

**An exploration into whether the developmental  
appraisal system is achieving its desired  
outcome of promoting teacher development**



**By  
MIRANDA JANE WHITLEY**

*Thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of  
Master in Education in the Department of Education Policy Studies in the  
Faculty of Education at the University of Stellenbosch*

**Supervisor: Dr Nuraan Davids**

**March 2016**

## Declaration

By submitting this dissertation electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the owner of the copyright thereof (unless to the extent explicitly otherwise stated) and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

DATE:.....

## Abstract

Prior to 1994, the evaluation of teachers occurred by means of an inspectorate system. This was an external body that ensured that all schools complied strictly with certain official rules and regulations. This method of evaluation was met with much resistance and distrust. It was seen as being “top-down”, “closed”, “bureaucratic”, “hierarchical” and “authoritative”. The inherent feeling of mistrust in this inspectorate system of evaluation was lodged within the troubled history of apartheid. With the onset of democracy came the dire need for educational reform and redress – one element of which was addressing the major concern of teacher and curriculum development as a means to ensure quality teaching and learning. In response to the latter, and in reforming the highly contentious inspectorate system, the Department of Basic Education (DoBE) introduced the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS).

The primary aim of this research study was to explore whether the developmental appraisal system delivers on its outcome of promoting teacher development in five former model C schools in the Western Cape. The study explores the experiences and challenges of the IQMS appraisal system as encountered by principals, deputies and teachers. Among the main findings of this research is that teachers and principals hold extremely negative perceptions of the appraisal system. Furthermore, peer observation tends to lead to window-dressing of lessons, making it a futile exercise, as scores are unreliable and based on one lesson only. Very little, if any, teacher development stems from the IQMS appraisal process. Some financially well-resourced former model C schools implement additional appraisal systems with a financial incentive attached to the outcome. The IQMS’s 1% salary increase is not a motivating factor for teachers to be committed to the process.

Furthermore, the DoBE needs to strictly monitor that the process is leading to teacher development. To allow this, substantial funding has to be available. Furthermore, attitudes need to be adjusted by the principals, accountability enforced and the implementation of different appraisal systems across public schools must be realised. This will have a positive impact on the quality of education in South Africa and should be a goal that the South African education system should strive to achieve.

**Keywords:** Inspectorate system, teacher development, appraisal, former model C schools, streamlined, quality teaching and learning

## Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Nuraan Davids, for being my inspiration. Without her unfailing encouragement, guidance and support I would not have been motivated to continue striving for my goal. She encouraged me to keep going, helped me to believe in myself, and fuelled my passion for education. I aspire to be someone like her, with her deep-seated intellect and her commitment to excellence in her field. She has inspired me and taught me never to stop learning and growing as a person, and to play my part in whatever way, however small, in seeking to improve educational standards. Education is, after all, the foundation on which our nation is built. I am honoured to be your student!

I am also most thankful to the principals and deputy principals who agreed to be interviewed and gave such honest answers to all my questions. Thank you for all the correspondence that you had with me. I do appreciate the time you gave up to be a part of this study. I am also grateful to the fifteen teachers who participated in this study. Thank you for giving up your valuable time to answer all my questions. Without your co-operation, this study would not have been possible.

I am also thankful and blessed for all the support and unconditional love I receive from my Mom, Jenny Shingler, and step-dad, Rob Shingler. Thank you for always believing in me and lifting me up.

Lastly, I would like to thank my husband, Tim Ripsold, my best friend and pillar of strength. Thank you for being my anchor and support through this extended time of study, always being there to encourage me and to help me keep on going. I appreciate everything that you have done for me.

## **Dedication**

This thesis is dedicated to my beloved Dad, Helier Martin Whitley, who tragically passed away in 2002. Thank you for teaching me to live, laugh and love. I know you are very proud of me.

## **Abbreviations and acronyms**

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| CPD   | Continuing Professional Development      |
| DAS   | Developmental Appraisal System           |
| DoBE  | Department of Basic Education            |
| ELRC  | Education Labour Relations Council       |
| HOA   | House of Assembly                        |
| HOD   | House of Delegates                       |
| HOR   | House of Representatives                 |
| IQMS  | Integrated Quality Management System     |
| NCS   | National Curriculum Statements           |
| NDE   | National Department of Education         |
| NUT   | National Union of Teachers               |
| OBE   | Outcomes-based Education                 |
| PAM   | Personnel Administrative Measures Policy |
| PGP   | Personal Growth Plan                     |
| PM    | Performance Management                   |
| RNCS  | Revised National Curriculum Statements   |
| RTC   | Registered Teaching Criteria             |
| SACE  | South African Council for Educators      |
| SADTU | South African Democratic Teachers Union  |
| SGB   | School Governing Body                    |
| SIP   | School Improvement Plan                  |
| SMT   | School Management Team                   |

