants perceived the presence and influence of the proprietors as a source of security and strength with regard to keeping up academic performance and standards. The image of the school seems to be a reflection of the faith and religious practices of the proprietors and the school community is expected to be part of the same faith and culture.

The researcher observes that if the relationship between the two bodies is well managed, it can be beneficial to both governance and management in schools. However, since this is an unequal relationship, the researcher feels strongly that unless there are checks and balances put in place, the bigger partner (proprietors) is likely to bully the smaller partner (SBs). In the interest of growth and development in secondary schools, there is a need to encourage and maintain healthy relationship between the two bodies.

4.4.4.2 Effect of the expectations of school proprietor on SB members

This sub-theme examined participants' views on the effects of proprietors' expectations on SB members. The sub-theme is informed by Mijungu's (2015:17) study, which declares that sponsors' expectations on teachers, students and the school operations in Migori County in Kenya are of positive effect, especially in relation to academic performance. Contrary to Mijungu's (2015) assertion, the effect of proprietors' expectations on SBs' roles and responsibilities in Maseru, Lesotho, reflects a negative bearing on the performance of SBs.

This study has established that proprietors' expectations on SB members brought about conflicting expectations in carrying out expected roles and responsibilities. Some principals believed it affected the SB's performance negatively in that it caused misunderstanding and divisions among SB members. Principal A said:

The school proprietor's influence has effect on the SB performance. Sometimes SB members become divided on certain issues once they know they come as

directives from the proprietor. It takes them time to reach consensus on those issues. It causes misunderstanding and divisions among the SB members.
(Principal A)

Teachers' representatives shared the above sentiment that proprietors' expectations on how they should perform their duties had negative bearing on their performance. They perceived this as something that created confusion in their work and resulted in members who became resistant to directives from the proprietor. This situation eventually gave birth to sour working relationships between the employees in the SB and the proprietor. Teachers' representative A presented her/his opinion as follows:

The effect it has is that one finds himself/herself in the middle, not knowing what to do. You feel you are very close to this person (proprietor), at the same time there is legislation on the other side. At the end, you find yourself in the middle and that makes you appear like you are stubborn and if you don't take instructions from your boss, you are not safe at all. Unsafe because it threatens my employment in that when my school proprietor is of a view that I am not serving his/her interests as the owner of the school he/she might transfer or terminate my contract. (Teacher rep A)

Parents' representatives believed this matter posed a challenge to the morale levels of the SB. It created a situation where the SB members and proprietors found themselves holding conflicting views on certain issues. Parents' representative B claimed:

It creates a problem where we as the school governors hold a certain view on a matter; for instance, that of disciplinary measures against a teacher, then he (proprietor) comes and presents a differing opinion. That affects our morale negatively but we talk and advise one another and carry on with our duty. (Parent rep B)

Parents' representative A concurred that proprietors' expectations on the roles of SBs brought more harm than good in relation to school buildings' management. Sometimes there was a conflict between the two parties as to who possessed authority to manage the school's residential houses. Parents' representative A made the following submission:

We are also encountering problems [when] coming to buildings that are controlled by the church. We would also like to evacuate a certain teacher from school houses because they leave the place of work during the day to have a day rest. We are unable to take him/her out of the house because he/she will be saying he/she got permission to stay in the house from the highest authority in the church or the proprietor. It is difficult in that case; it affects our performance negatively. (Parent rep A)

One thing that becomes very clear about the findings of this sub-theme is that the expectations of proprietors on SB members have a negative bearing on the performance of the SBs in general. The expectations normally conflict with what the SB members perceive to be their roles and responsibilities. This results in the following challenges: (a) misunderstanding and divisions among SB members; (b) confusion that causes SB members to become resistant to proprietors; (c) deflation of SB morale; and (d) conflict between proprietors and SB members as to who has authority to manage school buildings. This implies that proprietors' expectations in this regard are inconsistent with what SB members perceive to be their roles and responsibilities according to the law. In this case, proprietors need to ensure that their expectations fall within the boundaries of their roles and should always try to work in consultation with the SBs. If this challenge remains unresolved, more conflicts should be expected between proprietors and SBs.

The proprietors' expectations on SB members are seen as creating a fertile environment for proprietors to overstep SB roles and responsibilities in schools. If proprietors do not exercise restraint in this matter, they are likely to witness hostility from SBs to the detriment of good governance and management in their schools.

4.4.4.3 Support and guidance

This sub-theme has discovered that another effect of proprietors' influence is its ability to give support and advice to SB members. According to some SB members, proprietors' influence helped them in that it gave them direction to follow in their work as SB members. Once the direction was set and well-articulated, the SBs were able to follow and work towards its fulfilment. Teachers' representative B expressed her/his thoughts like this:

It helps me a lot because I am able to know which direction to take. If you give me direction, it's easier for me to come up with ways of how to get there. If they have given us mandate, manuals and trained us in workshops; it's easier to say, okay! They say I should go over this mountain to a place called Katlehong within a specified time. To me it becomes easier to come up with strategies that will help me reach there on time. (Teacher rep B)

SB chairperson B echoed the above feeling that proprietors' influence was positive in nature. In short, he said he liked such influence because it served as a guide and advice to him. They were helping him to always stay focused. He/she explained as follows:

It has a very positive effect. We work with education sector. We report to him (proprietor); it is my duty to report to him that we have decided to do that and that. And he gives me counsel and he directs, 'May be if you do it this way, it will be better and all those.' So, such influences to me are very good because I think at the end of the day we have to stay on track. And to stay on track would mean, I don't know how you say it in Sesotho but in my language we say "a person who is cutting the path never knows if the path is getting crooked behind him, someone must always say from behind 'hey! The route is not straight!'"'. I take that with all the positive mentality that is required. (SB chairperson B)

Educational secretary 2 felt very strongly that it was part of their work to give support and advice to SB members in their schools. He said that they equipped SB members with the necessary knowledge and skills through various ways of training with the sole purpose of helping them to improve their performance. He/she aired his/her views like this:

Like I talked about the workshops which we hold for the SBs to help them perform, we hold meetings especially when a SB is newly appointed. Then we show them all they have to know in terms of their functions. That is actually trying to help them perform to their best, because if they mishandle issues, then we feel we are to blame. On many occasions SBs have underperformed and we have always found that we were to blame for having not workshopped them. (Educational secretary 2)

The findings in this section reveal that the effect of proprietors' influence in this area is positive. This type of influence is deemed helpful and it is felt it must be on-going. However, this situation raises some concerns about the understanding of governance in schools. Globally, one of the major roles of the SBs is to set direction for the school under their governance (ACT Government, 2015; UK Department of Education, 2012). This entails developing a mission statement for the school and its vision (Marais & Meier, 2012:59). Now, in principle, if proprietors are the ones mapping direction and giving mandate to schools, this implies that SBs in some schools in this study are not aware of this major role. By giving direction to SBs, proprietors could be misconstrued to be crossing responsibilities' boundaries.

4.4.5 Theme 5: Factors that contribute to the proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs

This theme examined participants' views on factors that contribute to the proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs. The participants addressed themselves to the following question: In your view, what factors contribute to the school proprietors' influence on your roles and responsibilities as members of the SB?

The theme consists of two sub-themes:

- Sense of ownership
- Goals and objectives of proprietor

The first sub-theme looks into the two following factors:

- Ownership of the school
- Uncertainty of the roles and responsibilities of SBs

The second sub-theme deals with other two factors, namely:

- Promoting the set objectives of the proprietors
- Striving for excellence

The following paragraphs display a detailed discussion on the said sub-themes and their highlighted factors.

4.3.5.1 Sense of ownership

The current study has established that ownership of the schools is the main factor that contributes to the proprietors' influence on SB's roles and responsibilities in church-owned secondary schools. Some participants, particularly principals, believed that if it were not for the sense of ownership that proprietors had, they would not experience that influence in their roles and responsibilities. Principal A commented as follows:

One factor is that they influence because they are owners of the school. They feel they have to take part in the governance and management of the school. They come because they feel it has been long since they last came to monitor how things are being done. (Principal A)

Principal C fully supported the above claim. She/he emphasised that there could be no other factor for this influence except ownership. This is what she/he said:

It is about sense of ownership. If your own thing fails, it means you as an institution you are a failure. There is no other thing. There is no profit, there is nothing! These schools do not bring profits to churches, but it is only about that sense of ownership. (Principal C)

The above verbatim quote highlighted another important point. That was, people take pride from the success of whatever they own. The SB chairperson B in his answer reiterated this when she/he said:

The first one is ownership. When you own something, you have to make sure that it is operating well. (SB chairperson B)

Another contributing factor to proprietors' influence was said to be uncertainty of the roles and responsibilities of SBs. If SBs are not aware about their roles and responsibilities, the proprietors feel duty bound to influence in that situation. Teachers' representative A conceded:

Another factor could be the SB of my school is not clear about their roles and responsibilities. That is so because even I, as a member, am not clear about my roles and responsibilities. Anyway, because some of them had been serving in the SB before me, maybe they were trained at some stage. But to my observation, they are ignorant about their roles and responsibilities. (Teacher rep A)

The first finding here is that proprietors go to schools to influence because they have sense of ownership and this makes them feel obliged to ensure that their schools do not collapse in the hands of SBs. After further examination of this, the researcher feels obliged to share this notion. The fact that proprietors own the schools, they just cannot turn a blind eye on them. This means regardless of whether the SBs are performing or underperforming, it is only natural that the owners will always want to keep a closer eye on the SBs' operations.

The second finding is that SB members are ignorant about their roles and responsibilities as a governing body of the school. This makes proprietors to do away with complacency; they go to schools as a way of ensuring that there is proper governance and management in their schools. This suggests that there is no guideline or policy that specifically addresses the expectation of the school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of SBs in church-owned schools. Such gaps necessitate the proprietors' closer monitoring of the work done by SBs.

