MANAGING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE: A CRITIQUE OF THE TOP-DOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN BOTSWANA

Nkobi Owen Pansiri

Associate Professor
University of Botswana.
Email: pansirio@mopipip.ub.bw

ABSTRACT

The thesis of this article is that, in view of the increasingly complex nature of change and in the light of insights from the complexity theory, managing educational change for school effectiveness and school improvement should shift from top-down to consensus-based decision-making models. The discussion uses the Primary School Management Development Project in Botswana as a case study. The complexity theory and current research are applied to critically analyse the project. In the final analysis, an all-inclusive bottom-up model of management of change, reform and innovation that encourages active interaction, collaboration, partnership, involvement and participation in educational development is recommended.

Key words: change, reform, innovation, consensus-based decision making, top-down decision making, complexity theory, school improvement

Introduction

Change, reform and innovation are concepts that are often used interchangeably. However, some researchers working in the field of management of educational change have tried to make a distinction between the terms (See Nicholls, 1983; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Dalin, 1998; Hannay et al, 2005). Change is an alteration in situations and may not imply any improvement. Reform is a top-down set of related initiatives that aim at restructuring a system. Innovation is a deliberate and well-calculated process that is intended to improve practice. As an educational management initiative, the Primary School Management Development Project (PSMDP) involved elements of all the three concepts. It originated from policy initiative, resulting in organisational restructuring and hoped to transform from reform to innovation in order to impact on classroom practice. This article therefore evaluates this project in view of the nexus of 'change', 'reform' and 'innovation', and as efforts towards school effectiveness and school improvement by the ministry of education in Botswana. The ministry of education was abbreviated as MoE till the implementation of the 2006 organisational structure when it was re-named Ministry of Education and Skills Development (MoE&SD). These two nomenclatures will be used in this discussion interchangeably according to the time changes as and when they were operationalised. MoE is therefore used to refer to its function before the re-naming, while MoE&SD is after the re-naming.

The discussion first gives a brief background to the Botswana primary education establishment during the project (1999 - 2002), which also provides contextual information about the project. Secondly, an understanding of the complexity theory is outlined. Thirdly, a brief explanation and analysis of the project is given. A theoretical framework and current research on managing educational change are used to interrogate the project. The discussion concludes with some of the lessons learnt from the project and proposes recommendations for consideration in the change management of such a project.

Background

During the PSMDP, and which is still is, Botswana ran two primary school systems. There were public or government schools which were constructed and owned by government through local authorities or district councils. There were also private schools mostly known as English medium schools. These were owned by either by rich individuals or companies. This discussion concerns itself with public schools where the government has a political obligation to invest public resources to provide the needed education programmes to its people.

The impact of PSMDP was supposed to be noted at the end or after the project. By April 2004, Botswana had 720 government primary schools accommodating 313 352 pupils and 11 406 (79% female and 21% male) trained teachers (Republic of Botswana, 2004). In terms of organisational management structure, a school had a headteacher, a deputy headteacher, up to five heads of department (depending on school size), and up to six senior teachers/teacher advisers (depending on school size). Bigger schools had close to 40 teachers while small ones had a minimum of seven teachers. The headteacher, deputy and heads of department made up the school management team (SMT) and had overall responsibility for school management and supervision. The senior teachers/teachers advisers were responsible for supporting teachers in the area of curriculum implementation including planning and teaching subject areas (Republic of Botswana, 2000).

During the same period, the country had 12 well-resourced education centres that supported teachers' professional development. These were spread strategically all over the country. According to the Republic of Botswana (2004) there were 39 district inspectors who supervised an average of 15 schools each. Most of the schools did not have support staff (secretary, messengers, grounds men, cleaners). Schools lacked basic equipment such as computers, typewriters, fax machines and photocopiers. Most schools in rural areas did not have electricity or telephone. Schools were encouraged to establish a Parents and Teachers Association (PTA) to link the school to the community and to raise additional resources not provided by the government.

