RHODES UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Principals' perceptions of the management of staff appraisal in schools

---

presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

MASTERS IN EDUCATION

(Education Leadership and Management)

by

LINDIWE ELLEN BLAAUW

March 2000

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of this research study would not have been possible without the co-operation of the people whose names appear below. I therefore place on record my sincere gratitude to the following:

My Supervisor, Prof H. van der Mescht for his encouragement, guidance, support and teachings.

The principals of the schools for their co-operation during data collection.

My parents and siblings for their love, support and for believing in me.

Above all, to the Almighty God who is the First Creator and without whom this endeavour would be in vain.

ABSTRACT

Teacher appraisal has long been a contentious and contested area in educational management. The recent implementation of a new system of appraisal in Eastern Cape Schools has led to renewed interest in the role and management of appraisal.

The objective of this study was to investigate principals' perception of the management of staff appraisal. An interpretive paradigm was adopted and the research is a case study of four secondary schools in Port Elizabeth. Two methods were used in collecting data, namely, questionnaires and interviews.

The content comparative method was used to analyse the data.

The findings of this study showed areas of continuities and discontinuities with the literature and the new document on appraisal. There is a clear understanding among the principals interviewed that staff appraisal should be used to assess individual teacher performance and that it should also be developmental. There is clear support from the principals on the involvement of other stakeholders. They see the process as transformative and participatory. They find it acceptable and are willing to be involved. However, the findings also indicate a lack of readiness on the part of the principals to fully embrace a fully participative and developmental approach to appraisal.

On the strength of these findings I conclude the thesis by making recommendations for policy, principals, teachers and for future researchers in the field.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I discuss the context in which this research has been undertaken, the research question, objective, and rationale, and provide a definition of terms used. Finally, I give an outline of the organisation of the study.

1.1 Setting the context

My interest in teacher appraisal was aroused when I was invited to attend a workshop on staff appraisal last year. The workshop was organised by the provincial education department to introduce educational district officials and subject advisers to a new system of teacher appraisal (South Africa 1998b), a system which emphasises development rather than judgement. The approach to appraisal advocated in the new system is characterised by participation, transparency, representivity and democracy in action. I am particularly interested in how such a system will be operationalised by officials and principals who have been, historically, trapped in a paradigm of measurement and judgement, and accustomed to bureaucratic structures and procedures; and also whether such a huge undertaking can be completed within the prescribed time period.

Another reason for my interest is that appraisal has been an area of ongoing contentiousness in South African education history. I remember reading and hearing about accounts of teachers' strikes and chalk-downs, in protest against the requirement that principals and especially inspectors had to "inspect" teachers in their classrooms. Indeed, barely a decade ago inspectors (or subject advisers) were denied access to teachers' classrooms, and the entire appraisal system collapsed. One of the main reasons for its demise was, I believe, the fact that the inherited system of teacher appraisal was simply another manifestation of the authoritarian,

opaque and dehumanising approach to black education in South Africa. Education in South Africa seems always to have been characterised by strong overhead control, authoritarian governance and management, and bureaucratic lines and levels of command (Hartshorne 1992) Teachers have traditionally had little input into any facets of education, from curriculum to management structures and appraisal systems. Darling-Hammond (cited Beardall 1995:366) argued that teachers have had their decision-making rights appropriated by a "higher authority" with regards to learning theory, child development, curriculum and assessment, and have not needed to be highly informed in these spheres. He believes that unless there is a change in thinking, teachers would continue to occupy the same level in society as they do at present: as civil servants who are expected to "toe the party line" because the "party" pays them (Ibid.) Naturally, the fact that teachers have not been given an opportunity to be involved in decision making has led to lost confidence in the importance and validity of their own ideas. Teachers carried out their task in an authoritarian system and faced repressive action when they challenged the system. Those teachers who dared to challenge the working of the department have often been threatened with dismissal, demotion, transfers or other forms of victimization (Reeves, 1994:5).

Resistance to appraisal is of course not merely a South African phenomenon. As Hoyle (cited in Zynoe 1995:384) remarked, "Teachers anywhere in the world don't like to be evaluated..." However, South African teachers have a particular resistance to, and suspicion of being appraised, and with good reason. In the past evaluation was used by the apartheid structures not as a mechanism for development but to control teachers.

A further reason for my research interest rose from my exposure to management thinking and theories in the course-work component of this master's course. Appraisal, or evaluation in some form or another, is central to the process of human management and the notion of professional growth. The process of management,

even in its classical and perhaps restricted sense, includes activities described as monitoring, control or evaluation, as important steps in the management cycle (Adams 1987). What interests me is therefore not the existence of appraisal as such, but the form it takes within schools. Education institutions are notoriously problematic institutions to manage, for a variety of reasons. Bush (1995) has provided an enlightening list of these reasons; I want to refer briefly to two of these. First, the fact that the "product" of an educational institution is difficult to define. Is it good academic results? Good sporting results? Or something more vague, such as a school's success in turning out well-rounded young people ready to take up their places as citizens of the country? Closely related is the second reason, that educational institutions find it hard to agree on specific goals. There are no easy answers to question such as "Why are we here?" "What are we, as teachers, trying to achieve?" How much more problematic, therefore, to agree on criteria and procedures for evaluating the work of educators.

A third reason for my interest lies in the question of how something as historically threatening as teacher appraisal can be accommodated within a context of increased professionalism, transparency, personal accountability and self-management. The trend (in education management thinking world-wide) is towards what the Report of the Task Team on Education Management Development (1996) described as self-management. The report argues that South African educators have, for too long, been reliant on higher authorities; they have been too ready to wait for instructions and guidelines from above. As a result then, one could argue, we inherited the appraisal system we deserve, that is, one dictated entirely from above, and run by persons in authority over us, with little or no input from ourselves. How likely is it that a system which is far more developmental and participatory will be effective, given our current levels of professionalism? This is another question my research will indirectly try to address.

Finally, my interest in school leadership - again aroused by the course-work - leads me to the main issue I wish to investigate. I am particularly interested in how school

3

principals will receive and perceive the new approach to appraisal. The new system holds fundamental challenges to principals, in so far as their role will change from that of being the key evaluator, to simply being part of a panel of evaluators. Will principals experience this as a motion of no confidence? How do they feel about the new system?

1.2 Research question

These questions lead to my research question, which is:

Since the principals were key figures in the previous appraisal system, and will continue to be a members of the Staff Development Team (SDT) responsible for the appraisal of teachers, how do they perceive their changed role in the management of the whole appraisal process?

1.3 Research goal

The chief goal of this study is to investigate principals' perceptions of the management of staff appraisal in schools. I also hope, in the process, to identify possible problem areas and pitfalls, which may be of benefit to

education managers. Finally, I hope to be able to point positively towards a way forward in this problematic and contentious aspect of management.

1.4 Rationale

For the last decade teachers' unhappiness with appraisal approaches led to complete suspension of the appraisal process. Although teacher unions, amongst

them SADTU, were negotiating for a new system of appraisal, no recent research on appraisal has been done. I hope that this study will help to highlight the importance of appraisal in developing and identifying teachers' strengths and shortcomings and equipping them with the necessary skills that can help them in improving their teaching practice.

I also trust that this study will be of benefit to all the stakeholders who will be part of appraisal panels and also to other researchers who have an interest in this area.

1.5   Definition of Terms

There is a variety of terms used in the literature - performance appraisal, performance review, performance evaluation, staff review, staff reporting and more especially teacher appraisal and teacher assessment - which have no accepted difference of meaning (Fidler, 1989:191). I have elected to use the term "staff appraisal" to refer to a developmental approach to assessing the performance of teachers with a view to improving their skills and knowledge.

1.6   Organisation of the Study

In Chapter One the foundation upon which this investigation is founded has been identified. The goals are explained, a rationale is provided, and the organisation of the thesis is outlined.

Chapter Two is a review of selected literature on appraisal, and an account of the recent history of teacher appraisal in South Africa. I also refer briefly to the history of staff appraisal in other countries (the USA and Britain). I discuss the philosophical understanding of staff appraisal and distinguish between evaluation and appraisal. I also discuss how appraisal could be managed. Different models of staff appraisal

and the similarities and differences of the different models and the methods of appraising are also explained.

In Chapter Three, the interpretive paradigm and the reasons for choosing this paradigm are explained. I address issues such as the research methods used to collect the data, sampling, data analysis, reliability, validity and the limitations of the study. In Chapter Four, the questionnaires and interviews are analysed and discussed. Chapter Five contains the recommendations and the conclusion of the study.

Appendices attached include letters I wrote to initiate and sustain the research process, a copy of the questionnaire and interview schedule I used, and a summary of Developmental Appraisal Document outlining the new approach to appraisal in the Eastern Cape.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter I attempt to give a brief history of staff appraisal, and discuss its different philosophical understandings. I also differentiate between evaluation and appraisal, and the management of the process, and outline the different models of staff appraisal. Finally, I discuss the different parties involved in staff appraisal.

2.1 Trends in teacher appraisal

According to Fidler and Cooper (1992:3) appraisal was first applied in industry and commerce. Stauss (cited in Fidler and Cooper 1992:4) explain that the process was concerned with the performance of employees as demonstrated by the extent to which they achieved targets to which they were committed. The philosophy underpinning this approach to appraisal has its origins in early management thinking, in which control was perceived to be one of the most important functions of management. The early 20th century industrialist, Henri Fayol, for example, placed considerable store by control, i.e. "to see that everything is done in accordance with the rules which have been laid down and the instructions which have been given" (Hoy and Miskel (1991:10). In similar vein, Taylor, the father of scientific management, believed that people could be programmed to be efficient machines (Hoy and Miskel 1991).

In line with classical management thinking early attempts at teacher appraisal are viewed as representing an autocratic philosophy of supervision, where teachers were seen as appendages of management and as such were employed to carry out pre-specified duties in accordance with the wishes of management (Sergovianni and Starrat 1998). I characterise the early philosophical understanding of staff appraisal as being similar to the scientific management approach - with its machine metaphor. The atmosphere that prevailed was characterised by a boss-subordinate

relationship. Rasool (1997), Squelch and Lemmer (1994) and Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:139), described appraisal as being bureaucratic, closed and authoritarian:

> One of the weakest areas in education in South Africa has been the appraisal of teachers - and this for various reasons. Because evaluation was managed in a top-down, hierarchical way, it was seen as a way of maintaining control and keeping surveillance over teachers.

Quinlan and Davidoff (1997) explain that inspectors and principals of schools would visit the classes of teachers, observe their teaching and complete a record which the teacher never saw. In this way the Department of Education was able to keep records of teachers. It was a once-off event. Teachers did not know the criteria used to judge them, nor were they given any feedback on strengths and weaknesses. As long as the teachers' administrative work and pupils' notebooks were neat and up to date, and the teachers delivered a rote-learning lesson on that day, the teachers were judged positively. What the teacher did otherwise was not important (Zynoe 1995:384). According to Egan (cited in Rasool 1997:6) the traditional appraisal schemes were retrospective, "taking place at the end, after everything is over - in other words, when it is too late". This type of evaluation has largely come to be seen as a summative, judgmental exercise to point out the wrongdoings of teachers and punish them accordingly. Evaluation was used for promotion purposes and to judge teachers so that principals and inspectors could have a means of controlling them. This approach to appraisal came of age with the advent of the Management by Objectives (MBO) movement in the 1960s. In terms of MBO thinking, teachers were measured against pre-determined criteria; the emphasis was on "inspection" and control, rather than development (Fidler and Cooper 1992:4). Mc Laughin (cited in Bollington et al. 1990) has drawn attention to the fact that teachers are more likely to improve if they are provided with informed feedback and opportunities to communicate effectively about their work than if they are made to work through an "uneven desultory ritual" or a standard checklist. Despite counter-movements in management thinking over the past century - such as the human relations drive, behaviourism and systems thinking - the "machine" seems to have been the most

8

pervasive metaphor for management in education, and thus also for teacher appraisal. And it seems to have found its expression most happily in Weberian notions of bureaucracy (Hoy and Miskel 1991).

2.1.1 A brief look at two other countries

It may be helpful at this stage to examine the position of appraisal in other countries to give one a framework for comparison. In the United States of America appraisal of teachers has undergone different stages. Firstly, in the 1920s, staff appraisal was primarily centred on establishing whether a given teaching style correlated with a desired educational philosophy and psychology, notably those of William James and John Dewey (Schwab 1990). This "prescriptive" approach has obvious links with scientific theories of management. This tendency was, however, gradually replaced by the belief that each teacher should develop his or her own particular style (Scriven as cited in Schwab 1990:9) and that teachers have no obligation to imitate the style of other teachers considered successful. Peterson *et al.* (1990:9) supported the notion that the imitation of teaching styles is neither appropriate nor productive.

The second stage was more concerned with ascribing certain personality traits as being related to excellence in teaching. Stenhouse (cited in Smith 1995) criticised this view by stating that it failed to include autonomy and the ability to scrutinise critically and question one's own teaching. It is also possible to determine, in this approach, the kind of leadership and management thinking that was prevalent during the early decades of this century, variously referred to as the great man theory, or the trait approach (Hoy & Miskel 1987).

During the 1960s, and persisting through the 1970s, the emphasis was on generic teaching behaviour that would be effective in all instructional settings. In 1976, there was a call for a new approach to the definition of effective teacher training. This

9

signalled the growth of a movement of licensing teachers on the basis of competence and performance rather than the completion of a teacher education programme of an accredited college or university. This development influenced the appraisal process to grow along summative lines as a basis for initial certification of teachers and for the renewal of contracts (Turner and Cliff 1988:10). Assessment was carried out by a team of experts, usually experienced teachers, using agreed upon instruments of appraisal such as observation schedules and knowledge tests. On the basis of the assessments made, contracts were renewed or terminated. These developments appear to be a natural development of the behaviourist thinking that underpinned much of the management and leadership thinking of the 60s and 70s, evident in the (still popular) theories of Hersey & Blanchard and Blake & Mouton.