4.4.5.2 Goals and objectives of the proprietor

The study has found that promoting the set objectives of the proprietors is another factor that contributes toward proprietors' influence. Some participants said the very purpose and objective that proprietor had when he/she established an institution was the main reason for him/her to influence SB's roles and responsibilities so that they were aligned with the main purpose. Teachers' representative B made the following submission:

When they established this school, they already had objectives...The world to come is after the coming of Jesus Christ. That is why I am saying they have an objective which they set from the onset. They said one way in which we can reach to people is by having an institution and governing it our way. So, we as the Board, we execute their objective and plan, that is why you find that they become unhappy if the Board spends a long period without meeting some of their religious expectations, but when they are fulfilled they become quite happy.
(Teachers' rep B)

Educational secretary 1 concurred with what Teachers' representative B said. He/she was very specific and brief in his response about proprietors' goal and objective in church-owned schools. He/she said:

Proprietors want to see their religious ethos upheld in their schools. (Educational secretary 1)

Another factor that was said to be contributing toward the influence was striving for excellence. Some participants believed that schools were formed to excel in the work of grooming and moulding of children, so proprietors would always want to see things on track in that regard. Educational secretary 2 put it this way:

All you want is the best performance of the school. You want the school to be able to mould a child in a manner that will help him fit well in the community when they leave the school. After all that is the reason why the school was established. That is what will prompt us to want to make sure that the SB roles are performed well. (Educational secretary 2)

SB chairperson B reiterated the above sentiment when she/ he said:

The other factor is the zeal for excellence. We are surely guided by the zeal for excellence, not just for here but even for life to come. We are also guided by the fact that we believe that as Christians we must be good citizens. And good citizens should make a good contribution. (SB chairperson B)

The findings of this sub-theme revealed that two contributory factors led to proprietors' influence on SBs' roles and responsibilities. The first factor was their desire to see the school's objectives being met. This implies that proprietors are sceptical to leave SBs unattended, lest they consciously or unconsciously derail their school from its main purpose. Nonetheless, a deeper analysis of circumstances that prevailed in schools under investigation in this study would cast doubt on proprietors' awareness of their schools' goals and objectives. The researcher feels that the participants here once again made a superficial opinion. It is misleading to say proprietors influence SBs' roles because they are driven by schools' goals and objectives while such proprietors are not even aware of their schools' visions. The absence of vision suggests that there are no clear goals and objectives for such schools.

The second contributory factor was said to be striving for excellence. This means proprietors somehow doubt SB members' commitment towards production of quality results in their school. For a fact that some of them, in some cases majority, do not

belong to 'the rightful' denomination, they are probably perceived to be lacking love of their institution at heart. In short, it becomes difficult for proprietors to trust SB members governing their schools.

4.5 SUMMARY

This chapter concentrated on the findings and discussions of the findings based on the focus and scope of this study. The findings were arrived at based on data collected through semi-structured interviews, which some of them took place in three selected church-owned secondary schools while others were conducted at participants' homes. The main purpose of this study was to explore how school proprietors influence SBs' roles and responsibilities in church-owned secondary schools in Maseru. In an endeavour to achieve the said purpose, there were areas that served as a backbone, which could not be avoided in this chapter. These areas were looking into school proprietors' and SBs' roles and responsibilities; analysing relationships between school proprietors and SBs; assessing the effects of proprietorship influence on the performance of SBs; and determining factors that contributed to such influence. The findings displayed here and discussions thereof are summarised in the next chapter. That summary enabled the researcher to draw conclusions and make relevant recommendations.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter reported on the findings of this study. This chapter presents the summary of research findings, conclusions and recommendations. The purpose of the study was to explore school proprietorship's influence on the roles and responsibilities of SB members in church-owned secondary and high schools in Maseru, Lesotho. The study strove to achieve the objectives stated in chapter one. The collected data were analysed in line with the set purpose and objectives of the study. The data analysis made it possible for this chapter to draw conclusions and recommendations, which in turn gave way to suggestions for further research.

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This section presents a summary of findings discussed in the previous chapter of this study. The said findings are classified into five themes, which provide answers to the five main research questions of the study. In the following paragraphs, a summary of each theme is put forward and the researcher's personal opinion on each finding is expressed.

5.2.1 The roles and responsibilities of school proprietors and SBs

In this section, the findings reveal, on one hand, that school proprietors' roles and responsibilities are perceived to fall within the following categories: religious teaching of values and morals and holistic development of the learners. However, some participants doubted the existence of a formal documentation that stipulated the role of school proprietors in school management and governance. There were other views indicating that perhaps such document existed but some participants were ignorant about it or they were not aware of its contents. On the other hand, it has transpired that the SBs have numerous roles and responsibilities to perform in their schools. There is a general belief from the participants that SBs should manage human resource, school physical infrastructure, school funds, conduct of learners and teachers and policy

implementation. There are areas that only one group of participants mentioned as part of the functions of the SBs. For example, only parents held a view that the SBs have a role to play in academic performance of learners while the educational secretaries made a strong submission that SBs should take part in curriculum issues.

The researcher in this study would like to argue that what is perceived to be the roles of school proprietors might invite a plethora of debates from some stakeholders. While it is true that proprietors' work is to uphold the teaching of religious values and morals and to ensure that learners are groomed holistically, of late proprietors' focus has gradually drifted from that. More often than not, they find themselves paying more attention to governance and management activities in schools such as recruiting staff and managing school funds. This has created a situation where proprietors find themselves working against or inconsistently with the dictates of the law (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010).

5.2.2 The relationship between the school proprietors and the SBs with regards to school governance

The researcher in this study explored the relationship between the SBs and the school proprietors. The findings of this study show that different members of the SB seem to have different levels of interaction with the school proprietors. Some SB members experienced negative relationship with the proprietors while others described a harmonious relationship that is based on trust and respect. The negative aspects of the relationship included limited interaction; poor relationship due to abuse of ownership power; strained relationship caused by misinformation about who owns the schools; and unfriendly relationship caused by lack of respect for responsibility boundaries. Some of the participants talked of positive relationship although such cases were few. The experiences of positive relationship resulted in harmonious interaction, which led to efficient and effective execution of proprietors' mandate.

The researcher argues that the relationship between the SB and school proprietors in schools under this study is generally poor. This is supported by a number of factors discussed under this theme that are said to be contributing to the poor relationship between SBs and proprietors. A reader might think that this situation would apply only to schools whose principals do not belong to the proprietor's church. In response, the researcher would like to highlight the fact that all schools under this study were headed

by principals who belonged to the proprietor's church. Nonetheless, the study has revealed that the relationship between the two bodies is not good.

5.2.3 How school proprietors influence the roles and responsibilities of the SBs

The findings in this theme reveal the perception of the participants regarding how the school proprietors influence the roles and responsibilities of SBs. The school proprietors seem to be interested and focused on promoting and maintaining religious values and morals in their schools and ensured that they influence the running of the daily school activities to achieve their set objectives. The areas that attracted more influence were curriculum, academic performance, school's culture and climate, recruitment of staff, school finances, school buildings, and other properties. It was reported that the proprietors had strong influence on school culture including the hiring of a principal who could help them maintain the already existing school culture and climate. It was also reported that educational secretaries, working on behalf of proprietors, assumed certain powers and authority over the SBs and gave instructions as if they were more superior to the SBs in governance and management of schools. Owing to such power play, some of the SBs simply carried out instructions from the proprietors limiting their own authority and power to govern as stipulated in the legislation (Kingdom of Lesotho, 2010). The influence of the proprietors in some schools involved in this study seems to compromise the autonomy of SBs in governing their schools.

The researcher supports the perception that school proprietors influence SBs' roles and responsibilities by promoting and maintaining their religious values and morals. Conversely, one is inclined to refute the claim that proprietors influence the daily activities of schools in order to achieve their set objectives. Some schools under this study do not have well-articulated visions, goals and objectives but their proprietors never cease to influence SBs' roles and responsibilities in such schools. It is difficult to believe, therefore, that proprietors influence SBs' roles and responsibilities because they want their schools to meet their set goals and objectives. Of the three schools that participated in this study, only one school had a well-defined vision, goals and objectives.

5.2.4. The effect of the influence of proprietor on the performance of SBs

With regards to the perceptions of the participants on the effects of the influence of proprietors on the performance of SBs, the findings of this study revealed both positive and negative effect of the influence of the proprietors on SB performance. A group of participants believed that the influence of the school proprietor on the roles and responsibilities of SB resulted in reducing incidences of unethical behaviour of the SB members. The proprietors' influence was also seen as of good effect with regard to protecting the image and reputation of the school principal. The proprietors influence encouraged SB members to be committed to their work and collaborate as a team. The proprietors were also appreciated for their role in giving advice to the SB. Other participants perceived the influence of the school proprietors on the roles of the SBs as having a negative impact on school governance. They opined that the interference of the proprietors led to conflicting expectations on the function of the SB. There were experiences of misunderstanding of what should be done and divisions among the SB members. Other participants acknowledged positive as well as negative influence of the school proprietors on SBs.

The researcher contends that the influence is more likely to yield a negative impact than a positive one. Since the SBs in Lesotho are established by the Act and their duties are well defined in the Act, it will be difficult for proprietors to influence SBs' roles without encountering resistance and hostility from SB members. The situation will be worse when it involves especially those who are aware of the legislation that governs their participation in schools. To the researcher, the positive aspect of influence purported to be existent in this affair is short-lived. The SBs are likely to view proprietors' efforts in this regard as tantamount to meddling and interference in their lawful roles and responsibilities.

5.2.5. Factors that contribute to the proprietors' influence on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs

This study also reports on the views of SBs on factors that contribute to the proprietors' influence on their roles and responsibilities. The findings of this study show that factors which make the school proprietors interested in the work done by the SB are their position of ownership in church-owned schools and the desire to achieve their schools' set objectives and goals. Moreover, SB members who are ignorant about their roles and responsibilities of school governance further motivate the action of the proprietors.

There is also a gap in policy guidelines with regard to the role of school proprietors in church-owned school management and governance.

The researcher is inclined to concur that ownership is a factor for proprietors' influence while at the same time he would like to reiterate that he does not believe school's goals and objectives can be a factor in this influence. It is undisputable that proprietors influence SBs' roles because they (proprietors) have that sense of ownership. They own sites and buildings and they feel they somehow own even those who are placed there to govern and manage their schools. Therefore, it remains controversial to claim that schools set goals and objectives can prompt proprietors' influence on SBs' roles and responsibilities. It is argued that proprietors do influence and will continue to do so regardless of whether they are aware of their schools' set goals and objectives or not.