The Revised National Policy on Education (RNPE) of 1994 - an education policy blue print for education development, presented pronouncements, several reforms and innovations to guide the education sector. As a result, the PSMDP was launched in 1999 as a primary school improvement project. As a change approach, it could be seen as a reform project that was supposed to forestall innovations for school improvement. Its goal was to improve the quality of primary education in Botswana. Its major activities were the provision of effective management training and support to SMTs in all primary schools (Republic of Botswana, 2002) to facilitate innovative classroom practice. This discussion therefore employs the complexity theory to critique the tenets of 'change', 'reform' and 'innovation' in this project.

Theoretical Framework

The complexity theory is a scientific ontology which scholars use to explain the nature and problems of change. Change is viewed to be an inevitably emerging and unpredictable phenomenon of the social world. Morrison (1998; 2002) holds that change does not develop according to a linear pattern. He argues that change cannot be predicted by linear equations. Stacey (2003) too argues that change is a process of social order and that it is an outcome of disorder. Interdependence and interaction between people leads to the emergence of social evolution and order. The scientific ontological argument is that the future is a possibility but not a certainty. Educational reform and innovation could therefore be understood from the context of this ontological position. For example, Wallace and McMahon (1994) along with Fullan (2003) and Wallace (2003) argue that the complexities of educational change and reforms relate to dynamics emerging at school, district and state levels. The dynamics come from the nature of human relations as individuals or groups which have a direct connection in the process of educational reforms. The relationships translate organisations into social open complex processes that develop from unpredictable patterns. Distributed control and communication are some of the key principles used to manage emerging dynamics.

Morrison (2002) describes an open system such as a school as a "collection of interacting parts which, together, function as a whole" (p. 7). He argues that there are a variety of variables involved in interaction so much so that behaviour of a system is understood as emerging consequence of the sum of the constituent elements (p.8). He argues that as systems emerge, it is difficult to predict consequences and implications with any degree of certainty or precision. In a similar view, Fullan (2003) argues that complex changes in education are increasing in pace and speed. Wallace (2003) indicates that issues of globalisation, the collapse of communism and increase in marketisation have also increased the complexity of reform in education. Wallace holds that educational change cannot be managed with a precise degree of accuracy. From my experience, complexity, speed and pace of increased multiplicity of innovations in schools cause teacher frustration and burnout. However, the complexity theory as a postmodernist perspective helps agents of change in school systems to understand the nature of social order.

Research points out some emerging complexities that impact on strategies and processes of school effectiveness and improvement. Fullan's (2003) 'tri-level' argument (school, district and state) and Lodge and Reed (2003) and Wallace's (2003) account of globalisation are helpful in explaining how some complexities of change in education emanate from education polices. Education policies are influenced by the dictates of social development and world trends. For example, declarations and policies from UNESCO, World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), Education for All of 1990 and Millennium Development Goals of 2000 have huge influence on education policies across the world, particularly in the middle and low-income countries (Crossley & Watson, 2003; Crossley, Herriot, Waudo, Mwirotsi, Holmes, & Juma, 2005; Tabulawa, Polelo & Silas, 2013).