In Great Britain staff appraisal has traditionally been the responsibility of Local Educational Authorities (LEA) and was carried out by a team of local inspectors or advisers who usually have considerable experience in teaching (Turner and Cliff 1988). The purpose of appraisal was to assess probationary teachers, to advise on appointments and promotions and to look into cases of poor performance. The British schools have also developed a periodic appraisal of individual teachers by senior personnel within schools. This has emerged as a management tool in some cases, to promote redeployment and boost morale at a time of falling rolls.

2.1.2 A brief look at South Africa

The position in South Africa has been both similar to and different from the experiences of the USA and Britain. Prior to 1980, it was principals and inspectors who were traditionally responsible for the appraisal of teachers in schools. Teachers were judged in a once-off evaluation, usually on superficial evidence (such as neatness of workbooks). What made the process even more complex and threatening in South Africa was the fact the appraisal was interpreted as a weapon

of the state. As Zynoe (1995:384) explains: "...in the past, teacher evaluation was used by the Apartheid structures not as a mechanism for development but to control the teacher." Teachers felt that the management of staff appraisal was top-down, autocratic and politically motivated.

Teachers' resistance to this approach to appraisal found its expression in the protesting voices of teacher unions. Widespread dissatisfaction led to a complete rejection of the system. In 1990 the National Education Union of South Africa (NEUSA), forerunner of SADTU, announced that subject advisers would no longer be permitted to "carry out inspection of teachers"; "subject advisers would be expected to teach rather than supervise" (Ndlovu 1990:4). They believed that teachers' supervision (appraisal) should be conducted by new subject committees.

Soon afterwards, the South African Teachers Union (SADTU) came to an agreement that they would not allow education inspectors into their classrooms. They believed that the inspectors and advisers served no purpose, and called for their dismissal. This demand was, however, thwarted by the Cape Teachers Professional Association (CTPA). They claimed that there might be teachers who could do without the services of the subject advisers but others did need help. They therefore could not "support a call for the summary removal of inspectors of education and service advisers in the absence of a workable alternative" (Herald, 1991:3).

In 1992 SADTU called for a new approach to appraisal, and initiated a process of negotiation between teacher organisations and the former Department of Education and Training (DET). The WITS University Education Policy Unit (WITS, EPU) was commissioned by SADTU to develop an alternative form of educator appraisal. In 1993 all teacher organisations, unions and all the departments of education were involved in these negotiations which sought to address the principles, processes and procedures for the new appraisal system.

In October 1994, a conference on School Management, Teacher Development and Support, hosted by the Educational Policy Unit of the University of Witwatersrand, was held at the Eskom Centre in Midrand, Johannesburg. Due to the transformation period in South Africa, the newly constituted national and provisional departments and all teacher unions / organisations were represented. Among the issues that were addressed in the conference, the following were key aspects:

*   General agreement on the guiding principles;
*   Overall consensus on the nature of the instruments;
*   General agreement on the need to pilot the new appraisal system with post level 1 educators before it may be implemented.

On the basis of the decisions taken by the different stakeholders, the Educational Policy Unit of WITS conducted a pilot study of the new appraisal system. The pilot study took place during 1995 and 1996 and covered 93 schools throughout the province. The only province that was not represented was Kwa-Zulu Natal. The findings were released in 1997. According to the Manual for developmental Appraisal, the findings of the pilot revealed that there was unanimous support for the nature and processes of the new teacher appraisal system. It also showed that it could be applied in all schools in South Africa no matter what their contextual conditions may be. It also pointed to the centrality of training in the process so that school-based educators are equipped with the necessary knowledge of actually implementing the new appraisal system. The pilot indicated that the nature of the new appraisal system contributed significantly to facilitating relations between teachers and school management, and between schools and departmental offices.

However, while the pilot study was conducted, further discussions and negotiations around the new appraisal system took place in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC). The ELRC showed appreciation for the report, but did not accept the instruments that were proposed in the report, on the grounds that they were too complex, not sufficiently developmental, and that teachers had not been consulted.

The research committee of the ELRC appointed a Task Team in November 1997, with the following mandate:

*   to formulate a simpler version of the PU appraisal instrument;
*   to focus on development in the first phase of the introduction of appraisal;
*   to prepare a questionnaire to assist educators in obtaining feedback on performance.

The report consisted of three parts:

*   A manual for developmental appraisal
*   Instruments for developmental forms
*   An implementation plan

The Task Team indicated that there is an urgent need to introduce appraisal for the following reasons:

*   The presence of an evaluation system will encourage professional development and quality service delivery.
*   Developmental appraisal could facilitate the introduction of Curriculum 2005.
*   It could be a forerunner to performance management and possibly evaluation.

The new document (South Africa 1998b) was finalised In October 1998 and became operational in April 1999. It outlines an approach to appraisal which emphasises development, transparency and formative evaluation. The role of the principal in particular is viewed very differently; compared to previous systems, in which the principal was often the sole appraiser, the new system envisages the composition of a Staff Development Team, which includes the principal as a member. (A full explanation of the new appraisal system is enclosed as Appendix G.)

When one compares staff appraisal in South Africa with the other two countries, namely USA and Britain, one notices differences and similarities. In South Africa

13

and Britain, inspectors were used to assess probationary teachers and the main purpose was for promotion reasons. However in South Africa, inspectors assessed both permanent and temporary teachers whilst in Britain senior members within the same school were responsible for appraising individual teachers. In Britain schools took the initiative to develop their own systems of appraising teachers, whereas in this country, when opposition to state-imposed systems grew stronger, the entire system collapsed and no appraisal at all took place for over a decade. Clearly this points to hugely differing levels of professional maturity in the two countries, and probably also underlines the debilitating effects of apartheid education and its accompanying authoritarian mindset.

Another interesting comparison is that a call for a new appraisal system - as happened in South Africa in 1992 - occurred in the USA as early as 1976. In both cases it was teacher unions who took the initiative.

A pointer to how appraisal is viewed today is provided by research conducted by Bradley (cited in Wragg *et al* 1996) in Britain. After having evaluated six local authority pilot studies, he discovered that, of the various stages of the evaluation process, teachers rated the appraisal interview most highly, and the classroom observation element as least important of the four elements surveyed (the other two being initial discussion in second place, and self-appraisal in third place. Powney as cited in Wragg *et al.* (1996) used the same approach and some of the questions as Bradley in investigating the process as perceived by 86 teachers in middle management roles. His results were similar, although not identical to those of Bradly's experience. The appraisal interview was again highly rated with classroom observation in the fourth place. These findings are indicative of current thinking and aspirations of educators. They confirm that the emphasis needs to be on development, rather than judgement, and that appraisal should be formative, rather than summative. This tendency is clearly in line with current management thinking too, where self-management is seen to be the ideal, as well as with the philosophy of

"fourth generation" evaluation, where the process is characterised by participation and empowerment (Guba & Lincoln 1989).

Thus we have moved from a "traditional", supervisory appraisal system where often a single person played judge, criteria were not openly discussed, and findings often used for bureaucratic means, to an open system, where a pool of information is created on which the appraisal is based. The new process is developmental and transparent. And, unlike the old process whereby evaluation was a once-off event, the appraisal of teachers will be an ongoing process.

2.2   Evaluation or appraisal: The management of the process.

At this point in time I want to distinguish between the two concepts evaluation and appraisal. Adelman and Alexander (cited in Hugo 1994:84) defined educational evaluation as follows:

> The making of judgement about the worth and effectiveness of educational intentions, processes and outcomes; about the relationships between these and about the resources, planning and implementation for such ventures.

The differences in interpretation and the divergent use of evaluation processes in different institutions and in different countries tend to make the meaning attached to evaluation concepts and procedures confusing. However, with the different terms being used with regard to appraisal, Quinlan and Davidoff (1997) postulated that in many countries evaluation and appraisal are being treated interchangeable. However in the South African context these two concepts have taken on different meanings, each laden with its own associations. The authors further explained that evaluation has been seen as a summative, judgmental exercise to point out the wrongdoing of teachers. Appraisal on the other hand is regarded as a formative and positive process and has the professional development of teachers as its most pressing concern. The South African Teachers Union (SADTU) has suggested that

15

the term "evaluation" no longer be used but that the term "appraisal" be adopted to dissociate the process from the former evaluation system (Quinlan and Davidoff 1997:9).

> The main aim of the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) is to facilitate the personal and professional development of educators in order to improve the quality of teaching practice and education management (Naude and Bridgraji, 1999:9). The whole appraisal process is based on the fundamental principle of life-long learning and development. The vast complexities of our education transformation, the scale of our need, and the great diversity of training providers, require that we harness all our development capacity in practical networks and modes of operation. Government needs partners - in the governmental and private sectors in training institutes and universities - if management development is to reach every classroom, every teacher and every learner.
>
> (South Africa 1996).

The process of teacher appraisal would definitely have an enormous impact on the Education Department, locally, provincially and nationally. That being the case, one needs to ask how much of an effect would it have on educational management structures. The Report of the Task Team on Educational Management Development (1996) made the recommendation that district, provincial and national management structures be designed principally to ensure that the managers of the learning process, the teachers and learners are able to operate as effectively as possible.

The Task Team promotes the concept of self-management, whereby teachers can no longer wait for instructions or decisions from government. The pace of change, and the need to be adaptable and responsive to local circumstances require that all educators develop new skills of working. They must be capable of providing leadership for teams, and be able to interact with communities both inside and outside the system. They must be able to manage and use information to promote efficiency and support democratic governance.

The process of appraisal needs to be managed, and according to the new appraisal process the coordinator needs to ensure that the process is implemented as stipulated. Wragg *et al.* (1996:16) claimed that the implementation of appraisal will often reflect the personality, beliefs and ideologies of the coordinator who plays the key role. However, the process is a change process, and I believe that managing change implies recognition of the complexity and scope of the task ahead. It needs careful planning, which addresses threats and risks, and creates strategic opportunities. Change strategies are translated into action plans, while organisations that are conducive to successful change are created, and mechanisms ensuring a close strategic focus are put in place.

The argument that I want to put forward is that principals should support and work in collaboration with the co-ordinator of the appraisal process. The staff appraisal document (South Africa 1998) states that, by virtue of his/her position the principal will be part of the Staff Development Team (SDT), but not necessarily the chairperson or co-ordinator. I support this view because I believe that there are many teachers who are not part of the management team, who have good leadership and management qualities. Moreover, appointing a teacher who does not hold an official promotion post to this position should help to militate against the perceived authoritarianism which has characterised appraisal systems in the past.

It is true, however, that the appraisal process has got off to a slow and bumpy start in the country as a whole. According to Naude and Bridgraji (1999:9), while Gauteng is set to complete the training process by April 2000, other provinces, namely Northern Province, Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, Mpumalanga and North-West, have got off to a difficult start. Educators complained of inadequate training, a shortage of training manuals in schools and a lack of support by district officials. It is of utmost importance that teachers have to receive the necessary training so as to carry out their tasks to the best of their abilities. It seems as though the Task Team's vision of a self-

managed system is an over optimistic view of the professional management capacity of educators in South Africa.

2.3 Models of staff appraisal

The models that I will discuss are the following: accountability, developmental, managerial and collegial. The first two models are regarded as traditional models and the last two are regarded as the emergent trends of appraising teachers.

2.3.1 Accountability model

Osborne in Davies *et al.* (1990), Poster and Poster (1991), Bennet *et al.* (1992) and Craft (1996) postulated that accountability is regarded as one of the two routes that has developed from the 'great era debate', commencing with the Ruskin College Speech (1976) by Callaghan. This is evident in Bennet *et al.* (1992:1) where Callaghan stated: "To the teachers I would say you must satisfy the parents and industry that what you are doing meets the requirements and the needs of their children".

Bennet *at al.* (1992) and Craft (1996) specified that the suggestion made by Callaghan's speech laid the philosophical groundwork for the whole movement towards efficient and effective use of resources for society's good, where teachers and schools were accountable to the wider society. This model emphasised that teachers and schools should account for how they effectively and efficiently make use of the resources that are made available to them. This encourages teachers to be responsible for their actions.

This is similar in some ways to Bollington's *et al.* (1990) belief that appraisal was being regarded as a response to the desire to bring a greater degree of

accountability into public services. However, Elliot *et al.* as cited in Wragg *et al.* (1996:6) does not share the same sentiment:

> Teachers feel most accountable at a local level, to their pupils, fellow teachers and children's parents. To wider constituents, such as governors, committees and local authorities, accountability may be seen as more remote and thus more legal and formal in nature ... However many teachers probably see the head as the ... person [to whom] they are most accountable.

In the same vein Burgess (1992:7) emphasised that:

> Headteachers have all the accountability of teachers, and more. It is through them that accountability of schools is expressed. They answer to local authorities, governors and parents ... to point out managerially the head answers both to the governors and to local authority ... the parents may question the exercise of functions not only of the governors and the local authority but also of the headteacher, and they must pass resolutions on the head's activities.

Teachers in general think that they are only accountable to the principals and not to the wider constituents i.e. the community, parents and the pupils. In South Africa the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) is part of whole school development and it is important that the teachers need to have clarity on the fact that it is one aspect of whole school development.

2.3.2 Developmental model

Craft (1996:26) suggested that the developmental approach to appraisal could be traced back to the James Report which explored the nature of and the need for teacher development. The developmental approach tends to identify the needs of teachers and allocate resources in order to address those needs.