5.3 CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of the SBs in church-owned secondary/high schools in Maseru, Lesotho. It had transpired that proprietors' roles and responsibilities were to uphold their religious values and morals and to ensure holistic development of learners while SBs' roles were to manage staff recruitment, school physical infrastructure, school funds, conduct of learners and teachers, policy implementation, academic performance and curriculum issues. The message passed by this finding is that there must be a clear line of demarcation that separates proprietors' roles from SBs' roles and responsibilities in schools to avoid over-stepping of roles' limits or boundaries. The findings revealed that there was minimal interaction between proprietors and SBs and their relationship was susceptible to abuse of ownership power, misinformation about who own the schools and lack of respect for responsibility boundaries. What this finding suggests is that there is a need for proprietors and SBs to seek common ground in their operations and relationships. Failure to do so will make both groups to develop an element of mistrust that will hinder any efforts for interaction between the two bodies serving the same community.

Another finding was that proprietors influenced SBs' roles by promoting and maintaining religious values and morals and by ensuring that their set goals and objectives are met. Areas that were said to attract influence from proprietors were curriculum, academic performance, school's culture and climate, staff recruitment, school finances, school

buildings and properties. The study concludes that the participants' views on this matter were superficial and contradictory. To say proprietors influence SBs' roles by promoting and maintaining religious values and morals and by ensuring that their goals and objectives are achieved while at the same time proprietors are attracted to the stated SB roles and responsibilities leaves much to be desired.

Proprietors' influence on SBs' performance was said to have positive and negative effects. The positive effects were its ability to deal with unethical behaviour of SBs; protect principal's image and reputation; and encourage commitment to hard work. Conversely, the negative side of it was that it brought about conflicting expectations on the functions of the SB. While the researcher appreciates positive effects brought about by proprietors' influence, there is still a concern about the negativity that goes with it. Though the negative impact of it may appear minor at face value, it may have lasting repercussions on school governance and management in the long run. There is a need, therefore, for both groups to find remedies to this by establishing strategies to monitor and regulate proprietors' influence. If the influence continues unattended, it could cause more harm than good in governance in schools.

Lastly, the study discovered the following as contributory factors for proprietors' influence: sense of ownership and desire to meet set goals and objectives. The study concludes that it is difficult to attribute the latter factor to proprietorship influence in schools. The researcher argues that the majority of proprietors are not aware of their schools' goals and objectives. After all, proprietors, whether they are aware of their set goals and objectives or not, they continue to influence the running of schools.

The conclusions drawn here set a platform for the researcher to invite all concerned stakeholders with legitimate authority in governance and management of schools to consider the recommendations of this study and act accordingly. There is a need to address governance and management challenges reported in this study and seek ways to curb or improve the situation in such schools. If not, there is likelihood that there will be incidences of anarchy in schools and schools will be ungovernable. The next section presents recommendations of this study.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FINDINGS

The conclusions reached in the previous section of this study led the researcher to make the following recommendations:

- From the findings of this study, the researcher recommends that the Department of Education should draw up a policy on the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors in church-owned schools to reduce incidences of role conflict and interference of the proprietors in the functions of the SBs.
- There needs to be training on SBs' expected roles and responsibilities. The Department of Education and other role players could provide such workshops.
- Induction of new SB members should be conducted, which should include strategies of establishing positive working relationships with other stakeholders, which are based on mutual trust and respect.
- The selection criteria for SB members should consider knowledge and skills needed for good school governance. Such criteria should ensure that members of the SB have capacity and competence to effectively perform their roles.
- School proprietors need to be discouraged from meddling in school governance and management activities, especially because they have two nominees representing them in the SB.
- The MOET needs to formulate a policy that will help in creating awareness on separation of powers and line of command in schools.

5.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Like any other academic research, this study had a number of limitations. The limitations are going to be discussed in detail in the following paragraphs.

During the actual collection of data, it was not easy for school principals to allow the researcher to access to the intended documents. As a result, the researcher ended up depending on one strategy of data collection, which was semi-structured interviews. This has disadvantaged the researcher to apply triangulation of results to close some gaps that are likely to appear when using one strategy of data collection. The researcher suspects principals would feel a bit comfortable if schools' documents were analysed in their presence and left in the principals' offices. Anyhow, this would still remain a challenge because principals' schedules are too tight. However, it is advisable

for the researcher to create ample time in future for document analysis so that the little time he is afforded, he can take advantage of.

Secondly, the study had intended to collect data from four secondary schools in Maseru and from three educational secretaries recognised as such by the Lesotho Education Act of 2010. The data used here were collected from three secondary schools because the principal of the fourth school was unwilling to take part in this study and could not help the researcher to secure appointments with other SB members. It was also difficult to secure appointment with one educational secretary and three SB chairpersons. This negatively affected the study in that it reduced the intended sample. Therefore, this denied the researcher access to a site and participants who could have yielded richest data for this study. The researcher suspects that the principal of the fourth school felt uncomfortable to share her/his views with a principal from a sister-school. In future, it is advisable to choose participants who may not identify in one way or another with the researcher.

Thirdly, the interview questions were originally set in English. Anyway, the researcher had to translate them into Southern Sotho because some participants preferred to be interviewed in their mother tongue. As a result, this had a bearing on the semantic interpretation of the questions and on the participants' responses during interviews' transcription. Nonetheless, the researcher pursued the matter despite the challenge posed because this was the only way the participants could express their views freely, without any language barrier. To minimise this challenge in future, the researcher would need to engage someone who has specialised in Southern Sotho and English Language to assist in ensuring that the translated questions still contain the intended meaning.

Time constraints were also a great limitation. The majority of participants from whom data were collected were full time employees, and so was the researcher. The researcher had to create time to meet them at their workplaces, some during working hours and others after hours. This made it difficult for some of them to put aside time for interviews. Consequently, some participants like SB chairpersons could not be reached for interviews because their schedules were said to be tight. Failure to collect data from SB chairpersons who were believed to be having the richest information for this study on account of positions they occupy in the SB and experience they had did not do this study any favour. In future, the researcher would have to consider using questionnaires

alongside interviews as another way of collecting information especially from officers of high rank whose schedules are always tight.

5.6 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

From the onset, the researcher had a feeling that much as the current study had identified case study as a right method for data collection, site observation could not be used because observing proprietorship influence on SBs' roles and responsibilities could have been impractical. Therefore, the researcher decided to collect data through two ways: document analysis and semi-structured interviews.

The study aimed at covering four secondary schools belonging to different church denominations in Maseru urban area. Therefore, its findings cannot be generalised or claimed to represent the situation in Lesotho. The reason behind this choice was that the researcher was looking for schools nearer to church headquarters assuming that they would experience more influence from proprietors based on their location. Besides, the researcher could not include schools from other areas because that could have had negative implications on time and money to be used in this study.

On the part of proprietor, the researcher decided not to collect data from church leaders namely, arch-bishops, bishops, priests, and religious groups or movements. The reason behind this was that according to the legislation, proprietors have appointed educational secretaries to oversee education in their schools (Kingdom of Lesotho 2010). For that matter, only educational secretaries were interviewed because they stood on behalf of proprietors.

5.7 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

From the research findings, there are certain areas that the researcher feels need further investigations. Those areas are as follows:

5.7.1 It is recommended that the same study may be conducted with quantitative research approach employed to allow opportunity for larger population of schools and participants to take part in this research. If, for instance, survey is used to collect data, it would help produce more consistent and reliable results, which could be generalised on an increased population of schools.

5.7.2 It is recommended that document analysis and site observation of proprietors' influence, if and where possible, be considered in future studies in order to minimise possible gaps.

5.7.3 It is recommended in future that the Department of Education officials be part of the study population. The researcher believes that Education officials' perceptions can add more value to the findings of this study.

5.7.4 Since this study was conducted in the urban area of Maseru near the churches' headquarters, it is recommended that the same study be conducted in rural areas and see if it could yield the same results.

5.7.5 Since the current study explored proprietorship influences on SBs' roles and responsibilities in church-owned secondary schools, it is recommended the same study be conducted focusing on either government or community schools.

6. REFERENCING

ACT Government. 2015. Education and training directorate. [Online] Available from: www.det.act.gov.au/schooleducation/schoolboards. (Accessed on 24/05/2015).

Ball, S.J. 2009. The governance turn. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(5):537-538.

Baxter, P. & Jack, S. 2008. Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4): 544-559.

Botha, R.J. & Marishane, R.N. 2011. *School leadership in a changing context: A case for school-based management*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Briggs, A.R. 2007. Modelling: What's in it for me? The application of modelling to the management of accessibility. *Research in Post Compulsory Education*, 5(1):115-132.

Buckland, P. & Hofmeyer, J. 1993. *The governance of education in South Africa: Historical and international perspectives on system change*. Johannesburg: SSAEMP.

Caldwell, B.J. 2009. Centralisation and decentralisation in education: A new dimension to policy. In Gamage, D.T. & Zajda, J. (Eds.). *Decentralisation, school-based management, and quality*. London: Springer Science and Business Media B.V.: 53-66.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. 2007. *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge.

Creswell, J.W. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oakes: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J.W. 2007. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J.W. 2008. *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Creswell, J.W. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

David, F.R & David, F.R. 2015. *Strategic management: Concepts and cases*. 15th edition. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Ltd.

Darmody, M. & Smyth, E. 2013. Governance and funding of voluntary secondary schools in Ireland. *The Economic and Social Research Institute*. October, 2013. Research Series Number 34. Ireland.

De Grauwe, A. 2005. UNESCO-Education for All Global Monitoring Report. Report on school-based management (SBM): does it improve quality? (2005/ED/EFA/MRT/PI/16).

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. 2000. *Handbook of qualitative research*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. 2003. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks: California: Sage Publications.

Donnelly, C. 2000. Churches and the governing of schools in Northern Ireland: A Redistribution of Power? *Educational Management & Administration*, 28(2): 161-172.

Duan, N., Green, C.A., Hoagwood, K., Horwitz, S.M., Palinkas, L.A. & Wisdom, J.P. 2013. *Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research*. New York: Springer Science + Business Media.

Everard, K.B. & Morris, G. 1990. *Effective school management*. 3rd edition. London: Paul Chapman.

Fancera, F. & Bliss, J. 2011. Instructional leadership influence on collective teacher efficacy to improve school achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10(3): 349-370.

Glesne, C. 2011. *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. 4th edition. Boston: Pearson Education.

Griffin, R. 1987. *Management*. 2nd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K.H. & Johnson, D.E. 2001. *Management of organisational behaviour: leading human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hughes, O. 1998. *Public management and administration: An introduction*. 2nd edition. London: Macmillan.

Jobo, M., Khiba, A., Lefoka, P.J., Liphoto, N., Mapuru, P., Molise, M., Moeti, B., Moorosi, M., Nenty, H.J., Ntoi, V., Qhobela, B., Sebatane, T., & Sephelane, T. 2000. *Lesotho: A*

baseline study of the teacher education system. Centre for International Education: University of Sussex Institute of Education.