According to Morrison (1998; 2002), Fullan, (2003) and Stacey (2003) the complexity theory perspective shows that change in social setting such as a school depends on a variety of social forces from within and from outside the school. The level of interaction that people engage in is critical. The new knowledge that people's interaction produce as individuals and as groups is fundamental. The new solutions that emerge from interaction and new knowledge are essential. The level of ownership of the solutions by the people interacting is a key factor. The degree of critique and questions that people raise significantly influence the process of change. All these are conditionality of interaction that makes change a situational and complex phenomenon. To manage change, one therefore needs to create highly collaborative and networking systems that actively engage people to confidently deal with the unfolding uncertainties. Schmidt and White (2004) argue that, "success with implementation of complex reform depends on the people engaged" (p. 209). The quality of communication, collaboration, partnership and involvement of all key parties such as local authority (Bennett & Anderson, 2005), teachers (Gunter, 2005), parents and wider community (Tikly, Caballero, Haynes & Hill, 2004; Tikly & Ngcobo, 2005), and learners (Oerlemans & Vidovich, 2005) in educational change is a necessity. Complexity theorists are adamant about the role of conflict, confusion, uncertainty, anxiety and stress because these inevitably trigger new and meaningful interaction. In this view, the role of change agents is best if it takes people in their institutions out of the equilibrium into positive conflict, out of conformity and comfort zones to functional confusion, and out of dependence and complacency to search for new meaning. This humanistic approach allows people in an organisation such as a school to develop trust, faith and hope in themselves and their efforts. It encourages continuous learning as well as individual and organisational improvement (Fullan, 2003: 56), a position necessary for schools in Botswana where the national vision is "to be an informed and educated nation" (Gaolathe, 1997). Most importantly, leadership is able to control the groups' willingness to open up for dialogue during the process of planning and implementing change. Listening to one another as individuals at inter and intra-group levels is fundamental. Open communication creates active networks in a community of practice where change reinforces effective practices with "greater recognition, aspirations and effectiveness…" (Fullan, 2003, p.45). Hoban (2002) in Fullan (2003) argues that to manage change, it is essential to challenge the groups "sense of uncertainty or intellectual unrest" (p.49). The complexity theory therefore helps one to understand that change is inherent in the people's interaction, hence the need to lead by constantly reinforcing and engaging people into active and meaningful interactions.

In their circles of thinking, Wallace and McMahon (1994) and Wallace (2003) introduced the paradigm of 'orchestration' as yet another device that enables one to 'cope' with complex educational change and multiple innovations common in schools. The paradigm allows the agents of change apply 'flexibility, planning and coordination' through out the change process. Wallace (2003) encourages efforts that build 'common culture and communication' to accommodate the views and feelings of all the players involved in educational change. Such inclusion encourages change agents to minimise resistance and opposition to

change. Orchestration strategies encourage change agents such as heads of schools to marshal different support to different groups involved in change such as teachers, parents and children so that all people feel that the change processes meet their differentiated needs.

To conclude this section, I wish to observe that while one may not claim the ability to manage complex change with precision and accuracy, it is important for one to apply skills and knowledge to manage 'coping'. Fullan (1993, p.25) argues that, "problems are our friends". This implies that change is a challenge but not a problem. It brings the unexpected implications and outcomes that should be viewed as energizers and motivators for creativity towards opportunities for success. In my view 'managing coping' is another critical element in management of educational change. Managing coping means the ability to flexibly coordinate situational communication and interaction of people and patterns of change through a reflective all-inclusive plan. In managing coping, a change agent tries to balance the horizontal and vertical involvement of all parties. Vertical means those who effect change and horizontal refers to those to be affected by change. From my experience, change is sometimes derailed before reaching its goals from the focus because agents lack self-organisation to manage coping, and consequently the focus is overshadowed by emerging complexities during implementation. This is how this discussion introspect the PSMDP.

The PSMDP in Botswana
The PSMDP was a collaborative effort between Botswana and Britain, through the MoE and the British Department for International Development (DfID). This was in accordance with the neo-liberal dominated policies influenced by major international institutions such as the World Bank and IMF (Tabulawa, Polelo & Silas, 2013) and the agenda of the Education for All (EFA) on 'partnership and collaboration' (Crossley & Watson, 2003; Crossley, et al, 2005) especially that since the 1990s Botswana has been active towards achieving the EFA goals (Tabulawa, 2011). One of the EFA strategies as well as the World Bank policy is 'partnership and collaboration' between developed and developing countries for capacity building and for funding. For this reason, the PSMDP was located within this global trend policy context.

The PSMDP was one strategy through which Botswana implemented the RNPE to address effectiveness and improvement of the quality of primary education. The overall goal of the PSMDP was "to improve the quality of primary education in Botswana by providing effective management training and support to school management team" (MoE Report, 2002). Its objectives therefore addressed both school effectiveness and school improvement. The project coincided with the introduction of the country's vision 2016, and the implementation of the RNPE which emphasised 'equity, relevancy, access and quality' of basic education to create 'an educated and informed nation' by 2016 (Gaolathe, 1997). The RNPE requires heads to be made instructional leaders who could apply a site-based type of school management and lead in the implementation of the vision. In terms of the policy, SMTs were viewed as critical agents that needed professional skills to foster change and quality in schools (Tsayang, 2002) hence the introduction of PSMDP. To analyse the development of this project and for purposes of this discussion, I will divide it into three phases. Phase One was a baseline study; Phase Two included the development of training materials; and Phase Three was training of SMTs.