A study conducted by Turner and Cliff (cited in Bell and Day 1991:165) revealed that one of the main differences between appraisers and appraisees in staff development

was whether appraisal should serve institutional or individual needs. For the most part they found out that if appraisers were senior members of staff, the desired outcomes were concerned with the maintenance and improvement of the institution as a whole and that appraisal and staff development were viewed as a management tool. This is further evidenced in Bollington *et al.*'s (1990) claim that appraisal can be seen as a culmination of a series of moves that are designed to improve the professional development of teachers and to identify more precisely their in-service training needs.

Turner and Cliff (1988) found that most schools focus on staff development as the main aim of appraisal. Drummond in Bell and Day (1991:165) takes a different view that professional development must not only focus on staff development but must also take into consideration the personal development of an individual teacher. The South Africa programmes such as the Culture of Teaching and Learning, Outcomes Based Education and Curriculum 2005 require both the personal development and staff developmental of teachers. It is through the developmental approach to staff appraisal that the needs of teachers can be identified.

In comparing the two traditional models i.e. the accountability and the developmental model, Goddard and Emerson (1993:18) stated that the compatibility of the two models depends on the attitudes which teachers are likely to adopt in undergoing appraisal in each of them. The authors explained that in the professional development model, appraisal is a genuine two-way process between the appraiser and the appraisee. This model takes places in an atmosphere of trust and confidentiality. For the professional development to succeed, it requires openness, honesty, a self-critical disposition, willingness to comment frankly on their perceptions of their own strengths and weaknesses and those of the management, openness to constructive criticism and to pointers to self-improvement.

The authors explain that the accountability model, on the other hand, fosters defensiveness. It encourages the teachers to defend their own positions, to hide

20

weaknesses, and to blame managers and others for deficiencies in their performance. When teachers have to set targets they will be looking at their own interest rather than those of the school. In commenting on their own performance, teachers will tend to inflate their actual achievement.

These two models are not compatible because their perceptions differ, in the sense that the development model takes place in an atmosphere of trust between the appraiser and the appraisee. The appraisee can reflect back on his or her own performance after being critiqued by the appraiser. The accountability model encourages teachers to be self-centred and to believe that they are not at fault but to blame others for their weaknesses.

Hewton (1990:30) observed that the two models lead in different directions. He explained that the developmental model is more concerned with the development needs of individuals, appropriate INSET activities, providing broad-ranging work experience, and job satisfaction. The accountability model, on the other hand, is more concerned with the assessment of standards. It is linked to the overall evaluation of the schools' performance, the needs of the school as an organisation. Turner and Cliff (1988) argued that there is a belief that appraisal systems should be based on the developmental rather than the accountability model, and would be concerned with the improvements of practice by identifying strengths, weaknesses, needs and interests.

Looking at the South African context, the model that has been adopted is the developmental approach. The Staff Appraisal document for educators explained that:

> ...it is one that is not judgmental, is more positively oriented and one that acknowledges people's strengths, it does not mean that the "developmental approach" is blind to negative aspects that may exist in educator's

21

performance. Rather it notes such negative aspects, if they exist. Instead of blaming the educator in a faultfinding way, the developmental approach tries to find ways in which such negative aspects may be responded to within "developmental" programmes that would enable the educator to improve his/her performance in that area.

(South Africa 1998b)

Unlike the accountability model which emphasises that teachers need to be accountable to how they efficiently and effectively make use of resources, the developmental model goes a step further and first of all identifies the needs of teachers and then allocates resources according those needs.

However, the critique that I have regarding the developmental approach that has been adopted in South Africa is the fact that the appraisee must indicate when he or she is ready to be appraised. What if the appraisee does not indicate whether he or she is ready? Appraisees are also allowed to choose an area in which he or she will be appraised on. This then goes back to the "old system" whereby a teacher was regarded as a good teacher because of the fact that he/she has presented a "good lesson" whilst the teacher has revised the lesson over and over. Although supporters of the new developmental appraisal system regard this system as a better than the previous one, I am of the opinion that it is allowing too much freedom for teachers.

2.3.3 Managerial model

Bollington et al. (1990) postulated that although appraisal has sprung from the two routes, it is also linked to attempts to develop the management of the schools. Fidler and Cooper (1992) claimed that the managerial model addressed the tensions which inevitably existed between the accountability and the developmental model and between the needs of the organisation and those of individuals.

22

Simons and Elliot (1990:26) contend that according to the managerial model the appraisal of teachers is to be conducted by the management team in the school (senior and middle management). Fidler and Cooper (1992:44) are of the opinion that:

> The evaluative aspect of the manager's job is to identify those that are performing well, acknowledge and reward their efforts both financially and with praise, and to help maintain and further develop a continuing high standard. Equally, it is a part of the manager's job to identify those who are not performing well, and to provide them with opportunities through which their performance might be improved.

Poster and Poster (in Kydd *et al.*1997) argued that each individual comes into the organisation with a unique set of needs and objectives. They further argued that the problem of organisations is to harness the unique talents of individuals and coordinate their activities towards the achievement, by effective and efficient means, of organisational objectives.

Poster and Poster (1997) further argued that individuals need to be provided with essential information if they are to achieve the organisational objectives. This is contrary to how appraisal was being conducted, because teachers were not given any feedback on the evaluation that was conducted. It stands to reason that there was a conflict between the individual needs and that of the organisation.

Beare *et al.* as cited by Poster and Poster (in Kydd *et al.* 1997) stated that:

> Every school has a particular culture, determined by the individual values and experience which each person brings to it, the way in which people act and interact and the footprints they leave behind them.

This implies that appraisal must be of benefit to both the school and the individual. In order for appraisal to meet both the needs of the school and of the individual there must be a management of appraisal.

23

The authors further defend themselves by stating that:

> The evaluative aspect of the manager's job is to identify those who are
> performing well, acknowledge and reward their efforts ...Equally it is the
> manager's job to identify those who are not performing well, and to provide
> them opportunities through which their performance might be improved (Ibid.)

Unfortunately the management model is strongly reminiscent of the system which
was prevalent in this country, where the task of appraisal was the domain of a select
few senior personnel. Thus the management model may, from some points of view,
seem inappropriate in these times. However, its strength appears to be the role it
can play in harmonising individual and organisational needs.

2.3.4 Collegial model

Simons and Elliot (1990) postulated that an alternative model for conducting
appraisal might be a collegial system where colleagues in an institution (from
different status positions) might begin to examine their own practices. The authors
further explained that the approach could be based on the manner that was
advocated by Stenhouse. I support the notion that colleagues have to work together
and that the headteacher must create an atmosphere whereby teachers can discuss
openly and share ownership of the problems and jointly find solutions. The
headteacher must ensure that teachers see themselves as part of the team and by
so doing trust will develop among colleagues. The collegial model is more like a
mentorship whereby an experienced teacher might work hand-in-hand with an
inexperienced teacher in showing him/her the ropes.

The collegial model and the developmental model are related because both focus on
the needs of the individual. They differ in the sense that the developmental model
identifies the needs of individuals and based on those needs, resources are
allocated, whereas the collegial model is based on the fact that colleagues must

24

examine their practice. Both the collegial and the developmental models are on-going exercises. By this I mean that at every stage the needs of the teachers have to be realised and at the same time they must examine their practices.

2.4 Different methods of appraising teachers

2.4.1 Hierarchical approach

The hierarchical approach to appraising teachers is also known as the superior-subordinate method. Wragg *et al.* (1996:15) specify that the most logical structure for appraisal in strictly hierarchical organisations is for each person in the school to be appraised by the person holding the rank immediately above. In such schools it meant that teachers on the basic professional scale would be appraised by heads, deputies or heads of departments. In turn the middle managers would be appraised by the head, who would be scrutinised by fellow heads from other schools, local authority or inspectors. Supporters of the hierarchical approach argued that it is logical in an organisation, as those who are in senior position have *ipso facto* responsibility for those lower down. They further argued that senior people then, as part of their duties, ensure follow-up and support after the appraisal is over. This would seem to be the method adopted in this country, where evaluation was seen as a way of maintaining control and keeping surveillance over teachers. Inspectors and principals would visit the classes of teachers, observe their teaching, complete a record which the teacher never saw (Davidoff and Lazarus, 1997:139). This implies that no follow and no support was given to teachers.

Wragg *et al.* (1996) reiterate that critics of this approach believe that appraisal does not harden hierarchies, but also make teachers the unwilling recipients of management directives, as they become compelled to implement policies with which they may not agree.

25

Wragg *et al.* (1996:16) observe that instead of a superior-subordinate pattern, there must also be a subordinate-superior pattern whereby the head of the school would be appraised by teachers. I support this view. The head from another school is unlikely to be in a position to appraise the principal; teachers of the school concerned know him/her better.

2.4.2 Self appraisal

Pollard and Tan (cited in Smith 1995) used the phrase 'reflective teaching' in an attempt to define what they mean by self-appraisal, which draws on the ideas of Dewey. Squelch and Lemmer (1994) are of the opinion that self-appraisal provides a means of improving one's performance and can serve as a guide for setting goals and standards. Smith (1995) postulated that:

> A teacher who is effective in recognising his or her own strengths and weaknesses and hopefully changing those weaknesses into strengths has several well-developed characteristics. This might include the ability to continuously monitor, evaluate and revise their own practice; approaching their job with an open mind; basing their judgement as teachers on insights gained from many educational disciplines and enhancing the fulfilment they get by collaboration and dialogue with colleagues.

If teachers are constantly engaged in dialogues with their colleagues that will enable them to be in a position to identify their weaknesses. However, Montgomery and Hatfield (1989) argued that self-appraisal does not always lead to improvement in personal performance. The authors state that studies that were conducted revealed that the weakest teachers overestimate their skills and personal performance, and appear to be 'process blind', whereas the best teachers see themselves as poor performers and underrate and undervalue themselves, for their standards are low.

The recommendation that was made by Squelch and Lemmer (1994:120) was that "...self appraisal precede formal appraisal because the information gathered by the

teacher can serve as a basis for further evaluation and discussion." Bollington *et al.* (1990) postulated that research approaches to self-evaluation vary. He distinguished between the more quantitative approaches that encourage teachers to use a set of performance criteria to analyse their teaching, and produce a description profile of perceived practices, and qualitative approaches, which are more open-ended and appropriate to self-review. A qualitative approach is line with Steakhouse's ideas of teacher researcher and Schnook's notion of the reflective practitioner (Bollington *et al.*)

2.4.3 Peer appraisal

Peer appraisal occurs when two people of equal rank, such as two basic scale teachers appraise each other (Wragg *et al.* 1996:16). Squelch and Lemmer (1994:127) observed that peer appraisal was not common practice in South African schools. They found that colleagues seldom appraise each other, nor observe each other's lessons or even engage in team teaching. Teachers often feel intimidated by the presence of colleagues in their classrooms. However the new document on staff appraisal in South Africa states that an individual teacher can nominate a peer that will be part of the panel in appraising the teacher concerned (South Africa 1998a).

Peer appraisal in practice has received mixed reviews. Wragg *et al.* (1996:16) believe that observation from a peer can effect change if the peer is credible with the recipient, and that collegial appraisal need not be synonymous with "lack of bite." But this is not necessarily always the case, as Darling-Hammond *et al.* (in Bollington 1990:28) explain:

> ... a 3-year experiment including peer review was enthusiastically supported by the teaching staff in one district, another school district found that teachers lacked respect for evaluations by their peers and that the evaluations resulted in staff tensions.

27

Wragg *et al.* (1996:16) believe that co-equal pairs will simply confirm each others' practices, and engage in mutual congratulations. Simons and Elliot (1990:84) argued that appraisal by others is often contrasted with self-appraisal. This distinction was made by the Suffolk report. The contrast between the two is that self-appraisal is a private activity conducted in solitude and isolation from other people. The authors argued that self-appraisal or reflective self-monitoring is a central feature of the process of personal development and may not easily articulate with broader appraisal processes.

Costa and Kallick (1993:50) were of the opinion that in order for peer appraisal to work one has to nominate a critical friend. They further stated that critical friendship must begin through building trust. The person and group needs to feel that the friend will:

*   be clear about the nature of the relationship, and not use it for evaluation and judgement;
*   listen well: clarifying ideas, encouraging specificity, and taking time to fully understand what is being presented;
*   offer value judgement only upon request from the learner;
*   respond to the learners' work with integrity; and
•   be an advocate for the success of the work

I think that appraisal by others is likely to be effective in helping one to improve one's practice. It stands to reason, though, that peer appraisal cannot be used as the only method to appraise teachers: it needs to be complemented by other approaches.

2.4.4 External appraisal

Turner and Cliff (1988:127) asserted that the question whether persons outside the school should be involved in the appraisal of teachers is a controversial issue. They

28

express their concern that outsiders' involvement would tend to stress accountability as an aspect of appraisal, and also believe that lack of knowledge on the part of the person doing the appraising may be a problem. Criticism of the approach also feel that outsiders cannot always understand the nuances of school and classroom life, can make little impact, as they have no roots in the school, and may simply become bureaucrats, fulfilling an obligation. I disagree with these criticisms. Principals of schools could have meetings with staff members where they as a team can reach consensus on the outsider they will nominate. The new South African appraisal system suggests that an outsider that can be nominated can either be a community leader, a university or college lecturer. I would rather suggest a college or university lecturer employed in the education faculty because of the fact that he/she will have more knowledge with regard to new teaching approaches, unlike a community leader who may not have done a teachers' course.

2.4.5 Pupil appraisal

Peterson *et al.* (1990) argued that although most educators will agree that student learning is the most important product of education, the use of student evaluation as the basis of teacher evaluation is fraught with pitfalls. Wragg *et al.* (1996) are also of the opinion that although it is clear that students' evaluation can be used as a guideline to evaluate teachers, it should not be used as the basis to evaluate them.