Johnson, C. L., & Christine, L.C. 2012. *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed approaches.* 4th edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kerre, R. & Gichaga, S. 1998. *Christian Religious Education.* Nairobi: KLB.

Kipkemboi, F. & Kipruto, I. 2013. Assessment of factors influencing management conflicts in church sponsored public secondary schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 2(6): 241-246.

Khalanyane, T. 1995. Power and struggle: A critique of hegemony and control of schooling in Lesotho. Unpublished MEd Thesis, Witwatersrand University, Johannesburg.

Khama, D. 2000. Church and state partnership in education: Perceptions of education administrators and community members in secondary schools in Lesotho. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Reading, Reading UK.

Khuzwayo, S. 2007. Role relationship of school governing body Chairpersons and Principals in school governance in selected primary and secondary schools in the Kwamashu area. Unpublished MEd Thesis, the University of KwaZulu-Natal, KwaZulu-Natal.

Kingdom of Lesotho. 1995. *Lesotho Education Act No.10 of 1995.* Maseru: Government Printer.

Kingdom of Lesotho. 2010. *Lesotho Education Act No.3 of 2010.* Maseru: Government Printer.

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. 2009. *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing.* 2nd edition. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Leedy, P.D. & Ormrod, J.E. 2005. *Practical research: Planning and design.* Upper Saddle River: Pearson.

Leedy, P.D. & Ormrod, J.E. 2010. *Practical research planning and design.* 9th edition. Cape Town: Pearson.

- Lekhetho, M. 2013. Lesotho: Organisation, structure and challenges. In C Harber (Ed): *Education in Southern Africa*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Lemmer, E. & Van Wyk, N. 2010. *Themes in South African Education: For the comparative educationist*. Cape Town: Pearson.
- Lesotho Catholic Bishops' Conference. 2015. A brief history of Catholic Education in Lesotho. [Online] Available from: www.lcbc.org.ls/index.php/2015-09-14-15-24-05/catholic-school-secretariat. (Accessed on 21/04/2018).
- Lichtman, M. 2012. *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. California: Sage Thousand Oaks.
- Mabeya, T.M., Ndiku, J.M. & Njino, J. 2010. Role of church sponsor in management of secondary schools: Impact on academic performance and conflict concerns in Kenya. *Education Administration and Policy Studies*, 2(2):031-038.
- Makokha, P.N. 2002. *The Catholic sponsored schools as agents of evangelization*. Nairobi, Government Press, Kenya. March, 2001. Nation Media Group, Kenya.
- Marais, P. & Meier, C. 2012. *Education management in early childhood development*. 2nd edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Maree, K. 2010. *First steps in research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Matalasi, J.M. 2000. The role of the School Governing Bodies in Lesotho: A case study of four high schools. Unpublished MEd. Thesis, the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Matheolane, R. & Seotsanyana, M. 2014. *The Lesotho education system: Prospects and problems*. Potchefstroom: University of Potchefstroom Press.
- Matshe, P.F.A. 2014. Challenges of parental involvement in rural public school in Ngaka Modiri Moleme District of North Province (South Africa). *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education*, 1(6):93-103.
- McLeod, S.A. 2008. Case study method in psychology. [Online] Available from: www.simplypsychology.org/case-study.html. (Accessed on 22/12/2015).

McMillan, J.S. & Schumacher, S. 2006. *Research in Education: Evidence-based inquiry*. 6th edition. Boston: Pearson.

McMillan, J.S. & Schumacher, S. 2010. *Research in Education: Evidence-based inquiry*. 7th edition. New Jersey: Pearson.

Merriam, S.B. 1998. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S.B. 2002. *Qualitative research in practice: Examples of discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S.B. 2007. *Non-Western perspectives on learning and knowing*. Florida: Krieger Publication Company.

Merriam, S.B. 2009. *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Mijungu, K.O. 2015. An evaluation of the role of church sponsors in academic performance: A case study of public secondary schools in Migori County, Kenya. Unpublished MEd Thesis, The Kenyatta University, Nairobi.

Mojtahedzadeh, R. & Sayadmanesh, F. 2013. The rule of school-based management in developing countries. *Global Journal of Biodiversity Science and Management*, 3(2): 169-174.

Mokotso, R.I. 2017. Religious pluralism for inclusive education in Lesotho secondary schools. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

Motaba, M.N. 1998. The Lesotho Education Act of 1995/96, and its socio-economic and academic impact on Lesotho teachers: A case study in Maseru, Lesotho. Unpublished Med. Thesis, the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Muller, M. & Ellison, C.E. 2001. *Religious involvement, social capital and adolescents' academic progress*. Washington: Government Press.

Muzvidziwa, N. & Seotsanyana, M. 2002. Continuity, change and growth: Lesotho's Education System. *Radical Pedagogy*. [Online] Available from:

http://radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/issue4_2/01_muzvidziwa.html. (Accessed on 25/06/2016).

Njeru, J.M. 2013. The role of the sponsors' participation in management of public secondary schools in Maara District, Tharaka Nithi County – Kenya. Unpublished Med Thesis, the University of Nairobi, Nairobi.

Nkobi, O.P. 2008. Instructional leadership for quality learning. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 36(4): 471-494.

Onderi, H. & Makori, A. 2013. Secondary school principals in Nyamira County in Kenya: Issues and challenges. *Educational Research International*, 1(1): 67-90.

Potgieter, J.M., Visser, P.J., Van der Bank, A.J., Mothata, M.S. & Squelch, J.M. 1997. Understanding the South African Schools Act. What public school governance need to know. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Punch, K.F. 2009. Ensuring an effective staff. In van Deventer, I. & Kruger, A.G. (Eds). *An educator's guide to school management skills*. Pretoria: van Schaik: 139-155.

Portin, B. 2004. The roles that principals play. *Educational leadership*. 61(7):14-19.

Regina, C. & Wanyanyi, D. 2012. Improving the relationship between Religious Sponsors and Public Primary Schools' development in Nandi County, Kenya. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS)*, 3(5): 784-791.

Republic of Kenya. 2013. *Kenya Basic Education Act No.14 of 2013*. Nairobi: Education Department.

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

Reynolds, J.G. & Warfield, W.H. 2010. Discerning the differences between managers and leaders. *The Education Digest*, 75(7): 61-64.

Schwandt, T.A. 2007. *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry paperback*. 3rd Edition. London: SAGE Publications.

Shonhiwa, S. 2006. *The effective cross-cultural manager (A guide for business leaders in Africa)*. Cape Town: Struik Publishers.

Silverman, D. 2013. *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. 4th edition. London: SAGE.

Smith, A. 2010. Religious segregation and the emergence of integrated schools in Northern Ireland. *Oxford Review of Education*, 27, 2001: 560-575.

Steyn, G.M. 2008. The influence of school leadership preparation programmes: identification of possible focus areas. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 22(4): 889-905.

Strydom, J. 2014. *Principles of business management*. 2nd edition. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

UK Department of Education. 2012. Guide to governor roles and responsibilities. [Online] Available from: www.deni.gov.uk. (Accessed on 24/05/2015).

Van Deventer, I. & Kruger, A.G. 2011. *An educator's guide to school management skills*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Wahyuni, D. 2012. The research design maze: understanding paradigms, cases, methods and methodologies. *JAMAR* 10(1): 69-80.

Yin, R.K. 2009. *Case study research: design and methods*. 4th edition. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.

Yukl, G. 2006. *Leadership in organizations*. 6th edition. Upper Saddle River NJ: Pearson.

APPENDICES



Appendix A

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FROM SCHOOL PRINCIPAL TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Request for permission to conduct research at (name of the school and its postal address)

.....
.....
.....
.....

Title of Dissertation: THE INFLUENCE OF SCHOOL PROPRIETORS ON THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SCHOOL BOARDS IN CHURCH OWNED SCHOOLS IN LESOTHO

Date: 5th March, 2016
Names: Ntoa David Nkanda
Department: Education Department
Telephone number: +266 22322452
Cell phone number: +266 58855092
Email address: ndnkanda@yahoo.com

Dear Principal,

I, Ntoa David Nkanda, am doing research with Dr Teresa Ogina, a doctor in the Department of Education towards a M Ed at the University of South Africa. We are inviting you to participate in a study entitled 'The influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of school boards in church owned schools in Lesotho'.

The aim of the study is to explore the influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of school boards in church owned schools in Lesotho and the effects of such influence on the performance of the school boards.

Your school has been selected because it belongs to a church; as a result it is assumed it has relevant data to inform this study on influence that school proprietors may have on school boards' roles and responsibilities. Please, note that there are other three secondary church schools that are identified and selected for this study. You are humbly asked to put aside 45 minutes to one hour on your schedule for an interview session with you.


The study will gather data through face-to-face interviews and documentation analysis. The following participants will take part in the interviews: the school principal, the educational secretaries, teachers' and parents' representatives in the school board and the school chairperson. The researcher would also

like, through your permission, to study and analyze the following documents: staff meeting's minutes, school board meeting's minutes, management team's minutes, policies, letters, financial reports, websites etc.

The study does not have any direct material benefits or compensation for participants. Nonetheless, it holds a number of other benefits. Firstly, it will make contribution to the Department of Education in Lesotho on the knowledge of effectiveness of the school boards in church owned schools. Secondly, it will bring awareness and understanding on the working relationship between school proprietors and school boards that may enhance or inhibit the roles and responsibilities of the school boards. The study will also provide insights that may inform policy-making and sound management of not only church-owned schools, but all other schools that experience same challenges though under different proprietorship.

The only potential risk is that of inconvenience. The research will deal with grown up participants, there will be no minors involved. Though the information to be collected would be non-sensitive, the researcher would still gather data anonymously. The feedback from this study will be sent to all participants via email addresses. For those who do not have access to internet, one hard copy will be given to the Principal's office.

Yours sincerely



Ntoa David Nkanda

Researcher

Appendix B

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET (To be used as letter for consent and assent)

Date: 5th March, 2016

Title of Dissertation: THE INFLUENCE OF SCHOOL PROPRIETORS ON THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SCHOOL BOARDS IN CHURCH OWNED SCHOOLS IN LESOTHO

Dear Prospective Participant

My name is Ntoa David Nkanda and I am doing research with Dr Teresa Ogina, a doctor in the Department of Education towards a M Ed at the University of South Africa. We are inviting you to participate in a study entitled 'The influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of school boards in church owned schools in Lesotho'.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

I am conducting this research to explore the influence of the school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of school boards in church owned schools in Lesotho and the effects of such influence on the performance of the school boards.