Phase One of the project was a baseline survey. The premise of the project was that public or government primary schools were performing poorly in the national examinations. The survey (see Republic of Botswana - MoE, 2000) therefore identified a wide range of issues that needed redress. For example, the primary school managers or heads of primary schools were reported to be unable to develop school development plans; schools did not run through joint planning from leadership teams; there were more weaknesses in the teacher management approaches, which were affecting the desire for improved classroom-

based learning; distribution of trained teachers was skewed so much that remote area schools were staffed with the young and inexperienced teachers; and the rate of untrained teachers was higher in remote area schools than in urban and peri-urban schools. Some of the problems related to lack of induction of teachers, poor interpersonal skills among SMTs and teachers, poor communication and consultation techniques and weak reflection of professional ethics among the teaching staff. Schools' systems of resource (supplies) management were found to be wanting. Learners' inter-personal relations were found to be poor and that there was no pastoral role played by SMTs. Parental involvement in school curricula or co-curricula activities was reported to be minimal. These issues were used as the basis for enacting the PSMDP.

During Phase Two, the consultants first spearheaded the development of training of trainers (ToT) materials. A ToT team was subsequently put together from among school inspectors, in-service education officers and college lecturers. Secondly, the training materials were developed and used to train the team on school leadership with emphasis on school development planning. Thirdly, the consultants and ToT team developed three management units (commonly referred to as Management Unit 1-3). Unit 1 was on Learning School; Unit 2 on Ethical School; and Unit 3 on Person-Centred School. At the same time, thirty primary school heads were selected and sent to do a two-year tailor made degree in educational management in the UK. These later became Primary School Management Advisors (PSMAs) and have since become key facilitators of the reform responsible for the improvement of school leadership and classroom practice. This phase witnessed structural reform in the primary education management system.

Phase Three was the massive training of heads and other members of the school management team through a cascade model. Key players were the consultants as coordinators of national and regional workshops and the PSMAs as facilitators using the three management units developed during Phase Two. The SMTs participated in three training sessions of a week each covering each of the three units at the education centers. National training sessions were concluded in 2002.

At the conclusion of the project, the SMTs as instructional leaders were expected to continue with school-based training, the multiplier effect system so as to bring the teachers on board. The PSMAs were responsible for strengthening instructional leadership training through monitoring and supporting the SMTs. In this way, the project was a commendable initiative. The SMTs have been trained through the use of the three management units (see MoE Report, 2002). The impact of the project was minimally visible through charts of development plans displayed in school offices, which highlight managerial and classroom supervision activities. What was clear though, is that the project achieved restructuring and reinforced hierarchical and bureaucratic power relations in the management of primary education on the expense of declining quality of classroom performances.

PSMDP in the Context of the Complexity Theory and Current Research

While some of the factors discussed above are perceived as the key indicators of success in the Botswana education sector at the conclusion of the project in 2002, questions about its impact on classroom practice remained unanswered. Fullan (1993) argues, "you can't mandate what matters" (p. 22). From the complexity theory perspective, the project focus on motivation of teacher development and commitment was hijacked by the emphasis on hierarchical power relationships instead of developing effective interactive networks. According to some studies on management of educational change (Dalin, 1998; Goodson, 2001; Fullan, 2003; Hannay et al, 2005), meaningful reforms are those that raise the passion and commitment of the teacher. Scholars argue for partnership, collaboration and wider community involvement including learners during critical stages of change initiation (Fullan, 1993; Bennett & Anderson, 2005; Gunter, 2005;

Oerlemans & Vidovich, 2005; Tikly, Caballero, Haynes & Hill, 2004; Tikly & Ngcobo, 2005). Unfortunately the PSMDP has not been sensitive to the issues of increasing teachers' innovativeness and collegiality in the classroom. It did not concern itself with the issues of participation in school wide decision-making and commitment to the profession during its three phases of implementation. Senior teachers/teachers advisers who are critical on management of curriculum change were not taken on board at any of the three phases. The project has not included or involved parents directly. It paid lip service to what Fullan (1993) referred to as "connection with the wider environment" (p. 38).