In South Africa there has been much discussion and debate about the role of learners in the appraisal of educators. It was decided that it would be inappropriate to have learners sit on the appraisal panel. Learners' views are significant, not only because they are significant stakeholders in education, but also because they are best placed to be able to comment on an educator's classroom performance. In order to allow for this, a learner's questionnaire has been proposed. In essence, the learners' questionnaire emphasises the extent to which educators are able to promote a democratic, participatory, critical and supportive environment in the classroom.

On the positive side, literature reveals an astonishing consistency in the way pupils evaluate teaching (Wragg *et al.* 1996:17). Pupils prefer teachers who are slightly strict, enthusiastic, interested in them as individuals and fair in their use of rewards and punishments and who use humour which is not sarcastic. Again though, pupil appraisal cannot be used as the only yardstick in appraising teachers, and should be seen as another complementary source of data.

2.5 Concluding thoughts

The literature review shows that the approach to staff appraisal has shifted from the traditional bureaucratic approach to a systems approach whereby appraisal is no longer done by a single person but by a team who decides on the performance of an individual teacher. I have also referred to the history of staff appraisal in the USA, Britain and South Africa, and identified the differences and the similarities of the staff appraisal in the three countries. I have also distinguished between evaluation and appraisal and discussed the management of staff appraisal.

The different models with regard to staff appraisal were identified and differences and commonalities were spelled out. Of the four models examined, it seems clear that two of them - the developmental and the collegial - are likely to be influential in shaping appraisal practice in South Africa. Lastly I have identified the methods involved in staff appraisal and have also identified the criticisms laid against each method.

The next chapter presents an explanation of the research approach and methodology I followed in this study.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter includes a discussion of the research paradigm and methodology used, the population, the sample, data collection and data analysis as well as the validity and reliability of the methods used.

3.1   Research paradigm

My research is conducted in the interpretive paradigm because I seek "to understand the subjective world of human experience ... to get inside the person and to understand from within" (Cohen and Manion 1994:36). As a result of my using the interpretive paradigm the participants will be in a position to state their own perceptions of how they perceive the management of staff appraisal. This is achieved through a process of interaction with them so that I can learn their interpretations and perceptions of the management of staff appraisal as they were the only internal appraisers in the "old appraisal system" and now according to the Developmental appraisal system (DAS) they will be members of the Staff Development Team (SDT). Cohen and Manion (1994: 26) claimed that:

> ... the social world can only be understood from the standpoint of the individuals who are part of the ongoing action being investigated and that their model of a person is an autonomous one ... anti-positivist would argue that individuals' behaviour can only be understood by the researcher sharing their frame of reference.

Beck as cited in Cohen and Manion (1994:26) postulated that the purpose of social science is to understand social reality as different people see it and to demonstrate how these views shape the action which they take within that reality. Since the social sciences cannot penetrate to what lies behind social reality, they must work

31

directly with people's definition of reality and with the rules they devise for coping with it.

While the social sciences do not reveal ultimate truth, they do help us to make sense of the world. Johnson (1994:7) stated that qualitative research takes the view that all human life is experienced and indeed constructed from a subjective point of view, and that social research should seek to elicit the "meaning" of events and phenomena from the point of view of research participants.

I have selected a case study as this allows me to "probe deeply and to analyse intensively the multifarious phenomena that constitute the life cycle of the unit..." (Cohen and Manion 1994).

This case study is an intrinsic case study, a case study that is undertaken because one wants better understanding of a particular case. It is not undertaken primarily because the case represents other cases or because it illustrates a particular trait or problem, but because, in all its particularity and ordinariness, this case itself is of interest. The purpose is not to come to understand same abstract construct generic phenomena.

3.2   The population

Roscoe (cited in Mouton 1996:134) defined a population as a collection of objects, events and individuals having some common characteristics that the researcher is interested in studying. The population in this study are all the principals of high schools. They were selected because they have experienced appraisal as sole internal appraisers, and will now be appraising teachers under the new system.

The total population of this study consisted of thirty-two high schools in the Port Elizabeth East District. I focused on nineteen schools so as to be in a position to

32

select my participants. From the nineteen schools I have then selected four principals who would take part in this study.

3.2.1 The sample

A purposive sampling method was used, firstly, for selecting the nineteen schools, and secondly, for selecting the four principals for the study. Nachmias and Nachmias (1996:184) postulated that in purposive samples (occasionally referred to as judgmental samples), researchers select sampling units subjectively in an attempt to obtain a sample that appears to be representative of the population. In other words the chances that a particular sampling unit be selected for the sample depends on the subjective judgement of the researcher. In this study I selected principals who had appraised teachers before, as individuals, and would still be appraising teachers as part of a team.

3.3 Data collection

I used two methods of collecting data, namely questionnaires and interviews.

3.3.1 Questionnaires

Before administering the questionnaires to the respondents I first ran a pilot study. Johnson (1994:39) explained that the experience of pilot respondents is used to improve and amend the questionnaire before sending it out to the main research population. The pilot study helped me in restructuring the questions so that they could be understood by the respondents. The final product is enclosed as Appendix B.

Having completed that, I then phoned the principals of the nineteen schools that I selected and explained to them what the study was all about. Some principals of school felt that they did not have much knowledge of appraisal due to the fact that the meeting on staff appraisal that was supposed to be held by the Educational District Officers (EDOs) was postponed because of the process of redeployment. I then explained to them what the questionnaire was all about and some of the principals decided to take part; one principal declined totally. I then made an appointment with those principals who wanted to be part of the research and I personally handed over the questionnaires to them. I confirmed with them (principals) or in the case when a principal was not around the school premises at that moment, with the secretary. I reached an agreement with them that I would collect the questionnaires after two days. Within two days I collected the questionnaires. From the nineteen questionnaires that I issued to the school principals, I received eighteen completed questionnaires. The principal of one school was not at school by the time I went to submit the questionnaire and I handed the questionnaire over to the secretary who forgot to give the questionnaire to the principal. When I went back after two days to collect the questionnaire, it was then that the secretary remembered to give the questionnaire to the school principal. But due to the principal's busy schedule it was impossible for him to complete the questionnaire. He then promised to fax the questionnaire through to me, but I never received it.

The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first part of the questionnaire required the participants to give biographical information. The selected biographical characteristics of the sample included age, sex and work experience.

The second section consisted of six questions. The first four questions were closed ended and required the respondent to simply circle the number beside each statement that most accurately reflects his/her views. I used two numbers, 1 and 2, where 1 meant yes and 2 meant no. The last two questions were open-ended. Principals were required to write down their views on how appraisal should be run in

34

schools and secondly, the challenges and problems that lie ahead with regard to staff appraisal. After receiving the questionnaires from the principals I then selected four principals purposively based on the fact that (1) they had experience of appraisal, (2) they would have future involvement in appraisal, (3) they had strong views on appraisal. I then interviewed the principals based on the criteria that I have mentioned.

3.3.2 Interviews

I conducted semi-structured interviews. Answers in the questionnaires suggested questions to use in the interviews. A copy of my interview schedule is enclosed Appendix C. Markson and Gognalons-Caillard (cited in Stones 1988:152) pointed out that: "The great advantage of semi-structured interviews or non-directive interviews is its flexibility, which allows the investigator to grasp more fully the subject's experience..."

I conducted the interviews on an individual basis to allow every respondent to be free to voice his/her own views in private. The nature of the interview was such that every principal was able to give his/her own view with regard to his/her understanding of staff appraisal and their feelings concerning the fact that they were no longer the sole appraisers but would be part of a team. The interview was done in the principals' offices, because I wanted to ensure that they were within their own environment.

The first question required the participants to state their own understanding of staff appraisal. One of the questions was to determine their feelings towards appraisal as well as whether there was a need for teachers to be appraised. Another question required them to state the factors that have led to the reintroduction of staff appraisal. Also whether the appraisal of teachers in the Eastern Cape would be completed by 31 March in the year 2000. The last question was based on what

35

alternative ways of appraising teachers they could suggest. Interviews were captured on tape. The duration of the interviews was approximately 30-45 minutes. I feel that it was enough time to allow probing while not too long for interviewees to get bored.

3.4   Data analysis

Bogdan and Biklen (1992:153) postulated that analysis involves working with data, organising them, breaking them into manageable units, synthesising them, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others.

In analysing the data I used the constant comparative method. Maykut and Morehouse (1994:126) found that this method provides the beginning researcher with a clear path for engaging in analysing of substantial amounts of data in a way that is both challenging and illuminating.

Data collected was transcribed into units of general meaning and then reduced and categorised into themes. I searched through the data for regularities and patterns as well as topics that are covered by the data, and then wrote down words and phrases to represent these topics and patterns (Bogdan and Biklen 1992:166). The questionnaires were used as background data in order to shape the interview questions and to identify the participants that I was going to interview for this study. When analysing the data I first focused on obtaining a holistic understanding of the data. I went through the transcripts in order to arrive at the understanding of the respondents' views and opinions. I studied the transcripts in order to determine which issues were repeatedly discussed.

3.5   Reliability and validity

To ensure the reliability of the information provided by the interviewees, I employed several strategies. These included rephrasing a question when an interviewee did not hear the question clearly, creating a relaxed atmosphere for the interviewees to feel free to talk and discussing transcribed data with the participants. Lincoln and Guba (cited in Maykut and Morehouse 1994) use the term "member checking" in a process of asking participants to tell you whether you have accurately described their experience. Going back to the principals of the school actually helped in making the results reliable, because they confirmed after reading the transcripts that I had reflected their views accurately.

To ensure the validity of the findings, two methods were used to collect the data. This form of triangulation hopefully enabled me to add to the validity and reliability of the findings.

3.6   Limitations

The chief limitation of my study is of course the fact that it is a small study, involving few respondents. I was limited by the scope of this half-thesis, and, of course, also under severe time constraints. It does mean, however, that I am not able to generalise my findings to a broader population. I hope, however, to give as rich a picture of my small population as I am able, and its is then up to the reader to decide to what extent the picture I paint may be typical of a broader community of educators.

I have also only used two instruments i.e. interviews and questionnaires. No doubt the use of techniques such as document analysis and observation would have

enhanced the richness of my findings. Again, though, I had to settle for what I was able to do within the time and other constraints.

Another particular problem I faced, which turned into a limitation, was the fact I embarked on the study during the period that principals of school were sorting out the redeployment process. That created a lot of problems and it happened that in two schools that we had to cancel the appointments due to the fact that the school principal had to attend meetings that were not scheduled. It was also a very busy period at schools when I conducted the interview because the pupils were writing the mid-year examinations. That also created problems in the sense that principals had to see to it that the examinations ran smoothly. I had no control over the time of the day, mood of principals and disturbances such as the ringing of telephones.

Another limitation is that I did not solicit teachers' views, or those of the Educational District Officers (inspectors). That could have shown a comparison of factors on how the different stakeholders perceive the management of staff appraisal in schools. I return to this point later, as an area of future research.

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

In order to answer the questions of how principals perceive the management of staff appraisal in schools, I present the findings of my research in this chapter. I have analysed the questionnaires first, then the interviews. In both cases I have quoted liberally from the original data in order to present the respondents' views as accurately as possible. I then discuss the significance of my findings in terms of the literature, and with reference to a way forward, which I outline in Chapter Five.

4.1 Analysis of the questionnaires

From the eighteen questionnaires that I received 13 respondents were between 36-45 years old. Three principals were 46 - 55 years old and two were between the ages of 56-65. Fifteen of the principals were males and three were females. This pattern seems consistent with what has come to be expected in education management.

Goddard and Emerson (1993:29), for example, observed that there is an overwhelming predominance of women teachers; even in secondary schools, women teachers are in the majority. However, when one looks at the number of senior managers, the position is reversed. Simons and Elliot (1990:29) observed that in 1983, in secondary schools in the USA, men were more likely to hold senior posts. Although women constituted 45% of the workforce only 0,7% of women teachers were heads. This study also clearly showed that there are more male principals than female principals in secondary schools.

In relation to their work experience, one principal had between 1-5 years' experience, one principal had 6-10 years and fourteen of the principals had 11-20 of years' experience. Two principals had 31 - 40 years' experience. The fact that most of the principals I surveyed had, on average, more than 10 years experience was significant for my study, since I particularly wished to examine how their perceptions of appraisal may have changed with the introduction of the new system. Reference to systems that used to apply would therefore be a valuable framework for comparison.

The second part of the questionnaire (**See Appendix B**) required them to respond to the first question, i.e. whether there is a need for appraisal. All eighteen principals agreed that there was a need for teachers to be appraised. The second question inquired whether they had been involved in appraisal before. Eleven of the principals said that they had been involved in appraisal before and seven of the principal stated that they had never been involved before. Responding to the third question which inquired whether they had appraised teachers as the principals of schools, seven of the principals stated that they had appraised teachers as the school principal. Eleven said that they had never appraised teachers as principals of schools. The last question was whether they had received training in how to appraise teachers. Eight of the respondents said that they had received training and ten stated that they had never received any training on how to appraise teachers.

With regard to the last two open-ended questions, the first question was how they thought appraisal should be run in schools. The themes that emerged were the following:

- **trained and experienced teachers,**
- **involvement of all parties,**
- **the management team, and**
- **external involvement.**

40

The last question in the questionnaire required the principals to state their opinions with regard to the challenges and problems that lie ahead with regard to staff appraisal. Based on the challenges and problems that lie ahead, the following themes emerged:

- **time limit and time factor,**
- **changing threats into strengths,**
- **teacher innovation,**
- **consistency,**
- **attitude change,**
- **rewards,**
- **organising,**
- **relationships'**
- and lastly **implementation.**

I commenced with analysing the principals' suggestions on how appraisal should be implemented and then focused on the challenges and problems that the principals foresaw with regard to the management of staff appraisal.