The study carries a number of benefits. Firstly, it will make contribution to the Department of Education in Lesotho on the knowledge of effectiveness of the school boards in church owned schools. Secondly, it will bring awareness and understanding on the working relationship between school proprietors and school boards that may enhance or inhibit the roles and responsibilities of the school boards. The study will also provide insights that may inform policy-making and sound management of not only church-owned schools, but all other schools that experience same challenges though under different proprietorship.

WHY ARE YOU BEING INVITED TO PARTICIPATE

The researcher selected you to participate in this study because you hold a leadership position in a church owned school and it is assumed you may have adequate and relevant information for this study. Your contact details were obtained from a directory book issued by a local telephone company.

THE NATURE OF YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY

The researcher intends to interview you, the Principal, and three other participants from your school. The other participants are one teachers', one school proprietor's nominee and one parents' representatives in the school governing body.

The study involves semi-structured interviews and recording. The type of questions to be asked is open-ended questions, and they are presented here for your perusal:

1. Tell me about your experience as a member of the School Board. How long have you been a School Board member?
2. How many children do you have in this school? In which grades are they? What position do you hold in the School Board?
3. Can you describe to me how you as a member of the School Board interact directly or indirectly with the school proprietor?
4. What do you think are the roles and responsibilities of the school proprietor in relation to the activities that you perform as a School Board member in this school?
5. What are the roles and responsibilities of the School Board in relation to governance and management activities in your school?
6. In your view, does the school proprietor have influence on your roles and responsibilities as a School Board member in this school?
7. What areas of governance/management attract a lot of influence and why?
8. In what ways does the school proprietor of your school influence the School Board's roles and responsibilities?
9. What effect does the influence have on the performance as a member of the School Board?
10. In your view, what factors contribute to the school proprietor's influence on your roles and responsibilities as a member of the School Board?
11. What would you say are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietor and the School Board in your school?
12. What is your view about the school proprietor, school governance and management in your school?
13. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the school proprietor and the School Board?

CAN I WITHDRAW FROM THIS STUDY EVEN AFTER HAVING AGREED TO PARTICIPATE?

The interview is expected to take approximately 45 minutes. Your participation in this study is voluntary and there is no penalty or loss of benefit for non-participation. You are under no obligation to consent to participate and if you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a written consent form. You are free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason. The information gathered will be kept confidential and your identity will be kept anonymous.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY

The study may bring awareness and understanding of the working relationship between the school proprietors and the school boards that enhances or inhibits performance of the SGBs on their roles and responsibilities. This study may make a contribution to the Department of Education on the knowledge of factors that promote influence on the SBs' roles and responsibilities in church-owned schools.

The study intends to provide insights that might inform policy-making and sound management of not only the church-owned schools, but all other schools who are experiencing same challenges though under different proprietorship. The study may add new knowledge and understanding to all those

involved in the governance and management of education especially school principals, school proprietors and SBs of church-owned schools in Lesotho.

ANY NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES FOR ME IF I PARTICIPATE IN THE RESEARCH PROJECT

The only negative consequence anticipated if you participate in this study is inconvenience. For you to participate in this study, you will be expected to adjust your schedule to accommodate a once off 45 minute interview.

WILL THE INFORMATION THAT I CONVEY TO THE RESEARCHER AND MY IDENTITY BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL?

You have the right to insist that your name be not recorded anywhere and that no one, apart from the researcher and identified members of the research team, will know about your involvement in this research and no one will be able to connect you to the answers you give. Your answers will be given a code number or a pseudonym and you will be referred to in this way in the data, any publications, or other research reporting methods such as conference proceedings.

HOW WILL THE RESEARCHER(S) PROTECT THE SECURITY OF DATA?

The researcher will store hard copies of your answers for a period of five years in a locked cupboard/filing cabinet in my home in Maseru for future research or academic purposes; electronic information will be stored on a password-protected computer. Future use of the stored data will be subject to further Research Ethics Review and approval if applicable. After five years hard copies will be burned and electronic copies will permanently deleted from the hard drive of the computer through the use of a relevant software programme.

WILL YOU RECEIVE PAYMENT OR ANY INCENTIVES FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?

Your participation in this study is purely voluntary with no reward or payment.

HAS THE STUDY RECEIVED ETHICS APPROVAL

This study has received written approval from the Research Ethics Review Committee of the CEDU ERC, Unisa. A copy of the approval letter can be obtained from the researcher if you so wish.

HOW WILL YOU BE INFORMED OF THE FINDINGS/RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH?

If you would like to be informed of the final research findings, require any further information or want to contact the researcher about any aspect of this study, please contact Ntoa David Nkanda on +26658855092 or ndnkanda@yahoo.com/ndnkanda@gmail.com.

Should you have concerns about the way in which the research has been conducted, you may contact Dr Teresa Ogina on +27721289958 or oginateresa8@gmail.com .

Thank you for taking time to read this information sheet and for participating in this study.

Thank you.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ntoa David Nkanda".

Ntoa David Nkanda

Appendix C

Semi-structured interview schedule: Questions for Principals

1. Tell me about your experience of working as a principal in this school. How long have you been working at this school?
2. In your opinion, what are the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors in relation to school governance and management activities in your school?
3. What can you say are the roles and responsibilities of the School Board in relation to governance and management activities in your school?
4. In your view, what can you say about the influence of the school proprietor on the roles and responsibilities of the School Board in your school?
5. What areas of governance/management attract a lot of influence and why?
6. In what ways does the school proprietor of your school influence the School Board's roles and responsibilities?
7. a) What can you say about the role of the school proprietor and the performance of the School Board?
b) What effect does the influence have on your performance?
8. In your view, what possible factors contribute to the school proprietor's influence on the School Board's roles and responsibilities?
9. What would you say are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietor and the School Board in your school?
10. What is your view about the school proprietorship, school governance and management in your school?
11. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me about the school proprietor and the School Board?

Appendix D

Semi-structured interview schedule: Questions for members of the School Board

1. Tell me about your experience as a member of the School Board. How long have you been a School Board member?
2. How many children do you have in this school? In which grades are they? What position do you hold in the School Board?
3. Can you describe to me how you as a member of the School Board interact directly or indirectly with the school proprietor?
4. What do you think are the roles and responsibilities of the school proprietor in relation to the activities that you perform as a School Board member in this school?
5. What are the roles and responsibilities of the School Board in relation to governance and management activities in your school?
6. In your view, does the school proprietor have influence on your roles and responsibilities as a School Board member in this school?
7. What areas of governance/management attract a lot of influence and why?
8. In what ways does the school proprietor of your school influence the School Board's roles and responsibilities?
9. What effect does the influence have on the performance as a member of the School Board?
10. In your view, what factors contribute to the school proprietor's influence on your roles and responsibilities as a member of the School Board?
11. What would you say are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietor and the School Board in your school?
12. What is your view about the school proprietor, school governance and management in your school?
13. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the school proprietor and the School Board?

Appendix E

Semi-structured interview schedule: Questions for Educational Secretaries

1. Tell me about your experience of working as an educational secretary. How long have you worked in this position?
2. In your opinion, what are the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors in relation to school governance and management activities in your schools?
3. What can you say are the roles and responsibilities of the School Boards in relation to governance and management activities in your schools?
4. In your view, what can you say about the influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of School Boards in your schools?
5. What areas of governance/management attract a lot of influence and why?
6. In what ways does the school proprietor influence the School Boards' roles and responsibilities?
7. a) What can you say about the role of the school proprietor and the performance of the School Boards?
b) What effect does the influence have on the School Board performance?
8. In your view, what possible factors contribute to the school proprietor's influence on the School Board's roles and responsibilities?
9. What would you say are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietor and the School Board in your schools?
10. What is your view about the school proprietorship, school governance and management in your school?
11. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me about school proprietor and School Boards?

Appendix F

A LETTER REQUESTING AN ADULT TO PARTICIPATE IN AN INTERVIEW

Dear

This letter is an invitation to consider participating in a study I, Ntoa David Nkanda, am conducting as part of my research as a Master's student entitled THE INFLUENCE OF SCHOOL PROPRIETORS ON THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SCHOOL BOARDS IN CHURCH OWNED SCHOOLS IN LESOTHO at the University of South Africa. Department of Education and the Ethics Committee of the College of Education at Unisa have given permission for the study. I have purposefully identified you as a possible participant because of your valuable experience and expertise related to my research topic.

I would like to provide you with more information about this project and what your involvement would entail if you agree to take part. The importance of school governance and management in education is substantial and well documented. Exploring the influence of the school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of school boards in church owned schools in Lesotho is very critical.

In this interview I would like to have your views and opinions on this topic. This information can be used to improve working relations between the school proprietors and school boards. Most importantly, it can be used to enhance role efficiency and effectiveness of the school board members.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. It will involve an interview of approximately 45 minutes in length to take place in a mutually agreed upon location at a time convenient to you. You may decline to answer any of the interview questions if you so wish. Furthermore, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences.

With your kind permission, the interview will be audio-recorded to facilitate collection of accurate information and later transcribed for analysis. Shortly after the transcription has been completed, I will send you a copy of the transcript to give you an opportunity to confirm the accuracy of our conversation and to add or to clarify any points. All information you provide is considered completely confidential. Your name will not appear in any publication resulting from this study and any identifying information will be omitted from the report. However, with your permission, anonymous quotations may be used. Data collected during this study will be retained on a password-protected computer for **5 years** in my locked office. The only anticipated risk to you as a participant in this study is inconvenience.

If you have any questions regarding this study, or would like additional information to assist you in reaching a decision about participation, please contact me at +26658855092 or by e-mail at ndnkanda@yahoo.com .

I look forward to speaking with you and thank you in advance for your assistance in this project. If you accept my invitation to participate, I will request you to sign the consent form which is attached to this letter.

Yours sincerely

Ntoa David Nkanda

Ntoa David Nkanda

APPENDIX G



REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FROM MASERU DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICE

N.D. Nkanda
P.O.BOX 17
Maseru 100

04 April 2016

THE SENIOR EDUCATION OFFICER
MASERU EDUCATION OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MASERU

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Request for Permission to Conduct Research in Maseru district

I, Ntoa David Nkanda, am doing research with my supervisor, Dr Teresa Ogina, a doctor in the Department of Education towards a M Ed in Education Management at the University of South Africa. My study is entitled 'The influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of school boards in church owned schools in Lesotho'.