In view of the self-organization and humanistic view of complexity theory, the project was too linear and mechanical to empower and skill the horizontal constituency (teachers, parents and children) and as such it missed the target (teaching and learning, which are the core business of a school). This is so, because during its life span, the project concentrated on training. It kept teachers and pupils passively at a distance. Goodson (2001:48) has observed a trend where the SMTs and teachers are usually 'conservative respondents' in educational change activities. This is indicative of a situation where the teachers do not take part in the initial decisions about the project. For example, both the SMTs and teachers only came in as passive recipients of the MoE-DfID project. In my view, the SMTs were trapped into what Wallace (2003) called "piggies in the middle" (p.9), because they had to liaise and link MoE and teachers. Dainton (2005) referred to this type of approach as the "unexamined addiction to bright new ideas" (p.159). This can be used to describe the development of the PSMDP because the PSMAs who trained overseas, together with consultants from abroad were perceived as unique people who bring with them some new ideas from the developed world. As Morrison (2002) argues, as the PSMDP developed, it was difficult for the project leadership to predict consequences and implications with any degree of certainty or precision.

Activities of the SMTs were constrained by a lack of resources. As mentioned in the background, schools lacked resources. These experiences show the degree of problematic nature of the project. According to Dalin (1998) and Hannay, Ross and Seller (2005), the top-down perspective on change put huge pressure on teachers. Top-down initiated reforms do not achieve sustained interaction or reciprocal accountability among players in change process. While PSMDP was a good project, the policy system or MoE were not sensitive to the material conditions under which schools existed. The policy created opportunity for resistance especially when schools did not have the right materials to implement the project.

During the third phase of the project, the PSMAs demanded higher status, arguing that they were highly trained and were performing at a level higher than school heads. In response and under the pressure to ensure sustainability and institutionalization of the project, the MoE created thirty new professional advisory positions. The PSMAs were automatically promoted and sent to district offices to work alongside the inspectors. This vertical decision was a contingency measure, a good example of evolutions in the process of management of educational change raised by Fullan (1993, 1999 & 2003) and Morrison (2002). However, the reform did not auger well with both serving headteachers and the inspectors. It was interpreted as a hidden deliberate plan designed to favour individuals who benefited twice (opportunity to study for a degree in UK and getting promoted). The inspectors felt sabotaged by the system because they too believed that in terms of responsibility they were operating higher than the PSMAs. Conflict and resistance emerged in the system as both long serving and more experienced headteachers and district inspectors accorded PSMAs minimal respect and support. Therefore, the restructuring of the primary education supervision during the PSMDP diluted the taste of the reform. The PSMAs new portfolios meant that the project focused on 'control and transactional leadership' instead of increasing teacher collegiality, participation and commitment to the profession or transformational leadership.

PSMDP as a Failed Initiative

Following the MoE&SD Organization and Methods (O&M) of 2006, government introduced a new organizational structure that came up with decentralization of the service from headquarters to the regions (Republic of Botswana, 2006). As a consequent, ten regions of the MoE&SD were established in 2010. This period also coincided with the observed "evidence of declining educational quality" as reflected by poor performance of schools in the national examinations (Republic of Botswana, 2006:7). Jotia and Pansiri, (2013) actually noted that "between 2002 and 2004 [the life of the project], 88% of children from RADs children progressed to secondary education with pass grades of C and D". They further argued that between 2004 and 2010, the primary school system recorded a dropout of 27 552 children at an average of 1.2% loss per annum (Jotia & Pansiri, 2013). These facts are indicative of PSMDP as an unsuccessful project. It should be noted that this project's mandate was to improve the quality of primary education. Faced with PSMDP as a failed initiative, the ministry abolished the PSMAs positions. The implementation of the 2006 O&M reform of the MoE&SD changed the organizational structure of the school external supervisory support system. New regional administrative centres were established. Some of the education centres were turned from in-service functions into new education administrative centers for newly established regions. As advocated by both the 1994 RNPE and the 2006 O&M, the ministry strengthened the inspectorate portfolios. Most of the PSMAS who trained in the UK retired from the service and were not replaced. Those who remained were absorbed in the inspectorate cadre and thus, bringing the PSMDP initiative to an end.