4.1.1 Experienced staff

Principals felt that appraisal should be carried out by experienced and trained senior members of staff who are exemplary. This is supported by a study cited in Wragg *et al.* (1996) on both primary and secondary school teachers, which revealed that some appraisers saw appraisal as an opportunity to reflect on their individual practice with the help of an experienced colleague, the latter acting as a mirror. One of the deputy heads of a piloted study for appraisal, as cited in Wragg *et al.* (1996) emphasised that appraisers have to be senior colleagues and they have to be well respected for successful professional experience. He also mentioned that when people are being appraised by someone who has been teaching for one or two

41

years, the appraisee may not have confidence in the appraiser as the appraiser may lack credibility.

4.1.2 Involvement of all parties

With regard to involvement principals felt that all stakeholders should be involved in appraisal. One of the principals felt that there should be "a Panel consisting of the (i) principal or deputy principal (ii) HOD (iii) teacher (iv) and the one to be appraised". The principal's view is in line with the new Developmental appraisal system (DAS) which emphasises that all the stakeholders should be involved in the appraisal of teachers. The principal, however, did not include an outsider as one of the parties that has to be involved in the appraisal of teachers. Turner and Cliff (1988:127) asserted that the question whether persons outside the school is a controversial issue. A study carried out by the authors revealed that some teachers were concerned that an outsider might not know them very well and that what they observed could be untypical.

4.1.3 Management Team

In relation to how appraisal should be run, principals felt that the management team should be responsible. By management team they meant the principals, HOD and the Educational District Officers. One of the principals wrote: "The management team of the school should form a panel. The teachers' written work, and students' results of two consecutive years should be used to evaluate the teachers' performance, including the teachers' involvement in at least two extramural activities."

4.1.4 External moderation

One principal felt that although appraisal is done by all the parties involved, there is a need that the process be assessed by an outside institution. The principal wrote: "At this institution [we] must see to it that appraisal is in fact done according to the basic principles", by which he probably meant adherence to the DAS discussed earlier.

4.1.5 Time limit and time factor

Some principals felt that appraisal should be done on a regular basis, at least twice a year or on a quarterly basis. However some principals felt that the whole process of appraisal is too time-consuming.

The appraisers and the appraisees in the studies cited in Wragg *et al.* (1996:137) indicated that they found the amount of time required to undertake the appraisal process as a major drawback. Some of the responses mentioned are as follows: "It's actually desperately under-resourced in terms of time ... It's partially at the minute when people are up to their eyeballs in other initiatives ... And it deserves better, I think ... It is a good scheme, if it is allowed time" (Ibid.).

Whilst the need for appraisal has been accepted by all the principals, it seems as if the time allocated to the appraisal process is a major concern for all of them.

4.1.6 Changing threats into strengths

The principals mentioned that one of the challenges that is facing teachers is that they must not view appraisal as a threat but instead change the threat into a

43

strength. In relation to changing threats into strengths, one of the principals wrote the following:

> The educator needs to be seen in the teaching-learning situation in the classroom on at least 2 occasions - this the educators regard as a "threat", but   once the system is implemented the threat, in my opinion, will translate into a strength since educators will want to prove that they have prepared their lessons.

A study conducted by Nutall and Turner (cited in Turner and Cliff 1988:161-162) on the teachers' perception of staff appraisal, identified negative views on staff appraisal. One of the respondents had this to say:

> Anything new off the ground is bound to be viewed with apprehension I think, especially in the light of the current national mood, so people were bound to be threatened by it and the general feeling I think was to be part of it because   it was threatening and if you weren't part of it, it might go away.

In the past appraisal was a threat to teachers due to the fact that inspectors and principals would visit teachers' classes observe their teaching, complete a record which the teacher never saw, and in this way the Department of Education was able to keep records of teachers. Moreover, teachers were not aware of the criteria that were used to judge their performance. However, the new appraisal process is developmental and the Staff Development Team (SDT) has a major role to play in implementing the new appraisal system so that the teachers no longer view appraisal as a threat but as a developmental and empowering process.

4.1.7 Teacher innovation

Principals mentioned that another challenge that the teachers are faced with is innovation. One of the principals wrote: "In the teaching profession we work with

44

guidelines which of course do not inhibit innovation." In relation to innovation Bolam as cited in Bollington *et al.* (1990:88) stressed that:

> There should be opportunities for members of the target user group to develop and modify the innovation locally by adapting the materials and by learning about the innovation characteristics and develop a sense of "owning" it.

Teachers are encouraged to be innovative and adapt the materials to suit their own pupils. In South Africa there is a move towards Curriculum 2005 and Outcomes-Based Education (OBE). Teachers must start now to design their lessons according to the OBE approach. They must not wait for the Department of Education to provide training but through reading about the outcome-based approach they would be in a position to implement it in their classrooms.

However, the system that has prevailed in our education system is that teachers have been made to believe that their training stops at the teacher training centre. This has led to the stagnation of thinking, teaching methods, managerial styles, interaction with pupils and colleagues, and their views of their role as teachers and how they view the learner (Zynoe 1995:382). It may therefore be both problematic and perhaps even idealistic to include innovation as a criterion for appraisal; yet in terms of projecting a picture of a reflective practitioner, innovation must rank as one of the most important criteria. The fact that some

of the principals refer to "guidelines" which may be stultifying indicates the mindset in which many educators are still trapped.

4.1.8 Inconsistency

A problem that the principals mentioned is that the appraisal panel can be inconsistent when evaluating the appraisee. One of the respondents wrote: "... inconsistency on the part of the appraiser that interferes with his ability to produce

45

accurate performance appraisal. These problems are not made consciously, but they are made often." The principals suggested that the appraisal panel must be consistent when they appraise teachers. They believe that due to inconsistency incorrect results will be produced. It follows that the kind of "consistency" to which they refer can only come with practice. Appraisers will need to develop a sense of "connoisseurship" (Eisner 1996).

4.1.9 Change of Attitude

Another challenge that the principals mentioned is that teachers should change their attitude towards appraisal and must be willing to be involved in appraisal. One of the respondents wrote: "The educators' negative attitude towards those conducting the programme ... [is a problem]. The animosity between the parties cannot be ruled out [as a factor] resulting in a stressful situation."

Bollington (1990:78) stated that in planning to introduce any new activity, such as the implementation of an effective appraisal system, it will be necessary to ensure that those involved are able to acquire appropriate attitudes (for example confidence, trust, willingness to experiment) and to develop the appropriate behaviour (i.e. possess the appropriate skills). The Staff Developmental Teams

(SDT) have to ensure that the necessary planning has been carried out before introducing staff appraisal in their schools.

The new appraisal system requires that teachers have to change their attitudes towards appraisal and they have to see it as a developmental approach. Through team teaching, sharing of information, peer coaching, appropriate training and change of behaviour, they can overcome these attitudes. Teachers are comfortable and feel safe in the present situation and they fear to undertake the journey into the

46

unknown. The Staff Developmental Teams have a major role to play in establishing a repertoire of relationships and to inform teachers on the new appraisal system.

4.1.10 Reward

The principals wrote that one of the problems is that there should be some form of recognition after successful appraisal, such as a financial advancement. One of the respondents suggested the following:

> Appraisal cannot be done for the sake of development only. There must be some form of recognition be it financially or otherwise. [Teaching is the] Only profession where no recognition is given to outstanding performance by the authorities - whilst so many people are "decorated" by central government on a regular basis.

Joseph as cited in Fidler, (1989) believed that merit pay or annual increments should not be related to annual appraisal procedures. Joseph suggested that the data collected through appraisal could be reflected in references and promotion some time in the future.

Likewise Goddard and Emerson (1993:16) mentioned that there are some problems when pay and promotion are linked to appraisal. They identified three problems, which are the following:

> Firstly, linking appraisal to pay significantly alters the attitude of teachers to the process. They must now present themselves in the best possible light. No longer is it in their interest to expose problems in the hope of receiving help and support. No longer is appraisal a partnership between the appraiser and the teacher discussing professional practice ... The second difficulty relates to the criteria to be used to award the performance-related element of pay ... The third difficulty concerns the operation of a performance to the maximum of their potential in order to earn their normal salary.

Literature this argues strongly against what the principals regard as important. Perhaps this is an indication of the professional maturity of the sample I researched.

Financial reward may be regarded as a lower-order need, as opposed to, say, personal growth and fulfilment. Yet it is this low-order need that is regarded as crucial by the principals. The literature I consulted - arising from developed professional societies - downplay the importance of money, and indeed, sees the link with money as problematic.

4.1.11 Organising

Another challenge that the principals mentioned was the organising of workshops for staff and also the resources to enhance teaching and learning. Bollington *et al.* (1990) observed that organising requires a clear understanding of both the structure and the staffing required if the objectives are to be realised and that also it requires a mutual acceptance of the empowerment of individuals. The observation made by Bollington implies that the structure that is going to be employed in organising workshops, in service training and also the people that are responsible for the organisation of such workshops must be clear to everyone involved.

4.1.12 Relationships

A problem that principals identified was the relationship that the appraisal panel should have with the appraisees. They mentioned that the treatment that they (appraisal panel) give to the appraisees should be consistent and that favouritism should be avoided.

4.1.13 Implementation

Some principals have doubts about the implementation of the system. One principal wrote: "The theory of the system is fine - the practical implementation is something

that I believe will cause it to be abandoned as happened with previous systems in model C schools."

This attitude points to a significant factor which may inhibit the implementation of the new system. It appears that the principals in my sample have a generous dose of cynicism in their make-up. This places a huge responsibility on the Staff Development Team, whose task it is to implement the guidelines contained in the Development Appraisal Document.

4.2   Analysis of interviews

When principals were asked about their understanding of staff appraisal, two main themes emerged:
- **development** and
- **assessment**.

The principals' responses to the fact that they are not going to be the sole appraisers were identified as follows,
- **transformation,**
- **participatory,**
- **acceptance** and
- **assistance.**

The third question required the principals to respond to their feelings related to staff appraisal and the fourth question required them to indicate the need for teachers to be appraised. Due to the close relationship between the two questions the principals' responses overlapped when they responded to the two questions. In my analysis I then categorised the two questions together and ended up with the following themes:
- **producing quality teachers,**

- maintenance of standards,
- too democratic,
- lack of knowledge, and
- rewards.

Question five required the principals to give their views with regard to the factors that have led to the reintroduction of staff appraisal in schools. The following aspects were identified:

- Teacher Union - SADTU,
- Teacher Morale, and
- Provision of In-service Training.

Principals where required to indicate whether the appraisal of teachers would be completed by 31 March 2000. The following themes emerged:

- failure, and
- causes of failure.

The last question required the principals to suggest other alternative strategies that they could employ to appraise teachers. The themes that emerged from the questions were:

- new appraisal system,
- mentoring,
- assistance by subject advisers,
- fix Team, and
- tertiary institutions' involvement.

4.2.1 Development

Principals referred to development as an ongoing process that aims at improving teachers' performance and empowering them with more skills in order to make them effective. In relation to the developmental aspect, Mr Zwane said the following:

> Staff appraisal is an ongoing process whereby teachers are appraised to the level of their work ... where areas are identified ... strengths as well as weaknesses. Thereafter there [has] got to be ongoing development to strengthen the weaknesses - something that's got to be there all the way as long as one remains in the teaching profession.

Studies that were done by Wragg *et al.* (1996) confirmed that a number of appraisees saw appraisal more positively, as a tool for teachers to evaluate their own practice with a view to its improvement and indeed to celebrate what was good.

4.2.2 Assessment

Of significance though is that staff appraisal was understood by principals as a way to assess how teachers are performing and then identifying strengths and weaknesses and assessing the performance of teachers. With regard to assessment, Mr Bennie understood appraisal as necessary to assess the educator. He endorsed his position in the following manner: "...looking at the individual educator and assessing how he/she is performing in that post ... to the debits and credits of his or her strengths and divulge [these] as indicated in that document".

Studies conducted by Wragg *et al.* (1996) indicated that a small number of the appraisees believed that the government's sole motive for introducing appraisal was the assessment of classroom practice with a view to "weeding out" poor teachers. For the majority of teachers "weeding out" meant removing poor teachers from the profession. This is contrary to what the interviewees understood by assessment. They rather perceived the assessment process positively, as a "means of assessing

how the individual is performing in that post". In other words they only look at assessment as a means to identify the performance of teachers. This shows that principals saw this new appraisal process as a democratic system: in the past appraisal was seen as a means by the government to keep surveillance over the teachers.

4.2.3 Transformation

With regard to transformation Mr Bennie was optimistic about the inclusion of the other stakeholders in the appraisal of teachers and has the following to say:

> ... I have no objection to it ... if it is an improvement on the previous ... procedure for appraisal, I have no objections to it either. I go with transformation and if this is going to be a better system, I am not opposed to it. But ... if the whole exercise at the end of it is just going to be introduced as a paper-chase then it would be bound to failure.

4.2.4 Participatory

With regard to the involvement of other stakeholders, principals saw it as a participatory approach. Mr Zwane had the following to say with regard to the involvement of other stakeholders:"... it is not one man's job it is for everybody to be involved in appraisal ... the more people get involved the more acceptable the whole matter is". Mr January also stressed the involvement of other stakeholders. In his words:

> ... there should be participatory approach - management ... we are going to put more people on board - other stakeholders will be involved in staff appraisal ... the person that is going to be appraised will choose the stakeholders, will choose the member of the teacher ... a colleague who should be involved.