I humbly request permission to conduct my research in four (4) schools in Maseru District.

The main aim of this inquiry is to explore the influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of the School Boards in church owned secondary and high schools in Maseru, Lesotho.

The study will gather data through face-to-face interviews and documentation analysis. The following participants will take part in interviews: the school principal, the educational secretaries, teachers' and parents' representatives and the school chairperson.

Participation in this study is voluntary and the participants have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty. The participants will be interviewed at school or at an alternative venue suggested by them. The duration of the interviews will be approximately 45 minutes. Further consent will be obtained to record the interviews. Confidentiality and anonymity regarding information shared will be guaranteed. The identity of the schools will be protected by using pseudonyms and codes instead

of the real names of the schools. The benefits of participating in this study are that at the end of the study a report on the summary of the main findings and recommendations will be given to the principals. Through participating in this study, the principals will be contributing to the construction of knowledge on proprietorship influence on school governance roles and responsibilities. The interview process will also give the principals opportunity to do self-reflection on their own practice.

Once the study is concluded the results will be communicated to the relevant office of the Maseru District Education Office.

Hoping my request will receive your positive response.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Ntoa David Nkanda'.

Ntoa David Nkanda (Student Number 50091921) Email : ndnkanda@yahoo.com or ndnkanda@gmail.com

Contact Number: +266 58855092/+266 58888129

Appendix H

Principal C – School C (01/09/2016)

1. Tell me about your experience of working as a principal in this school. How long have you been working at this school?

Seven years.

2. In your opinion, what are the roles and responsibilities of school proprietors in relation to school governance and management activities in your school?

They assist to see to it that the school is well run: there are teachers and other resources, even resources like funds: finances will ensure that other resources are there like infrastructure in general; human resources in their categories, teaching and non-teaching staff. That is the responsibility of the SB to hire them, to fire them, to promote them, to demote them.

Are you answering 2 or 3? It's like these points belong to 3 which wants you to state the roles and responsibilities of the SB? They are inter-related. All these are the responsibility of the school proprietor. They even have to oversee and check from time to time whether everything is in order, properly managed.

3. From what you said, can you select the roles and responsibilities that are SB's only? There is governance, there is administration and management, day to day activities in the school; there are administrative issues like attendance of classes, students' welfare in general is looked at by the administrator together with the management team whereby there the principal, deputy principal and heads of departments, then teachers in class manage their classes. But the SB, theirs is a bigger role. To make sure that resources are there is the bigger responsibility, you cannot expect teachers to come and organise resources of the school but it is the responsibility of the SB with their secretary, the principal. To see to it that infrastructure is there and is improved, you cannot expect a teacher to do that, that is why we say theirs (SB) is to govern, meaning to make things easier for teaching or day to day activities to take place, to set the stage, that is the work of the SB. Hence they hire, fire, demote and promote. They leave these people to do their work.

Let me give you an example. You cannot expect a teacher to be involved when maybe we fire a worker, it is the responsibility of the SB altogether because even the teachers answer to the SB. In the past, we had a problem whereby the SB decided to release the kitchen staff and teachers decided not to go to work, saying we are angry, we are in support of these other people. When the education officers came here, the chief inspector said, "Give me any clause that you teacher, in your contract which says that you won't teach children just because somebody from the kitchen is being fired." There was no such clause. That is where the line of demarcation is drawn. The responsibilities of the SB are the responsibilities of the SB. Teachers have their own responsibilities, but the principal is an all-rounder. He/she is everywhere.

Can you do the same with proprietor, how do you compare proprietor's roles with those of the SB? His is to appoint the SB. To see to it that the SB is there. The SB is sent by the proprietor to manage the school on behalf of the proprietor. This is because proprietor cannot be in every school and do management. Let us look at our proprietor, for example, we have the Synod. Those people cannot manage to come to each and every school and run them. They have to send representatives in the form of SB to do the job for them. What does that mean? It means the proprietor is the Board. The Board is answerable to the proprietor. When the Board has done a job it reports to the proprietor saying you sent us now we have done this and that.

What is another role of proprietor? In our Lesotho legislation is there. The bigger policy holder/maker is the government, so you will find that we don't use only the policy of the proprietor in schools but the one mostly used is the policy of the government. Government regulates, directs, guides and it is an umbrella body. That is why they have a legislation that stipulates how the SB should be comprised and how they (SBs) should operate. So the proprietor has to adjust to the policy of the government. But in other countries it is the other way round; you will find that proprietor directly is the government. But here where we have church schools you find that there is a bigger policy maker which is the government, then the proprietor who appoints the SB, then the management.

Besides appointing the SB, any other role of the proprietor? Proprietor has to see to it that there is a school. He ensures that there is a land on which to establish a school. Even the buildings are proprietor's responsibility. These other things he

(proprietor) does them through the SB: to see to it that there is harmony, his policies are being followed like in our case our proprietor will be saying you will pray every morning and every evening. When you get into the dining hall, before you eat you pray. You read the bible; on Sunday proprietor should see students in church. Sometimes, there is a church activity, learners and teachers must show up, they must contribute.

4. In your view, what can you say about influence of school proprietor on SB roles and responsibilities in your school?

It is enormous. And sometimes..., I am not happy to say this thing but it happens. Sometimes the influence of the proprietor clashes with the influence of the policy-maker which is the government. For example, government policy says 'education for all'. Only that sentence says a lot. It means even if my child is pregnant, she has to come to school. Even if she is married she has to come. But you may find that the proprietor sometimes doesn't understand that. How come that a pregnant child to school? What is this child teaching other children here? Does it mean that our norms and values are being compromised? According to church authorities, girls should be girls and mothers should be mothers. Truly speaking, there is confusion. There was a case whereby in one of our schools (LECSA schools) there was a pregnant child who hid her pregnancy. Teachers could not realise that she was pregnant and time for delivery came. You know what this child did? She left with her friends from the school boarding. It was a church school. They went to hospital. Luckily, the hospital was nearby. She delivered the baby, came back with the baby into the dormitory. Can you imagine what other students were saying and doing? Before even teachers could know that so and so had a baby, other students knew. When the school principal came, he said I am calling your parent to come and collect you. He had to sit down, make a decision about the girl. He said to the learner, you are no more a student you have to go and nurse your baby at home. The girl's mother went to the government inspector. The inspector said to the principal, "Hey! Look at the policy – education for all! That child should not be expelled from school. You would rather say the mother or the parents of this girl who has a child should take care of the baby and the girl should come to school. But these people were arguing saying the girl was bad influence. These girls here will copy this bad practice of hiding pregnancy, getting delivery themselves and coming with babies here. It was

tough! Our proprietors here have their own values which sometimes clash with the policy of the bigger policy holder, which is the government.

5. What areas of governance/management attract a lot of influence and why?

Proprietor sometimes, to be frank, although there is this thing we call a covert policy. Overt policy is open and is known by many while covert one is not open and is known by few but they have to follow it. Sometimes when we hire teachers, the proprietor would like teachers who are hired to be of the church, church members, so that they would improve the church because they would have input in the church. They will attend the church and be very strong members and teachers. This thing is a problem. Sometimes you find that you don't find a suitable candidate like that (who is a church member). Choosing that one seems not to adhere to the policy of the government. The government has its own policy, it's open. If you are qualified, you are qualified. It does not ask you about your religious denomination. And you look at our constitution, it is totally against that, it will be saying you are discriminating if you say somebody belongs to a certain church, then you can't employ even if he/she qualifies and has passed the interview. But of late, I have realised that the government is winning. Honestly, government will have an upper hand because the money that pays teachers comes from the government. So they (government) will dictate terms, whether the proprietor likes it or not.

Another one is utilisation of funds. Hey! Funds is a problem! They demand reports from you. They demand to know why you did such and such a thing. If you are a principal in a church school you cannot even use a single cent without them knowing why it is used. Sometimes even when emergencies come and you have to address them financially, for example, as you see our school is an old school, sometimes an electricity cable is torn and is causing a problem, electrical shock, and you cannot just wait for the Board to come and seek permission to use certain funds to repair because it puts students lives in danger. If they touch certain areas, that might be dangerous. Maybe the contractor will be demanding something like M12000.00. It becomes a problem. You have to go through a lot of process asking for permission to solve the problem and at the same time children are just moving everywhere. Really when it comes to funds they are so particular. **Why?** I think it is natural. People when they there is money somewhere everyone wants to know about it. Even when you are

delivering a report as a principal, they may sleep while you are reading other things but when you come to the money issue everyone becomes awake.

This time, which I think is positive, they just need performing schools. That is a positive growth because if the school is performing it becomes the best. It attracts parents to come and send their children here. Really, I have to commend them on this one. They have now realised their strength and role in influencing teachers to work hard and schools to perform. In the past they used to put pressure on the principal alone, blame it all on him/her but these days know. They even train the SB on its roles that if a certain teacher is not performing well they have a right to call that teacher because they are the ones who hired that teacher. He/she must come and tell you (SB) why he/she is not performing well as a specialist in that subject. So why are students failing? If you are a principal, like myself I am a language person, how do I know why students are not performing well in Science? What I will do is just to talk to the Science teacher to work hard and influence students to do their homework. But if the teacher is not willing to improve the subject it will be a problem. So they are now trying to show them their role.

How about in curriculum? They do. Sometimes you will find that proprietor wants the school to produce learners who are equipped in certain fields. Let's say in the commercials, they come and tell us that these commercial subjects are compulsory here. Like ours, we are inclined to sciences and we have made them compulsory. Even this one which is optional, Biology, here is not optional because we want to produce a scientist in totality. A child leaving this school should apply for any field in science after leaving our school. They (Proprietor) have a lot of influence. Sometimes the proprietor, I heard them advising us that in these other subjects which are optional, if a nearby school is offering the same subject and it is a school under the same proprietorship, we should opt for another one, so that there is variety. For example, we have done away with Development Studies. It was not performed well for some time in this school, and then since we were advised by the Ministry, the Ministry is everywhere, to chop our curriculum because it is too broad, the SB had to decide on how to channel the curriculum in a right direction and they said since a nearby school is doing Development Studies, do away with it and leave Geography. Since it is not done in the other school it will attract those who would like to have skills in Geography.