The PSMDP change process therefore set a good example that confirms studies on social movement which reveal that power relations lead to resistance and opposition to change or reform. Hannay et al (2005) argue that control initiatives demand achievement of standards, emphasize monitoring and compliance and specify specific tasks to teachers. They argue that control does not achieve improvement but rather forestall effectiveness, or in the case of school, is about increasing pass grades of students. Goodson (2001) in Hannay et al (2005) argues that reform that is based on control initiatives does not "incorporate the teachers' sense of passion and purpose" (p. 9), and so it cannot be sustained. Fullan (1993) argues that if cooperation and relationships are not based on equal power, chances of success are minimal. In my view, the PSMDP lacked strategy to 'manage coping' hence it fell easily into a trap of emerging issues and therefore risked failing to achieve its goal. The PSMDP lost focus because the agents of change did not manage coping with change. As such, emerging and evolving interactions in the life of the project overpowered the agents' ability to maximise distributed control.

Stall and Stoecker (1997) in Oakes and Lipton (2002) argue that the success of a reform depends on the level to which it empowers individuals such as teachers and parents and help them build relationships and networks. They argue that relationships and networks are essential to get people involved to "define their community, the problems they wish to address, the solution they wish to pursue and the methods they will use to accomplish their solution" (p. 397). The project was not relationship-driven despite the good sub-theme of 'person-centeredness' as one of the training units. It therefore failed to cope with diverse ideas from vertical and horizontal angles in managing change. The MoE&SD technical wing has not been able to effectively manage coping with emerging issues in the project hence the project's marginalization of teachers, children and parents who are essential members of the education constituency.

Conclusion

In view of both the complexity theory and the current research on management of educational change, there are lessons to learn from the PSMDP and for which the future could be built. For example, a new paradigm in management of educational change is focussed on the issues of school 'effectiveness' and 'improvement' (Hannay et al, 2005). The involvement of headteachers and teachers in innovations is being given new emphasis. Issues of teacher motivation, empowerment and commitment against teacher control, passivity, compliance and monitoring are critical. The complexity theory emphasise the need for increased collaboration, involvement and interaction of all parties in an organisation

In school effectiveness, school leadership tend to be more valued than classroom practice. Leadership plays a major role to initiate control strategies that make the school system effective. The system is controlled through measures such as tests and achievement of set goals and objectives (Nicholls, 1983; Hannay et al, 2005). Teacher effectiveness is managed through appraisal system, classroom assessment and competition between classes and between schools. The PSMDP was therefore school effectiveness-driven because it concentrated on mechanisms of control of headteachers' and teachers' work.

According Nicholls (1983), Fullan and Hargreaves (1991), Dalin (1998) and Hannay et al (2005) school improvement addresses quality of classroom practice and teachers are central in educational change. Teachers need to be entrusted with the ability to bring systematic, sustained and dramatic improvement that affect and improve learning settings. Strengthening of teachers' professional autonomy and professionalizing teaching is a recipe for teacher 'innovativeness'. Teachers need skills to have more control over their work so that they capably respond to the classroom challenges with minimum intervention from supervisors. The PSMDP missed this in all its three phases. Unfortunately teachers in Botswana continuously experience problems in their classrooms such as high drop out rates (Koketso, 2001), rampant use of corporal punishment (Molefe, Pansiri & Weeks, 2006) and high low attainment in remote area schools (Letshabo, Mafela, Magogwe, Mazile, Molosiwa, Ramorogo, Tabulawa, & Tsayang, 2002). School improvement did not come out clearly in the activities of the project as the main focus of the PSMDP despite being a fundamental issue in developing an educated and informed nation. This is so because the project did not target senior teachers/teacher advisers whose role is critical instructional and curriculum change and leadership. Teachers, parents and learners were not the immediate beneficiaries in the life of the project. Consequently, the PSMDP has failed to transform from a reform to an innovation.