Principals welcomed the fact that it is not only their job to carry out appraisal. They preferred looking at appraisal as a joint venture with the other stakeholders.

52

4.2.5 Acceptance

With regard to the acceptance of this new appraisal system principals felt that staff appraisal would not be readily accepted by teachers. They mentioned that there was a need to eliminate the suspicion that inspectors and principals used staff appraisal to victimise teachers.

Mr Diki explained what used to happen and what is expected of the new appraisal process:

> ... principals and inspectors used staff appraisal as a tool to victimise teachers. But this joint strategy focuses on equipping teachers with skills. Personally I don't have a problem. ... I think that peer appraisal is far better than having an authority coming in.

In similar vein Mr January said: "... we are going to put more people on board. - other stakeholders will be involved in appraisal. And it is going to eliminate the suspicion from teachers that the principal wants to catch them."

4.2.6 Assistance

With regard to the fact that the principals would not be the sole appraisers, Mr Diki said that he was willing to assist teachers. In his own words: "I feel comfortable and personally I am also there to assist. Therefore my role is to be there to assist."

4.2.7 Producing Quality Teachers

With regard to the need for staff appraisal, principals said that there was a need to produce quality teachers and that there was a need to "get them to think they are teachers." The Minister of Education, Asmal (Herald, 27 September) speaking at the

South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) provincial congress in Durban on 26 September 1999 stated that he had come to the SADTU's congress "to invite you to work with me to change the negative image our society has of a teacher. I want to take the profession back to a time when it was the most respected profession in the community." The principals seemed therefore to express a generally felt need to improve the public image of teachers, and saw appraisal as a mechanism to achieve this.

4.2.8 Maintenance of standards

Another factor that has been identified by the principals is that standards had to be maintained. Principals felt that in the past standards were dropping and that it is important to maintain the standards. Mr Diki had the following to say: "... there is a standard that needs to be maintained. And if the standards drop, the education drops. Education is there to maintain standards."

The Suffolk team (cited in Simons and Elliot 1990) explained that poor standards in education are caused by deficiencies in teacher performance. Clearly appraisal is a means to improving teacher performance. In the case of South Africa, though, I believe there is a need that the standards be raised, rather than maintained.

4.2.9 Too Democratic

Principals felt that the new process of appraisal is perhaps too democratic. Mr January expressed his suspicions as follows:

> Well I have been wondering whether it is a bit objective. Now that it is too open, especially for the appraisee, the appraisee should indicate whether he/she is ready to be appraised. He should choose the aspects to which he should be appraised and all that. So my question has been that (even in the workshop) what will happen if a person does not indicate whether he/she is

ready for appraisal. And what if the person chooses only the areas which she is interested in to be appraised in. Well to me it is rather too open - if it could have set dates ... if it could have a fixed approach to it. And also the question of choosing people that are going to be involved.

Goddard and Emerson (1993) stated that in the USA the principals choose an appraiser for the appraisee. The authors explained that there might be occasions when the headteacher appoints an appraiser whom the teacher finds repulsive. The authors further explained that a government circular stated that the headteacher should not refuse requests from staff for an alternative appraiser if there are particular circumstances which suggest that this might be appropriate. They mentioned that another aspect is that the appraiser is entitled to choose the areas for appraisal. If one compares the situation in South Africa to what is being practised in the USA, one can clearly see that the systems are different. Whilst teachers in South Africa choose their appraisers and the areas that they are going to be appraised on, teachers in the USA are not allowed to choose the appraiser nor the areas in which they would like to be appraised; instead the principal chooses the appraiser and the appraiser chooses the area in which he/she is going to appraise the teacher.

The new South African system thus seems even more democratic and transparent than the system followed in the US, and this is where some of the principals' reservations lie. It seems as if principals have not freed themselves of the policing mindset prevalent in approaches of the past, and will probably have difficulty in viewing the system as truly open, participatory and developmental.

4.2.10 Lack of Knowledge

Principals mentioned that there is a need for appraisal because of the fact that they did not know what was happening in classrooms. Mr Bennie elaborated on this aspect by saying the following:

Schools and management could not go into the classrooms and since then we don't know what is happening in the classroom. We are not sure - we are not sure whether the teachers are preparing adequately before the lesson or whether they are thinking properly about designing their tests. Whether they carry out individual work, whether they are working with the learners in a harmonious way. And we don't know [about] the relationship teachers are establishing in the classroom with the learners. So there is a big area in which we don't know what is happening. When there is a problem, we end up with a wrong perception either the teacher is to blame or the class and so on and so on. So we don't know what has happened.

This observation highlights an important after effect of the total collapse of teacher appraisal systems, discussed in Chapter Two. Clearly principals feel the need to be empowered by information on what is actually happening in their classrooms.

4.2.11 Performance

Another need for appraisal identified by the principals is performance. Mr Diki had the following to say:

If a person performs, then that performance needs to be rewarded and if a person does not perform then that person needs to be assisted. And if that person resists performance then that person needs to get out of the system. Education is not a welfare organisation for teachers.

4.2.12 Teacher's Union - SADTU

With regard to the reintroduction of staff appraisal in schools, the principals mentioned that teacher activism, more especially the teachers' union - South African Association of Teachers Union (SADTU) - has led to the reintroduction of staff appraisal.

Mr Zwane said the following:

A lot of commitment from the other schools ... and in ours ... we were fighting the political game, while other schools didn't care so much about politics. And I would also say that another contributory fact was teachers - SADTU which was the forefront of the political struggle and didn't worry so much about what happening in the classroom, more the bigger picture.

Similarly Mr Bennie also stated that: "... teacher activism which ... marginalised the function of the departmental officials (EDOs), subject advisers, principals in the schools, the management team and so on..." has led to the move towards a new system of appraisal.

4.2.13 Teacher Morale

Another factor that has been identified by the principals is the low teacher morale. Mr January had the following to say:

> I think it is because the Department of Education might have noticed that the morale is going down ... I am sure that they have raised concerns in the Department of Education. That they feel it is necessary now to keep on checking our teachers' performance. So that they can be more productive because if one works in a very relaxed atmosphere, even the one who has been good, can lower his standards due to that relaxation.

4.2.14 Provision for In-service Training

Principals identified the need for in-service training as another factor that has led to the reintroduction of staff appraisal. The principals mentioned that there is a need for in-service training where there is a lack of skills. In Mr Diki's words:

> ... there are certain teachers that need to be retrained for certain subjects. And this appraisal ... [is meant] to diagnose this problem. And ... whilst that has happened, I see that INSETS must be in place that will try to assist teachers. It would be useless to implement teacher appraisal where there is no support system now to equip teachers with skills.

57

Hickcox and Mussela (in Fullan and Hargreaves 1992) mentioned that in the United States, the Board of Education upon the recommendation from the Ministry of Education, introduced a programme that required some or all of the teachers to make changes, either in method or content. The obvious follow-up procedure was to introduce in-service staff development programmes to assist the teacher in making the necessary changes. In some cases assistance, external to the school, was employed.

4.2.15 Failure and reasons of failure

Principals mentioned that it was impossible for the appraisal process be completed by the 31 March 2000. Mr Bennie said the following:

> And it is going to fail, I suspect that in the first round it is going to affect the cycle, because the department hasn't got its act together. The process was supposed to have started at 1 April and run till 31 March next year ...the first cycle won't be as effective as we would like it to be.

Mr Zwane shared the same sentiment with Mr Bennie and said the following:

> ... I am certain that there are other schools were there were certainly no workshops and probably such workshops will only take place in July or August and to start appraisal in September and hope to finish it by the end of November, that is not possible. It is not possible to finish this whole thing within that time.

The principals identified reasons why the system would fail. One was the issue of redeployment, which was proving to be both time-consuming and emotionally draining for all concerned. Other reasons were the big number of schools and staff members.

In relation to other initiatives (such as redeployment) taking place concurrently with staff appraisal, Mr Bennie had the following to say: "... right at the middle of redeployment the department calls us to a workshop on staff appraisal... Teachers are finding it difficult to fix their minds on all this. They can't deal with two very serious issues simultaneously."

Goddard and Emerson (1993:70) observed that in large secondary schools it would be difficult to appraise all teachers in the same year. They then suggested that:

> Such schools will probably aim to introduce half of the teachers in one year, eg. a school might choose to begin the first year of the appraisal cycle for half of its teachers. And in the following year those teachers would complete their first appraisal cycle, while the other half would start the first cycle of their cycle.

In relation to timing Mr January said: I have been concerned about the time that is going to take place. What if one of the stakeholders is a worker somewhere else who is not available during school hours (you see) ... At the same time the school has its own programme as I have said some stakeholders may not be available at different times. I anticipate that there might be times when it is necessary for us to change appointments and so on.

4.2.16 Alternatives to the new developmental system

When principals were asked to suggest alternative strategies that they could employ to appraise teachers, Mr Bennie stated that he supported the present (new) system. He said the following: "The system seems to be better because it involves a great many people in the appraisal system and that is not going to be judgemental, but it is going to be transparent, democratic ... it is supposed to be developmental"

However, there were other responses. Mr Zwane said: "I think one alternative will be a one-on-one where you find for example, we have a history teacher or a senior history teacher to guide a relatively inexperienced teacher".

Lortie (cited in Simons and Elliot 1990) observed that teachers as a group suffer from low self-esteem and that their attitudes are being influenced by it. Simons and Elliot then lamented that there is a need for role models and mentors for teachers during their professional socialisation. However, the authors have noticed that it is not a common practice that senior teachers act as mentors to the inexperienced teacher. "Sink or swim" characterised many of the teachers' first years in the classroom.

It seems reasonable that the principal and his/her strategic team be responsible for mentoring and coaching one or more teams within the schools and might, in addition, be responsible for setting up a school-wide mentoring and coaching system which involves everyone in the school (Davies *et al*, 1990).

One principal mentioned that another alternative strategy is for subject advisers to assist them in the appraisal of teachers. Mr Zwane had the following to say:

> ... will be for subject advisers to come into our school - I am not certain that they will be readily accepted, when they come in... But it is a cry on their side that they are sitting in their offices and doing nothing. And if we were to get them involved into appraisal surely they will jump out of their offices into the schools... And I am sure if we were to say to them get into appraisal they will jump at that ...

Campbell *et al*. (1983:233) observed that principals need help to carry out the appraisal process:

> ... we think principals must take major responsibility for the appraisal of teachers in the school under their jurisdiction. Principals may - and often

should - solicit help in the process. A director of personnel or a subject-matter adviser from the central office can frequently be helpful.

According to the new appraisal document in South Africa, the principals will be members of the Staff Developmental Team (SDT) within their school and may not necessarily be the chairperson or co-ordinator of the team.

4.2.17 Fixed Team

One principal mentioned that staff appraisal should be carried out by a fixed team. Mr January said the following:

> ... there could be teams in conducting this process. It could be conducted during school hours and if there could be trained people in the thing, then it could go on, or if there is a fixed team of people in this thing, who are appraising, will go around the school - like in the past when inspectors would visit schools and conducted a panel inspection. Though that approach was not desirable one, because of its approach that was judgemental, and this one if it could be explained to teachers that it is not a judgmental approach but rather a developmental approach. Then I am sure everybody will accept it. There you get one or two stakeholders to join that team.

4.2.18 Involvement of tertiary institutions

Principals mentioned that there was a need for the involvement of tertiary institutions so that teachers could be involved in further studies, such as training of teachers. Mr Diki had the following to say:

> ... to engage in studies through universities and so on. Where perhaps universities play the role towards teacher appraisal in equipping teachers with skills. And regarding this, one who is outside the education process. The tertiary involvement ... as with teacher appraisal there is no tertiary involvement ... for it to be more effective is to have people from tertiary

institutions coming to schools and making use of assessment and going back to university coming up with a programme to retrain teachers... Tertiary institutions are out of the system and personally I believe that it will be more objective, if academics from tertiary institutions who will be in a position to assist us with skills. And at the end of the day come up with certificates from them ...

4.3   Summary and discussion of findings

The findings demonstrate significant ambiguities in the way principals perceive the new appraisal system. On one hand, there is unanimity that appraisal should take place, and that it should be developmental, transparent, carried out by a panel which is fully representative, even to the extent of including an appraisee peer, and, in one case, an external moderator. Indeed, they see this aspect - the involvement of other stakeholders - as "transformational." They call on teachers to change their attitudes towards appraisal and to see it as developmental rather than as a system that is going to be implemented in order to victimise them. The call for appraisal is seen as emanating from political activity (unions), low teacher morale and the need to improve teachers' public image.

On the other hand, some of the principals fear that the process might be "too democratic", meaning, in short, that too much is left to the individual teacher, as a result of which nothing is likely to happen. This lack of faith is indicative of an authoritative mindset that is associated with early management thinking (see Chapter 2) with its emphasis on control. It is also significant that none of the principals mention the need for professional development as a reason for appraisal to occur: instead, they identify external pressures, such as unionism. This reveals, I believe, just how far removed the principals I interviewed are from the ideal of the reflective practitioner and "self-appraisal" (see page 36). It is difficult to reconcile these contradictory attitudes.

In relation to the challenges and problems that principals are faced with, they are concerned about the time allocated to the appraisal process, since they see the process as a time-consuming exercise. In terms of provincial expectations (that the process should be completed by March 2000 - see Chapter Two) the principals do, of course, raise a valid point. In fact, the setting of a "final date" indicates a mindset (on the part of provincial authorities) that is entirely inappropriate to the spirit of developmental appraisal. That appraisal should be on-going (and thus, hopefully, developmental) was emphasised in the literature (see, for example, Simons and Elliot's [1990] collegial model in Chapter Two). To put such a rigorous and unreasonable time-frame to the process (even as a first round) is to miss the point, and indicates a task-orientation that makes little sense in a context of encouraging self-management and personal growth.