Tell me about an interesting subject here, Religious Studies. They are not putting it as an imperative option that we should teach Religious Studies but they are just encouraging. Since it is a church school, they want learners who are moulded in that way, know the bible and certain values. They are encouraging that the subject should be there but there are still some other LECSA schools which do not offer Religious Studies because I have not heard them outspoken about that, they are just encouraging.

6. In what ways does the school proprietor of your school influence the SB's roles and responsibilities?

Every time when the SB is newly elected, the secretariat will always workshop those members, trying to instil in them what is expected of them by the church. Certain things that we have spoken about will be highlighted, like this school should be a church school, children should go to church. Certain things that will benefit the church will be highlighted so that as a member of SB you know that I am in this Board and I am serving these interests. So they always train us through workshops.

How else? They sometimes send us pamphlets.

Do they have a constitution that governs schools? Yes, there is.

What does it contain? But it is a church constitution, inside it there is a section that talks about schools. It is just one page I think.

Do they ever come physically to influence, either the highest church body or the educational secretary? They do sometimes, especially those of us who are near, their offices are here (nearby). They sometimes visit us to motivate us and to pray with us, for example, last Sunday they were here praying for these kids who are going to sit their final examinations at the end of the year. It was a big prayer session indeed, a special Sunday. Different groups around here were called to the parish. Sometimes if we encounter problems the SB is not hesitant to contact the priests telling them they have a problem which needs their expertise. The priests immediately respond because it is their call to solve the problem.

7. a) What can you say about the role of the school proprietor and the performance of the SB?

If the school proprietor was not eager to see to it that his/her school is performing well the SB would be just relaxed. The SB knows its responsibilities and they are ready to execute them each time they have to because the proprietor is serious about what he/she wants and needs; asking what about my school, I am concerned. So the SB has to stand on its toes.

b) What effect does the influence have on your performance?

It has a big effect because you will have to work hard if you see your boss wants to see performance indicators. What do you have to show that you are there? People are working hard.

8. In your view, what possible factors contribute to the school proprietor's influence on the SB's roles and responsibilities?

It is about sense of ownership. If your own thing fails it means you as an institution you are a failure. There is no other thing. There is no profit, there is nothing! These schools do not bring profits to churches, but it is only about that sense of ownership.

9. What would you say are the effects of the relationship between the school proprietor and the SB in your school?

Sometimes it is not nice because sometimes you will find that proprietor sends a priest to chair the SB and I have seen it has negative impact. What they are trying to do maybe is to ensure ownership showing that this is their school. But when he is here you will find that sometimes he goes beyond his boundaries because he believes the school is his. You find that you, as a principal, are being micro-managed which is not a good thing and it causes unnecessary conflicts. In the end since these people we respect so much, they are our leaders in faith, sometimes you find that since they are too close to operational things and we clash. Sometimes there is no longer that respect which we do not like. It is like they should maintain their composure as proprietors and they should be proprietors. They should not come down to the operational level because you will find that once they are there they will be telling you, "this is my school, you cannot do that, you principal!". Even hiring of staff, he wants to do alone. Influence becomes bad. But in cases where these things do not happen, there is no problem, even the influence

becomes positive in a sense that if the SB realises that the person who sent us is with us, he listens to our grievances, he advises us, it makes effective governance.

10. What is your view about school proprietors, school governance and management in your school?

Governance is good because there is a lot of democratic principle applied towards composition of the SB. People, most of them who are there are being elected democratically and we don't elect the proprietor. Sometimes we whose schools are next to the offices of these people (proprietor) we suffer a lot. Sometimes these village people have negative attitude towards you as a principal, they have a lot of influence to the proprietor because he is within reach. Sometimes he hears negative things which are not true, like 'look at the car the principal is driving'. Some of us bought these 'import cars' and people in those days thought they were very expensive. They said, "This girl is chowing the money! Have a close look at this girl!". You will find that there are certain issues that are disturbing really. Sometimes even supervising somebody over what you are supposed to do makes that person angry. There is no sense of openness to one another, no sense of cooperation. You are always at logger-heads, fighting. You are trying to show that you are not what he thinks you are. Village people have told him/her, "Watch out!" and he comes and starts watching. Sometimes I wish the school was far away because some of the things are just unnecessary, they are allegations.

11. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the school proprietor and SB?

I think I have said everything. I have exhausted everything, my experience, everything. But one last thing which I would like to tell you whom I don't think is relevant is that I am a female. Sometimes you are considered a weak person if you are a female. Challenges that you face as a leader are more, fifty or hundred percent more than challenges that would be faced by your male counterpart in your position. Since you are already considered inferior everybody thinks can just override you, you are not fit for the position. Really women face... Before you do your management work, you do more trying to curb negative things that come to you, before you concentrate on management work. But if you are a man, such challenges do not come to you. They respect you

naturally and you concentrate on your work hundred percent. But in our position, we concentrate on defending ourselves most of the time and then after that we do our work. Especially me, I am the first female principal in this school ever since it was established in 1867. Some were even saying, even a church priest openly said, "This is not a school to be led by a woman. What have you done for our school?" And for all these years, I have spent seven years here. Let me tell you for the first four years, I have been dealing with making myself feel established, establishing my position because it was shaky, people wanted me gone and I had to stand firm. And these four years were years of conflict, trying to show them that I can do it. There was a lot of conflict. It is time that I consider wasted because there was valuable work which was not done for I had to manage conflict. There was a lot of pressure from within, outside, everywhere.

Even from proprietor? Even from proprietor. Some of them although they were not openly showing, you would realise that even when you take your grievance to them, they have already judged you. Some were even telling me, "Why don't you resign?".

Why? Is it because you were incompetent? Children were misbehaving. I said, "They are starting strike, I give you a report and you say I should resign? Because of naughty students? No, I won't". But as time went on, now that it is my seventh year it seems they are tired. Stability is coming and results have improved. People are now trying to do their work. They are now focused but in the past they were not focused on their work, they were focused on me.



Appendix I

**THE KINGDOM OF LESOTHO
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING
MASERU DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICE
P.O. BOX 47. MASERU 100.
22 313 709/22 322 755**

08/08/2016

The Principal

1.

Maseru 100

Dear Sir/Madam

RE : RESEARCH

**Exploring the influence of schools proprietors on the
roles and responsibilities of school governing bodies in
church owned school in Lesotho**

Mr. Ntoa David Nkanda is a student who is conducting a research on the above stated topic. He therefore wishes to carry out a research at your school.

You are kindly requested to provide him with the information that he may require.

Thanking you in advance for your usual support.

MASERU DISTRICT
EDUCATION OFFICE

P.o. BOX: 47, MASERU - LESOTHO

**LEPEKOLA RALIBAKHA 22313709
SENIOR EDUCATION OFFICER - MASERU**

Appendix J



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW COMMITTEE

13 July 2016

Ref: 2016/07/13/50091921/04/MC

Student : Mr ND Nkanda

Student Number: 50091921

Dear Mr ND Nkanda

Decision: Ethics Approval

Researcher: Mr ND Nkanda
Tel: +26622322452
Email: ndnkanda@yahoo.com

Supervisor: Dr TA Ogina
College of Education
Department of Educational leadership and Management
Tel: +2712420 2445
Email: oginateresa8@gmail.com

Proposal: The influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of school governing bodies in church owned schools in Lesotho

Qualification: M Ed in Education Leadership and Management

Thank you for the application for research ethics clearance by the College of Education Research Ethics Review Committee for the above mentioned research. Final approval is granted for the duration of the research.

The application was reviewed in compliance with the Unisa Policy on Research Ethics by the College of Education Research Ethics Review Committee on 13 July 2016.

The proposed research may now commence with the proviso that:

- 1) The researcher/s will ensure that the research project adheres to the values and principles expressed in the UNISA Policy on Research Ethics.*
- 2) Any adverse circumstance arising in the undertaking of the research project that is relevant to the ethicality of the study, as well as changes in the methodology, should be communicated in writing to the College of Education Ethics Review Committee. An amended application could be requested if there are substantial changes from the existing proposal, especially if those changes affect any of the study-related risks for*

the research participants.

- 3) *The researcher will ensure that the research project adheres to any applicable national legislation, professional codes of conduct, institutional guidelines and scientific standards relevant to the specific field of study.*

Note:

*The reference number **2016/07/13/50091921/04/MC** should be clearly indicated on all forms of communication [e.g. Webmail, E-mail messages, letters] with the intended research participants, as well as with the College of Education RERC.*

Kind regards,

(/

Dr M Claassens

CHAIRPERSON: CEDU RERC
mcdtc@netactive.co.za



Prof VI McKay

EXECUTIVE DEAN

Appendix K

Example of coding table

Questions and sub-questions	Responses	Segments	Comments/codes	Themes/sub-themes
<p>1. Can you describe to me how you as a member of the SB interact directly or indirectly with the school proprietor?</p>	<p>Teachers' rep A As a member of the school board I have never been in a position where I find myself interacting with the school proprietor.</p> <p>Teachers' rep B Mainly our interaction, its platform is SB meetings. Other than, that there are occasional, casual meetings with the proprietor when maybe he/she has come to our school.</p> <p>The main one is that of Board meetings.</p> <p>Teachers' rep C I think that is not direct. The school itself belongs to Lesotho Evangelical Church in Southern Africa (LECSA) and there is no way LECSA can interact directly with me except that</p>	<p>I have never been in a position where I find myself interacting with the school proprietor.</p> <p>Mainly our interaction, its platform is SB meetings.</p> <p>there are occasional, casual meetings with the proprietor when maybe he/she has come to our school.</p> <p>that is not direct. there is no way LECSA can interact directly with me except that I represent teachers in the SB.</p> <p>our decisions are passed to the Catholic educational secretary, our school's proprietor, by our secretary in the board.</p> <p>We do work with</p>	<p>According to teachers' representatives, direct interaction between SBs and school proprietors is either minimal or non-existent.</p> <p>Parents' representatives A and B view interaction taking place occasionally through meetings or trainings.</p> <p>Parents' rep B appears to confuse</p>	<p>Direct or indirect interaction with school proprietor .</p>