I however hold the view that both 'effectiveness' and 'continuous improvement' are critical in educational change. School improvement needs to reflect on school effectiveness and vice versa. From the perspective of both complexity theory and current research, a school as a social setting should be as good as its leadership as well as its teachers and its wider constituency. Any educational change project that is not informed by this philosophical position risks failure.

The major lesson to draw from this discussion therefore is that the PSMDP took a vertical and top-down reform or a high-powered distant management approach, which marginalised essential groups that affect and are affected by change. The project used top-down decision-making model and failed to transform from a program to innovations. Premised on the fact that human beings are social animals (Stacey, 2003), and learning from the emerging paradigm of the complexity theory (Fullan, 1993; 1999; 2003; Morrison, 1998; 2002) an all-inclusive bottom-up model of management of educational change (Wallace & McMahon, 1994) that encourages active interaction, collaboration, partnership, involvement and participation (Fullan, 1993; Bennett & Anderson, 2005; Gunter, 2005; Oerlemans & Vidovich, 2005; Tikly, Caballero, Haynes, & Hill,

2004; Tikly & Ngcobo, 2005) is recommended for Botswana. An all-inclusive model is consensus-based decision-making where active interaction between and among all members is effectively coordinated. It should allow orderly and reflective linkages from change through reform to innovation. In this way, balanced teacher and learner motivation and commitment to effectiveness and continuous improvement would be ensured. I would also recommend that 'management of change' be introduced in in-service activities of education planners, in-service providers, school leaders, teachers and members of school governing bodies in the Botswana education system to build strong attributes of distributed control and self-organisation in schools.

Acknowledgement:

References

1. Bennett, N. & Anderson, L. (2005). School - LEA Partnerships: Recipe for Success or   Chimera [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Educational Change,* 6, 29-50

2. Byrne, D. (1998). *Complexity Theory and the Social Science: An Introduction.* London: Routledge

3. Crossley, M., Herriot, A., Waudo, J., Mwirotsi, M., Holmes, K. & Juma, M. (2005). *Research and Evaluation for Educational Development: Learning from the PRISM Experience in Kenya*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

4. Crossley, M & Watson, K. (2003). *Comparative and International Research in Education: Globalisation, Context and Difference*. London: Routledge-Falmer

5. Dainton, S. (2005). Reclaiming Teachers' Voices [Electronic Version]. *FORUM*, 47. No. 2, 149-167

6. Dalin, P. (1998). *School Development Theories and Strategies*. London: Cassell

7. Fullan, M. (1993). *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*. London: Falmer Press

8. Fullan, M. (1999). *Change Forces: The Sequel.* London: Falmer Press

9. Fullan, M. (2003). *Change Forces: With a Vengeance*. London: Routledge Falmer

10. Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1992). *What's Worth Fighting for in Your School*. Buckingham: Open University Press

11. Gaolathe, B. (1997). Vision 2016: *Towards Prosperity for All – Long Term Vision for Botswana.* Gaborone: Government Printers

12. Goodson, I F. (2001). Social Histories of Educational Change [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Educational Change*, l 2, 45-63.

13. Gunter, H. (2005). Putting Education into Leadership [Electronic Version]. *Forum.* 47. No. 2, 181-185

14. Hannay, L. M., Ross, J. A. & Seller, W. (2005). Clashing Cultures, Clashing Paradigms: Lessons from District Research on Secondary School Restructuring [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Educational Change*, 6, 7-27

15. Jotia, L. A. & Pansiri, O. N. (2013). Multicultural education: the missing link in Botswana education policy. *European Journal of Educational Studies.* Vol. 5. No. 1. Pp. 101-110

16. Koketso, G. (2001). The Remote Area Dweller Programme of the Ministry of Local Government in Oussoren, O (ed.). *Education for Remote Area Dwellers in Botswana: Problems and Perspectives.* Windhoek: Research and Development Unit of the University of Botswana and Workgroup of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa.