Another challenge that the principals foresaw was teacher innovation, whereby teachers adapt their own material rather than work according to guidelines. The principals were concerned that innovation is included as a criterion for appraisal. This is a worrying response from them. Creativity and innovation are surely two of the hallmarks of good teaching. The fact that principals are concerned that their teachers would struggle with these elements bodes ill for the future of education in this country, especially when one considers the principles embedded in Curriculum 2005, which place the onus for development of materials in accordance with outcomes and criteria squarely in the teachers' court. Translating outcomes into lesson materials calls for considerable creativity, ingenuity and opportunism. If our teaching corps is still trapped in the teacher-talk, rote-learning, textbook driven paradigm of the past (Hartshorne 1995), there is little likelihood that Curriculum 2005 will succeed. A more positive view to take would of course be to suggest that appraisal is one of the means by which innovation may be encouraged and developed among teachers.

The principals' insistence on the idea of associating appraisal with some form of recognition (financial) also indicates, in my opinion, a short-sighted and

unprofessional attitude to the purpose and role of appraisal. It appears, from the literature, that this is a world-wide problem. The implications of linking appraisal with money have been discussed under 4.2.10 above. All I wish to add at this stage is that teachers, as professionals, need incentives which are more durable and intrinsic than mere financial reward. Personal and professional growth would seem to me to be more significant rewards than cash incentives.

The principals identified the role the appraisal system might play in producing quality teachers. This links with their concern that the image of teachers in South Africa needs attention, and also with broader concerns about standards. Allied to this is their view of the role of appraisal as both development and a measure of performance. I believe these concerns are a response to the world-wide drive towards accountability and the need for quality assurance. It is perhaps only a question of time before schools will be obliged to carry out quality audits, of the kind currently happening at universities (Van der Mescht 1999 pers. comm.), and principals are naturally anxious to have a system in place whereby teachers can give an account of themselves as professionals.

They also mentioned that there is a need for appraisal because they were not aware of what was happening in the classroom. This is a reflection of the poor state of schooling in the country over the last decade, as a result of the increased politicisation of teachers and students. Matters reached a point where no-one was "allowed" into a classroom to observe teachers (see Chapter Two), obviously an unacceptable state of affairs in the context of a truly developmental approach to teacher appraisal, in which opening up one's practice would play a significant role (Hagger, Burn and McIntyre 1995:74).

Principals are further concerned about the fact two huge initiatives - appraisal and redeployment - are happening concurrently. They believe it would be impossible to implement two serious issues at the same time. In current local circumstances, this is a partially valid concern. Certainly the process of redeployment has been a costly

exercise in every way, not least in terms of emotional and psychic demands on administrators and teachers. Gilmour's (1999) attack on the government's treatment of teachers is a typical response:

> If the state is going to treat educators (and public servants in general) with the contempt and disregard that has been demonstrated in the recent salary negotiations and rationalisation and redeployment processes, it should hardly be surprised when standards start to slide. Graeme Gilmour November 2, 1999

It is understandable that principals faces with the painful and cumbersome procedure of redeployment would find little time for anything else. To squeeze another huge project - the new appraisal system - into their schedules must seem like an impossible challenge. On the other hand, though, the fact that the appraisal system is viewed as an appendage, a separate programme, goes to the root of the problem. It is indicates how far we are from institutionalising appraisal, regarding it is part of our daily work rather than an add-on.

In terms of finding alternatives to appraisal, the principals were quite creative. One principal suggested that mentoring would serve as an alternative to staff appraisal, whereby an experienced teacher would guide an inexperienced teacher. The practice of mentoring has gained currency in educational theory recently (Hagger, Burn and McIntyre 1995), particularly in the context of initial teacher education. It would clearly be an appropriate strategy to follow in schools in any developmental context. Perhaps one should ask why it is not already happening. The principals also referred to the involvement of tertiary institutions, whereby teachers could be encouraged to engage in further studies and also be helpful in the designing of in-service training courses. This idea has much merit. It indicates that principals are aware of the need for in-service training, and of the role academics could play in guiding the process. It also indicates a willingness to open teacher practice and appraisal up as an are of research, which would clearly have many positive spin-offs for all concerned.

65

However, rather than viewing these as alternatives, I would imagine that they should be happening anyway, complementary to a system of appraisal rather than instead of. The fact that they are listed as alternatives perhaps suggests a deep-rooted reluctance on the part of principals to buy into the new appraisal system.

In summary, the principals say the right words, but I doubt whether they are convinced of the need and feasibility of appraisal. There are contradictions and reservations in their perceptions (see page 62). They seem to have a limited and short-sighted view of the role of appraisal. They seem not to see appraisal as integrally part of the management of the school - as control and evaluation are inextricably part of the classical management cycle. We seem to be in the same place as that identified by Hutchinson (1995:47) who lamented, in light of a study that he conducted,

> that those who advocate the professional developmental appraisal process have won the battle over the terminology and rhetoric, but so far have yet to win the substantive war over purposes, procedures and effect.

With regard to the new developmental appraisal system in South Africa, the terminology seems to be in place: the DAD explains the purpose for adopting the new appraisal system and the procedure that is going to be followed, but the implementation and effect of the new appraisal system have not been clearly thought through.

Hutchinson (1995:47-48) further argued that development, as with every other educational concept, is a contested area: the essence of the tension with regard to staff appraisal lies in the question of who is to determine what is to be developed, why and how. From the management point of view the key task is to ensure that

organisational goals consistent with the external requirements are met as effectively as possible; but from an individual point of view personal professional goals take priority. When the two sets of expectations diverge, the person and the organisation become at odds with one another: both a sense of satisfaction with one's work and the effectiveness of the organisation suffer. In the case of my own research, the fact that the principals find it hard to move beyond a mindset of authority and control indicates that this tension is likely to complicate the system.

Perhaps a quote from one of my respondents would be a fitting note on which to end this chapter: "The theory of the system is fine - the practical implementation is something that I believe will cause it to be abandoned..." One hopes that he is wrong.

CHAPTER FIVE: RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter I conclude the study by making recommendations, based on my findings, for policy, principals, teachers and for future researchers.

5.1   Recommendations for policy

The following recommendations are made to the Department of Education and Culture in the Eastern Cape Province.

◻ My first recommendation concerns training and information dissemination which the provincial authorities should provide. However, instead of training two members of the Staff Development Team who will then train the entire staff, as recommended in the DAD, I would advise that the Provincial or District Team should take on the responsibility of training the entire staff. This suggestion based on the fact that a similar process was established whereby two individuals in a particular school were trained in Outcomes Based Education and given the responsibility of training their colleagues. The process failed, because the elected staff members in some cases failed to report back to their colleagues, and in other cases could not explain the process to the entire staff. For staff appraisal to be a success all the stakeholders need to be trained.

◻ Second, the nature of the training needs careful thought. It is not sufficient simply to explain how instruments will be used (say, in terms of what the criteria mean), though that would clearly be a good start. The kind of training that is needed, as highlighted by my study, should emphasise whole person development. There is a desperate need to raise the level of professionalism among our educators, so that they would be able to perceive appraisal as a natural and necessary part of personal and professional development. This would help to answer teachers' anxieties about appraisal being about fault-finding

and policing. My research as shown that principals too need to grown in their understanding of the role of appraisal.

- Third, it will be of utmost importance that before appraisal of teachers could be done in this province that a campaign be launched in order to determine the different needs of the schools in the province. The largest part of this province consists of rural areas and in the past the schools in these areas were neglected with regard to the provision of materials. This has led to the fact that rural and farm schools lack the necessary resources.

- Fourth, the principals' anxiety about time frames needs to be addressed. Due to the large number of schools in the province and also because of the rural areas that are situated far from each other, I would suggest that the appraisal of teachers be done in two stages. The schools should be divided into two. Although the appraisal process is a two-year cycle, half of the schools can be part of the first cycle i.e. being appraised in a current year and when the first group are in their second cycle the other group will then be in the first cycle. The whole process needs to be thoroughly strategised for it to be successful.

- Fifth, the Department of Education and Culture should liaise with Education Faculties at tertiary institutions and with NGOs that are educationally oriented to assist in designing INSET courses that could help in equipping teachers who lack certain skills. It could also be useful that the facilitators designing those INSET courses could be selected as external appraisers. They could establish the problems that the teachers have and design courses that are relevant. The Education Department also needs to encourage research institutions to embrace the field of teacher appraisal as an area for research.

- Finally, the Department needs to give careful thought to the notion of linking appraisal with financial reward. It is clearly a problematic area. It may well be appropriate, given our context, that my respondents' feelings (that there should be monetary reward) should be acted on as a short-term measure.

5.2   Recommendations for principals

❑   First, it is the principals' responsibility to set up SDTs, as outlined in Appendix G.

❑   Second, principals need to accept the new arrangement, that they are now members of Staff Development Teams, and no longer have sole control of teacher appraisal. In light of the authoritative mindset discovered in my research, I suspect that this may be an area of potential conflict. They need to realise that their role will be one of supporting the coordinator, and indeed the whole SDT, as the head of the school. They must be willing to share their leadership and management skills with all the team members. It is a kind of enforced delegation. This development is in line with current management thinking, as outlined in the Task Team Report (South Africa 1996).

❑   Principals too, need to play their role in disseminating information and re-educating teachers. As instructional and professional heads, they need to ensure that development takes place within their schools.

5.3   Recommendations for teachers

❑   First, teachers need to make it their business to be fully informed on the new appraisal system. Accepting the fact that appraisal is part of one's professional life, and an added extra, will go a long way towards shifting the responsibility for knowing the facts away from the authorities.

❑   Second, teachers needs to change their attitudes towards being evaluated. This is easily said, but of course the implications are huge and the problems may seem insurmountable. Teachers need to be developed as people, rather than merely as professionals. They will then more clearly see the new appraisal as both a developmental and empowering process.

❑   Third, teachers should be aware of the role they themselves can play in repairing their damaged public image. Unfortunately the mindset we have inherited allows

70

us to wait for someone else - someone in authority - to solve our problems. We need to rise above this.

❑ Fourth, teachers should take on the challenge of becoming skilled observers and interpreters of classroom practice. Teachers are not the victims of the system; they are the system. The will evaluate, and be evaluated.

❑ Experienced teachers need to accept the role of mentor to younger and inexperienced teachers. They need to realise that they have much to teach others, and see it as part of their roles as professionals.

5.4   Recommendations for research

❑ First, future researchers need to investigate the role of co-ordinating of the new appraisal system. Interesting aspects to focus on include the notion of managing a system within a bigger system. Questions of communication and delegation will be important.

❑ Second, after the completion of the first cycle, research needs to be carried out to discover the strengths and weaknesses of the appraisal process. I was not able to do a retrospective study, since the cycle is presently running. I think it will be important to assess (and evaluate) the cycle on its completion.

❑ Third, I have focused on principals as the overall managers of the system. Clearly there is a need for research of how teachers perceive the system. Interesting questions to ask would include questions which probe how (or whether) teachers feel appraisal influences their classroom practice. It would also be interesting to test teachers' response to a system that claims to be participatory and transparent, in contrast to the opaque and top-down systems of the past.

❑ Finally, mine has been an interpretive study, aimed at discovering and describing the "reality" construed by others. The field lends itself to research carried out in a socially critical paradigm, such as participatory action research, where the researcher's intention would be to play a role in the development of the

71

system by giving it a research dimension. Here again, closer liaison between schools and research institutions would be helpful.

References

Adams, N. (1987). **Secondary School management today**. London: Hutchinson.

Anderson, G. (1990). **Fundamentals of educational research**. Bristol: Falmer Express.

Aspinwall, K., Simkins, T., Wilkinson, J.F., & Mc Auley, M.J. (1992). **Managing evaluation in education: A developmental approach**. London: Routledge.

Beardall, J. (1995). Teacher appraisal and professional accountability in South African education. **Perspectives in Education**, 16(2), 365 - 372.

Bell, L. (1992). **Managing teams in secondary schools**. London:Routledge.

Bell, L., & Day, C. (Eds.). **Managing the professional development of teachers**. Philadelphia: Open Univesity.

Bennet, N., Glatter, R., & Leva`cic`, R. (Eds.). (1994). **Improving educational management through research and consultancy**. London : Chapman.

Bennett, H., Lister, M., & McManus, M. (1992). **Teacher appraisal: survival and beyond**. London; Longman.

Block, B. (1992). The failure of state-mandated teacher appraisal. **Education Policy.** Vol 66(1), 35-60.

Bollington, R., Hopkins, D., & West, M. (1990). **An introduction to teacher appraisal**. London: Cassell.

Burgess, R.G. (1993). (et al) **Implementing in-service education training**. London: Falmer.

Bush, T. (1995). **Theories of educational management** (2nd ed.). London: Chapman.

Campbell, R.E., Corbally, J.E.,& Nystrand, R.O. (1983). **Introduction to educational administration**. London: Chapman.

Castetter, W.B. (1991). **The personnel function in educational administration.** New York; Macmillan.

Clark, C.M. (1995). **Thoughtful teaching**. London: Cassell.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L (1994). **Research methods in education** (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Costa, A.L. & Callick, B. (1993). Through the lens of a critical friend. **Educational Leadership.** 51:2, 48-51.

Craft, A. (1996). **Continuing professional development: A practical guide for teachers and schools**. London : Routledge.

Craft, A. (1996). **Continuing professional development: a practical guide for teachers and schools**. London: Routledge.

CTPA (1991, 25 February). Inspectors backed by CTPA. **Eastern Province Herald**, p.3.