	<p>I represent teachers in the SB.</p> <p>Parents' rep A As a Board, we work as a committee and our decisions are passed to the Catholic educational secretary, our school's proprietor, by our secretary in the board. True enough the proprietor has two nominees in the Board, the chairperson and the other member.</p> <p>Parents' rep B We do work with them directly because we hold meetings with them where we talk about what should and what should not happen. We talk about changes in the school and we give advices on things that are not</p>	<p>them directly because we hold meetings with them where we talk about what should and what should not happen.</p> <p>that happens occasionally.</p> <p>The first time I met with them was when we (Board members) were invited to the school proprietor's office.</p> <p>We were going to be trained on how to go about our work as members of the SB</p> <p>I interact basically through my position in the SB and also work together with education secretary to see implementation of the school policy.</p>	<p>proprietor's representatives in the SB with school proprietor.</p> <p>According to SB chairperson B, there is direct interaction between SB chairpersons and school proprietors.</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

	<p>running properly.</p> <p>Parents' rep C I do interact with the school proprietor but that happens occasionally. The first time I met with them was when we (Board members) were invited to the school proprietor's office. We were going to be trained on how to go about our work as members of the SB. Let me tell you that in the SB there is a priest who stands on behalf of the school proprietor, so the easiest way of interaction is through the priest who is working as a link between the SB and the proprietor.</p> <p>SB chairperson B In relation to the</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>school, I interact basically through my position in the SB and also work together with education secretary to see implementation of the school policy.</p>			
<p>2. What do you think are the roles and responsibilities of the school proprietor in relation to governance/management activities in this school/ in your schools?</p>	<p>Principal A The church ensures that religion as a subject forms part of the school curriculum and is compulsory to all learners.</p> <p>Of late, the educational secretary takes part in staff recruitment.</p> <p>Well, I don't know what was happening in the past, but what I see is that they want to have a say in leadership positions.</p> <p>They want someone who belongs to the Roman Catholic Church.</p> <p>Principal B The role of school proprietor mainly is</p>	<p>ensures that religion as a subject forms part of the school curriculum and is compulsory to all learners.</p> <p>takes part in staff recruitment.</p> <p>they want to have a say in leadership positions.</p> <p>They want someone who belongs to the Roman Catholic Church.</p> <p>mainly is governance, is overseeing.</p> <p>see to it that the school is well run: there are teachers and other resources, even resources like funds:</p> <p>to oversee and check from time to time whether</p>	<p>According to principals, school proprietors' roles are to take part in curriculum and staff recruitment (especially leadership positions), oversee school activities (governance), ensure smooth running of the school, availability of school resources and to appoint the SBs.</p>	<p>Roles and responsibilities of school proprietors</p>

	<p>governance, is overseeing.</p> <p>Principal C They assist to see to it that the school is well run: there are teachers and other resources, even resources like funds: finances will ensure that other resources are there like infrastructure in general; human resources in their categories, teaching and non-teaching staff.</p> <p>They even have to oversee and check from time to time whether everything is in order, properly managed.</p> <p>His is to appoint the SB.</p> <p>Proprietor has to see to it that there is a school. He ensures that there is a land on which to establish a school. Even the buildings are proprietor's responsibility.</p> <p>Teachers' rep A</p>	<p>everything is in order, properly managed.</p> <p>is to appoint the SB.</p> <p>to see to it that there is a school.</p> <p>ensures that there is a land on which to establish a school.</p> <p>buildings are proprietor's responsibility.</p> <p>I don't have an idea about them.</p> <p>they should be the ones who are providing the springboard so that whatever is going to be executed formally or informally in their institution they would be having influence.</p> <p>they must be a baseline of whatever happens here.</p> <p>formulate rules or structures that govern that institution.</p>	<p>Teachers say school proprietors' roles are to provide base for schools to operate, formulate rules and structures that govern schools. They must provide materials and direction for schools. They must have plans for their schools.</p>	
--	---	---	--	--

	<p>To be honest with you, unless someone provides me with a written document that stipulates their (school proprietor's) roles and responsibilities, I don't have an idea about them.</p> <p>Teachers' rep B So for me they should be the ones who are providing the springboard so that whatever is going to be executed formally or informally in their institution they would be having influence. In a nutshell, I think they must be a baseline of whatever happens here.</p> <p>They should also formulate rules or structures that govern that institution. They should also provide materials and the direction in which they want their school to follow so that the driver or whoever is involved just ensures</p>	<p>provide materials and the direction in which they want their school to follow so that the driver or whoever is involved just ensures implementation. certain pillars that are set by proprietor and one of them is that you teach a child holistically to have a plan for their schools.</p> <p>the school proprietor does not have much to do with it because decisions are made by the Board.</p> <p>The Board then reports to him/her (educational secretary) to find out how the Board is performing on a quarterly basis and report to the relevant body to ensure that children obtain quality education.</p>	<p>Parents' view is that school proprietors' role is to get quarterly reports on how SBs are performing; to ensure schools provide quality education, classrooms are in good condition, schools have qualified teachers, schools are run smoothly and obtain good academic results. They also believe school proprietors have some impact on children's religion.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

	<p>implementation. Our school has certain pillars that are set by proprietor and one of them is that you teach a child holistically: you teach him/her about God; teach him/her subjects in order to prepare him/her for life out there. The base for this is that the child should be able to draw power from God. This one I know the proprietor is paying attention to it.</p> <p>Teachers' rep C I think it is their responsibility to have a plan for their schools. What is it that they want to achieve?</p> <p>Parents' rep A I would say in as far as management of the school is concerned the school proprietor does not have</p>	<p>To ensure that students have classrooms which are in good condition and they have qualified teachers.</p> <p>ensure that the school runs smoothly so that the school produces good results.</p> <p>he impacts a lot on religious matters.</p> <p>also ensures that every child who stays on school compound goes to church every Sunday.</p> <p>we have the school basically because we want to contribute to the country's education.</p> <p>to make sure that physically, socially, mentally/intellectually, as well as spiritually, the citizenry of this country are educated.</p> <p>ensuring that everyone who comes there is exposed to the</p>	<p>The school proprietor's role, according to SB chairpersons is to contribute to country's education by ensuring that citizenry is educated in all aspects of life, physical, social, mental and spiritual. The most important aspect being spiritual life.</p> <p>Educational secretaries see their roles as to ensure smooth</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

	<p>much to do with it because decisions are made by the Board.</p> <p>The Board then reports to him/her (educational secretary) so that he/she takes the matter to the church, the Bishop or whoever the school accounts to. Another responsibility of the educational secretary is to find out how the Board is performing on a quarterly basis and report to the relevant body, regardless of whether there are challenges or not.</p> <p>Parents' rep B It is a bit difficult. But in my view, is to ensure that children obtain quality education. To ensure that students have classrooms which are in good condition and they have qualified teachers. They must ensure that the school runs smoothly so that</p>	<p>truth of God that would help lift the person useful in this world for service as well as in the kingdom to come.</p> <p>to ensure that their schools are run well.</p> <p>ensure that leadership in their schools performs their (proprietor's) mandate.</p> <p>ensure that they engage people who will pursue their church's ethos, particularly at the apex of school management.</p> <p>ensure registration of school boards.</p> <p>ensure that SB and management understand circulars from the Ministry.</p> <p>to liaise with the Ministry of Education and management of schools</p> <p>we organise, supervise and co-ordinate the educational work in the schools</p> <p>to do other things</p>	<p>running of their schools; ensure school leadership is performing proprietor's mandate; engage in schools people who will pursue their church's ethos; liaise between the Ministry and schools; organise, supervise and co-ordinate educational work; appoint SBs and keep a close eye on their dealings.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

	<p>the school produces good results.</p> <p>Parents' rep C The chief role of the proprietor as I have observed, since ours is a church school, he impacts a lot on religious matters. He has a lot of impact on children's religion present at our school. He also ensures that every child who stays on school compound goes to church every Sunday.</p> <p>SB chairperson B As a proprietor of the school we are aware that the school is a sub-system within a super-system. In other words, the school is within a country and of course, the</p>	<p>that can be assigned to him by the Ministry.</p> <p>the SB is appointed by the educational secretary.</p> <p>has to liaise the management because he has to oversee the management of the school</p> <p>to see to it that the schools are being managed well.</p> <p>to keep a close eye on the dealings and the workings of the SB in the management and governance of the school</p>		
--	---	---	--	--

	<p>citizenry of the country should be educated and we have the school basically because we want to contribute to the country's education.</p> <p>Apart from that we also believe that, as a church we are very firm on this, education is not total, is not holistic unless a person is educated spiritually as well and so our responsibility is to make sure that physically, socially, mentally/intellectually, as well as spiritually, the citizenry of this country are educated. And we pick that through the responsibility of ensuring that everyone who comes there is exposed to the truth of God that would help lift the person useful in this world for service as well as in the kingdom to come.</p> <p>Educational Secretary 1 Their roles are to ensure that their schools are run</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>well. They ensure that leadership in their schools performs their (proprietor's) mandate. They ensure that they engage people who will pursue their church's ethos, particularly at the apex of school management. They do this by making sure that their schools employ teachers who share their religious belief. They ensure registration of school boards. They ensure that SB and management understand circulars from the Ministry.</p>			
	<p>Educational Secretary 2 Actually as per the stipulation of the Education Act 2010, the role of the educational secretary is to liaise with the Ministry of Education and</p>			

	<p>management of schools and again we organise, supervise and coordinate the educational work in the schools and to do other things that can be assigned to him by the Ministry.</p> <p>every school is governed by SB, but the SB is appointed by the educational secretary. That is why the educational secretary has to liaise the management because he has to oversee the management of the school. He/she has to see to it that the schools are being managed well.</p> <p>Like I said he/she has to oversee management of the school. So he has to keep a close eye on the dealings and</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>the workings of the SB in the management and governance of the school. So everything that happens in the school in terms of governance, he/she is keeping an eye on it. And if he/she has to intervene, he/she has to do that timeously.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

Appendix L

EDITING AND PROOFREADING CERTIFICATE

7542 Galangal Street

Lotus Gardens

Pretoria

0008

01 November 2017

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This letter serves to confirm that I have edited and proofread ND Nkanda's dissertation entitled: **“The influence of school proprietors on the roles and responsibilities of school boards in church-owned schools in Lesotho.”**

I found the work intriguing and enjoyable to read. Much of my editing basically dealt with obstructionist technical aspects of language which could have otherwise compromised smooth reading as well as the sense of the information being conveyed. I hope that the work will be found to be of an acceptable standard. I am a member of Professional Editors' Guild.

Hereunder are my particulars:



Jack Chokwe (Mr)

Contact numbers: 072 214 5489 / 012 429 3327

jackchokwe@gmail.com

Professional
EDITORS
Guild