17. Letshabo, K. M., Mafela, L., Magogwe, J., Mazile, B. M., Molosiwa, A., Ramorogo, G., Tabulawa, R & Tsayang, G. T. (2002**).** *Report on Improving Instructional Setting for Children of the Remote Area Dwellers.* Gaborone: University of Botswana - Office of Research and Development.

18. Lodge, C. & Reed, J. (2003). Transforming School Improvement Now and for the Future. [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Educational Change*, 4, 45-62

19. Molefe, D, Pansiri, O & Weeks, S. (2006, May 22) Corporal Punishment and Children's Rights. *Botswana Mmegi/Monitor***,** Vol. 23. No 75 also [Electronic version] on http://www.mmegi.bw/2006/monday22/opinion.html.

20. Morrison, K. (1998). *Management Theories for Educational Change*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd

21. Morrison, K. (2002). *School Leadership and Complexity Theory*. London: Routledge Falmer

22. Nicholls, A. (1983). *Managing Educational Innovations*. London: George Allen & Unwin

23. Oakes, J. & Lipton, M. (2002). Struggling for Educational Equity in Diverse Communities: School Reform as Social Movement [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Educational Change*, 13, 383-406

24. Oerlemans, K. & Vidovich, L. (2005). Expert Witness: Voices of Significance. [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Educational Change*, 6, 363-379

25. Republic of Botswana, (1994). *The Revised National Policy on Education of 1994*. Ministry of Education. Gaborone: Government Printer

26. Republic of Botswana, (2000). *Primary School Management Manual.* Gaborone: Government Printer

27. Republic of Botswana, (2006). *Report on the Organisational Restructuring of the Ministry of Education*. Gaborone: Government Printer

28. Republic of Botswana - MoE, (2000). The Baseline Study Report. Gaborone: Ministry of Education

29. Republic of Botswana, (2004). *Ministry of Education - 2004 Primary Education Statistics Report.* Gaborone: Ministry of Education - Department of Primary Education

30. Schmidt, M. & White, E. R. (2004). Educational Change: Putting Reform into Perspective [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Educational Change*, 15, 207-211

31. Stacey, R. D. (2003). *Complexity and Group Processes: A Radically Social Understanding of Individuals*. New York: Brunner-Routledge

32. Tabulawa, R. (2011). The rise and attenuation of the basic education programme (BEP) in Botswana: A global-local dialectic Approach. *International Journal of Educational Development.* Vol. 31. Pp. 433- 442

33. Tabulawa, R., Polelo, M., & Silas, O. (2013). The state, markets and higher education reform in Botswana. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*. Vol. 11., No 1. Pp. 108-135

34. Tikly, L. & Ngcobo, T. (2005). The Role of Community in Supporting Effective Leadership for Change in Historically Black Schools in South Africa. Paper presented to the *British Educational Leadership, Management and Administration Society*, Kent's Hill Training and Conference Centre, Milton Keynes.

35. Tikly, L., Caballero, C., Haynes, J. & Hill, J. (2004). *Understanding the Educational Needs of Mixed Heritage Pupils.* Bristol. Department for Education and Skills - University of Bristol.

36. Tsayang, G. T. (2002). *Education Policy, Management and Administration: Implications for Instructional Setting Improvement of the Basic Education for Children of Remote Area Dweller Project*. Gaborone: University of Botswana - Office of Research Development

37. Wallace, M. (2003). Managing the Unmanageable? Coping with Complex Educational Change [Electronic Version]. *Educational Management and Administration,* London: SAGE. 9-29.

38. Wallace, M. & McMahon, A. (1994). *Planning for Change in Turbulent Times.* London: Cassell