Davidoff, S., & Lazarus, S. (1997). **The learning school: An organisational development approach**. Kenwyn : Juta & Co.

Davies, B., Ellison, L., Osborne, A., & West-Burnham, J. (1990). **Educational management for the 1990s.** London : Pitman.

Dennison, B., & Shenton, K. (1987). **Challenges in educational management: Principles into practice**. London : Croom Helm.

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.). (1994). **Handbook of qualitative research**. California; Sage.

Dunham, D (1995). **Developing effective school management**. London: Routledge.

Herald Correspondence (1999, 27 September). Teachers neglect their professional duties, take drugs and are involved in child abuse - Asmal launches stinging attacks. Eastern Province Herald, p 3.

Eisner, E.W. (1991) **The enlightened eye: qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice**. New York : Macmillan.

Everand, K.B., & Morris, G (1996). **Effective school management** (3rd ed.). London: Chapman.

Evetts, J. (1994). **Becoming a secondary headteacher**. Singapore: Cassell.

Fidler, B. (1989). Staff appraisal - theory concepts and experience in other organisations and problems of adaptation to education. In Riches, C & Morgan, C. (Eds.). **Human resource management in education**. (pp. 190-205). Philadelphia: Open University.

Fidler, B., & Cooper, R. (Eds.). (1992). **Staff appraisal and staff management in school and colleges: A guide to implementation.** Essex: Longman.

Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (1996). **Research methods in social sciences**. (5th ed.). London: Arnold.

Glatter, R. (Ed.). (1989). **Educational institutions and their environments: Managing the boundaries**. Philadelphia: Open University.

Goddard, I., Emerson, C. (1993). **Appraisal and your school.** London : Athenaeum.

Govender, L.(1996). **When "the chalks are down - A historical political and social interpretation of teacher militancy in South Africa**. Pretoria: HSRC.

Grace, G. (1995). **School leadership. Beyond educational management: An essay in policy scholarship**. London: Falmer Express.

Hagger, H., Burn, K., & McIntyre, D. (1995) **The school mentor handbook**. London: Kogan Page.

Hartshorne, K.B. (1992) **Crisis and challenge : black education, 1910-1990** Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Heath, G. (1989). **Staff development, supervision and performance appraisal**. New York: Longman.

Hewton, E. (1990). **The Appraisal interview: An approach to training for teachers and school management**. Philadelphia : Open University.

Hickcox, E.S., & Mussela, D.F. (1992). Teacher performance appraisal and staff development. In M. Fullan. & A. Hargreaves (Eds.). **Teacher development and educational change**. London; Falmer Express.

Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1991). **Educational administration-theory, research and practice** (4th ed.). New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

Hughes, P., & Jones, J. (1994). Managing teacher appraisal: an exercise in collaboration. **British Journal of In-service Education**, <u>20</u> (2),205-218.

Hughes, M., Ribbens, P.,& Thomas, H. (Eds.). (1987). **Managing education: The systems and the institution**. London: Cassell.

Hugo, W.M.J. (1994). Evaluating the academic department. **South African Journal of Higher Education**. Vol 8(2), 84-89.

Hutchinson, B. (1995). Staff appraisal:personal, professional and organisational development. **Educational management and administration**. 23 (1), p.47-57.

Jaeger, R.M. (Ed.). (1988). **Complementary methods for research in education**. Washington: American Educational Research Association.

Johnson, D. (1994). **Research methods in educational management**. Essex: Longman.

Kvale, S. (Ed.). (1989). **Issues of validity in qualitative research**. Swedan : Studentlitteratus.

Kydd, L., Crawford, M., & Riches, C. (Eds.). (1997). **Professional development for educational management**. Buckingham: Open University.

Leithwood,K., Begley,P.T., & Cousins, J.B. (1992). **Developing expert leadership for future schools**. London: Falmer Express.

Maykut,P., & Morehouse,R.(1994). **Beginning qualitative research: A philosophical and practical guide**. London : Falmer.
Montgamery, D., & Hadfield, N. (1989). **Practical teacher appraisal**. London: Kogan.

Mouton, J. (1996). **Understanding social research**. Pretoria : Van Schaik.

Naude, B., & Bridgraj, A. (1999). The new developmental system is slowly getting off the ground; Appraising appraisal. **The Teacher**,4(7),9.

Ndlovu, K. (1990, 17 April). 6000 Teachers suspend strike. **Eastern Province Herald**, p.4.

Owen, J. (1992). **Managing education**. London: Longman.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). **Qualitative evaluation and research methods**. Newbury Park : Sage.

Peterson, D., Kromrey, J., & Smith, D.C. (1990). Research-based teacher evaluation: A response to Scriven. In L. Schwab (Ed.), **Research based teacher evaluation**. Boston; Kluwer.

Poster, C., & Poster, D. (1991). **Teacher appraisal: A guide to training.** London: Routledge.

Quinlan, O., & Davidoff, S. (1997). **Valuing teachers through appraisal**. Pretoria: Via Africa.

Rasool, M (1997). Appraising for the future. **The Teacher**, 2(5),6.

Rebore, R.W. (1982). **Personnel administration in education: A management approach**. London : Prentice - Hall.

Reeves, C. (1994). **The struggle to teach**. Cape Town: Maskew Miller

Saran, R., & Trafford, V. (Eds.). (1990). **Research in education: Management and policy**. London: Falmer.

Sergovianni, T.J., & Starrat, R.J. (1988). **Human perspective** (4th ed.). New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

Shalem, Y. (1990). **Why professionalism ? A study of the relationship between teachers' work, teachers' power and teachers'struggle**. Occasional Papers. Educational Policy Unit, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Simons, H., & Elliot, J. (Eds.) (1990). **Rethinking appraisal and assessment**.

Smith, R. (1995). **Successful school management.** London: Cassell.

South Africa (Republic). (1996). Report of the task team on educational management development. Changing management to manage change in education. Pretoria. Government Printer.

South Africa (Republic). (1998a). Implementation plan on staff appraisal. Pretoria: Government Printer.

South Africa (Republic). (1998b). Developmental Appraisal. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Squelch, J., & Lemmer, E. (1994). **Eight keys to effective school management in South Africa**. Durban; Southern.

Stones, C. (1988). Research: Towards a phenomenological praxis. In D. Kruger, **An introduction to phenomenological psychology**. (pp. 141-156). Cape Town : Juta & Co.

Tenbrick, T.D., (1974). **Evaluation : A practical guide for teachers**. San Fancisco: Mc Graw-Hill.

Timperley, H.S., & Robinson, V.M.J. (1989). The micropolitics of accountability: The case of staff appraisal. **Education Policy.** Vo1 12(1),163-178.

Tomlinson, J. (1993). **The control of education**. London : Cassell.

Turner, G., & Clift, P. (1988). **Studies in teacher appraisal**. London : Falmer.

Van der Mescht, H. (1999). Personal communication.

Van der Westhuizen, P.C. (Ed.)., Erasmus, M., Janson, C.A., Mentz, P.J., & Theron, A.M.C. (1996). **Schools as organisations**.(1st ed.). Pretoria: van Schaik.

Van der Westhuizen, P.C. (Ed.). (1991). **Effective educational management.** Bloemfontein: Kagiso.

Williams, V. (Ed.). (1995). **Towards self-managing schools**. New York: Cassell.

Wragg, E.C. (Ed.). (1989). **Classroom teaching skills: the research findings of the teacher education project**. London: Routledge. Philadelphia : Open University.

Wragg, E.E. (1987). **Teacher appraisal : A practical guide.** Houndmills : Macmillan.

Wragg, E.C., Wikeley, F.J., Wragg, C.M., & Haynes, G.S. (1996). **Teacher appraisal observed.** London: Routledge.

Yin, R.K. (1994). **Case study research : Design and methods** (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Zynoe, P. (1995). National Conference on Teacher Development: A teacher's perspective. **Perspectives in Education**. Vol 16(2), 379-386.

Appendices

Vista University

Private Bag x613

PORT ELIZABETH

6025

9 March 1999

Dear Respondent

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

I am presently doing research on principals' perceptions of the management of staff appraisal in schools. I would appreciate if you could take time from your busy schedule to complete this questionnaire.

The reason why I have approached you to take part in this research, is because your school is conveniently situated to my workplace. This research is part of my studies and after the report has been completed I intend to publish the findings. I am also prepared to share my findings with you if you are interested. I wish to assure you that the research enquiry will be effectively administered and that your responses will be strictly confidential.

Kindly return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible.

Thank you

L. E. Blaauw (Miss)

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect principals' perceptions of the management of staff appraisal in schools.

SECTION A: IDENTIFICATION DATA

Age	25-35	[ ]
	36-45	[ ]
	46-55	[ ]
	56-65	[ ]
Sex	Female	[ ]
	Male	[ ]
Work experience	1-5	[ ]
	6-10	[ ]
	11-20	[ ]
	21-30	[ ]
	31-40	[ ]

SECTION B

Please answer all the questions:

Do you think that there is a need for teachers to be appraised ?
Have you been involved in appraisal before ?
Have you been appraised teachers before as the principal
of a school?
Did you receive training on how to appraise teachers before ?
How do you think appraisal should be run in schools?
Comment:..
....
....
....
....

In your opinion what do you think are the challenges and problems that lie ahead with regard to staff appraisal ?

Comment:...

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

What is your understanding about staff appraisal ?

Staff appraisal was done by you as a principal (sole responsibility) before but according to the new appraisal process, appraisal of teachers is a joint effort. How do you feel about this?

What is your attitude towards staff appraisal?

Do you feel that teachers need to be appraised ?

What do you think are the factors that has led to government to reintroduce staff appraisal in schools ?

Do you think that the appraisal of teachers in schools in the Eastern Cape can be completed by 31 March 2000 ?

What alternative way of appraising teachers can you think of?

APPENDIX D

The Principal

....................Secondary/ High school

PORT ELIZABETH

6001

Dear Sir/Madam

THANK YOU

I hereby wish to thank you for taking time from your busy schedule in completing the questionnaire and providing me with the information that I needed during the interview. I really appreciate your support.

Once more, thank you.

Truly

L.E. Blaauw (Miss)

Vista University

Private Bag x613

PORT ELIZABETH

6025

30 September 1999

The Librarian

Times Media Eastern Cape (Pty) Ltd

PORT ELIZABETH

6001

Dear Sir/Madam

SEARCH ON PREVIOUS RECORDS

I am presently doing research on principals' perceptions of the management of staff appraisal in schools. I am interested in finding out information on the history of staff appraisal in South Africa, more especially in the 1980s, as well as statistics on the teachers' strike due to the fact that they refused to be appraised.

I would appreciate your assistance in this regard.

Yours faithfully

L. E. Blaauw (Miss)

APPENDIX F

Vista University

Private Bag x613

PORT ELIZABETH

30 September 1999

The Librarian

Times Media Eastern Cape (Pty) Ltd

PORT ELIZABETH

6001

Dear Madam

I wish to thank you and your staff for the wonderful support that you have given me during my visit to your library. Although according to your rules I had to complete my search within an hour, I thank you for allowing me more hours to do a thorough search as well as two more days to complete the search.

Thank you for your assistance and your ever willingness to help the public.

Truly

L.E. Blaauw (Miss)

APPENDIX G

SUMMARY OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL DOCUMENT

According to the Developmental Appraisal Document (DAD), the head of the institution has to take the initiative to convene a staff meeting to establish a Staff Developmental Team (SDT). The SDTs should consist of the Head of the institution, elected members and others. The purpose of the SDT in the developmental appraisal system is to initiate, co-ordinate and monitor the appraisal process in institutions and to ensure that training in the developmental appraisal system occurs. Two members of the SDT will be trained by the Provincial or District Appraisal Team, and will then train the entire staff. The appraisees in consultation with the SDT will establish the rest of the appraisal panel.

The appraisal panel is made up of:

* the appraisee;
* a nominated peer;
* a senior management person;
* a union representative;
* a person from outside the institution eg. from district offices, non-governmental organisation, colleges and universities.

The appraisal panel must be made up of the appraisee and three others from the list. However in small institutions, it is acceptable for the panel to be composed of the appraisee and two others from the list. In general, the appraisal panel is made up of four people. Maximally, it is made up of five persons and minimally of three people.

With regard to the role of the peer appraiser, the DAD indicates that peer appraisal will assist the appraisee to review his/her performance with a view to prioritise professional development needs.

The Developmental appraisal document does not clarify the role of an outsider. [One of the key speakers in a workshop that I attended (19 Feb, 1999). Mr Qata stated that an outsider could be optional.] The DAD outlines the roles of members of the appraisal panel.

The duties of the panel are outlined. Members will:

* be available for appraisal panel meetings. Failure to attend two consecutive appraisal panel meetings disqualifies the person from further participation in the appraisal panel;

* elect somebody who will chair the appraisal panel meeting and who will liaise with the SDTs to arrange times for meetings and to report on progress to the SDT;

* ensure that the appraisee fill in the relevant forms and that these are discussed jointly in the appraisal panel meeting;

* consult each other and arrive at shared understandings of the terms used;

* decide on ways in which the appraisal will actually happens and on what basis decisions will be made eg. how will "management skills" be appraised and who will do this appraisal;

* arrange for observation of the educator in practice and elect person/s from the appraisal panel to conduct such observation. It is recommended that two such visits should occur;

* discuss critically, openly, honestly and non-judgementally the reports of the observation visits or other such appraisals with the appraisee in an appraisal panel meeting;

* jointly arrive at final decisions about the appraisal of the particular educator and work out practically what developmental plans may be put into place to ensure the further development of the educator who has been appraised;

* work through the Discussion Paper and make sure that clear recommendations for further professional development are stipulated;

* finalise the report and ensure that all panel member's signatures appear on it.