WCED Western Cape Education Department

WSE Whole School Evaluation

## **Table of contents**

|                                  |     |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| Declaration.....                 | ii  |
| Abstract.....                    | iii |
| Acknowledgements .....           | iv  |
| Dedication.....                  | v   |
| Abbreviations and acronyms ..... | vi  |
| Table of contents.....           | vii |

**Chapter One-Overview of the study**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1.1. Introduction .....                                     | 1  |
| 1.2 Motivation/rationale for the study .....                | 2  |
| 1.3 The research problem .....                              | 3  |
| 1.4 General aims and objectives .....                       | 4  |
| 1.5 Background to the study .....                           | 4  |
| 1.6 Research context.....                                   | 5  |
| 1.7 Research design and methodology                         |    |
| 1.7.1 Type of study.....                                    | 8  |
| 1.7.2 Case study research .....                             | 9  |
| 1.7.3 Population and sampling .....                         | 10 |
| 1.7.4 Instrumentation and data construction techniques..... | 10 |
| 1.7.5 Semi-structured interviews .....                      | 11 |
| 1.7.6 Data analysis and interpretation .....                | 11 |
| 1.7.7 Data management .....                                 | 12 |
| 1.8 Delimitation of the study .....                         | 12 |
| 1.9 Ethical considerations .....                            | 13 |
| 1.10 Overview of the study.....                             | 13 |
| 1.11 Conclusion.....  | 14 |



**Chapter Two-Literature review**

2.1 Introduction ..... 15

2.2 Conceptual overview of performance appraisal; management; evaluation; and professional development..... 15

2.3 Making sense of appraisal in public schools ..... 17

2.4 Appraisal in New Zealand ..... 18

2.5 Appraisal in the United Kingdom ..... 20

2.6 Appraisal in Botswana ..... 23

2.7 Appraisal in Zimbabwe ..... 25

2.8 Appraisal in South Africa..... 27

2.8.1 Developmental appraisal system (DAS)..... 31

2.8.2 Whole school evaluation (WSE)..... 32

2.8.3 Performance management (PM) ..... 33

2.8.4 Understanding the IQMS ..... 34

2.8.4 IQMS objectives ..... 35

2.8.6 How the IQMS should be used in schools..... 36

2.9 Negative perceptions surrounding the IQMS ..... 42

2.10 Chapter summary..... 49

**Chapter Three –Research design and methodology**

3.1 Introduction ..... 50

3.2 Statement of the research question ..... 50

3.3 Research paradigm ..... 51

3.4 Research design ..... 51

3.5 Population and sampling ..... 53

3.6 Data construction methods ..... 55

3.7 Research context ..... 59

3.8 Reliability and validity of data..... 61

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 3.9 Ethical considerations .....        | 62 |
| 3.9.1 Informed consent.....             | 62 |
| 3.9.2 Privacy and confidentiality.....  | 63 |
| 3.9.3 Risks and discomforts .....       | 64 |
| 3.9.4 Reciprocity .....                 | 64 |
| 3.9.5 Participation and withdrawal..... | 64 |
| 3.10 Limitations of the study .....     | 65 |
| 3.11 Conclusion.....                    | 65 |

**Chapter Four-Presentation of data**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 4.1 Analysis of IQMS policy .....  | 67 |
| 4.1.1 School A.....  | 68 |
| 4.1.2 School B.....  | 68 |
| 4.1.3 School C and D .....   | 70 |
| 4.1.4 School E.....  | 70 |
| 4.1.5 Interviews.....  | 70 |
| 4.2 Perceptions and experiences of the developmental appraisal process ..... | 72 |
| 4.3 The implementation of the appraisal process .....                        | 77 |
| 4.4 Teacher and curriculum development.....                                  | 79 |
| 4.5 Strategic planning of the school .....                                   | 81 |
| 4.6 Feedback .....   | 83 |
| 4.7 Positive aspects.....  | 84 |
| 4.8 Chapter summary .....  | 85 |

**Chapter Five-Analysis of findings, conclusions and recommendations**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 5.1 Summary of main findings .....                              | 88 |
| 5.1.1 Perceptions and experiences of the appraisal system ..... | 89 |
| 5.1.2 The implementation of the appraisal system .....          | 91 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 5.1.3 The contribution of the appraisal system to the development of the teacher in relation to the curriculum and his/her professional development ..... | 93  |
| 5.1.4 The incorporation of the appraisal findings into the strategic planning of the school .....   | 95  |
| 5.1.5 Feedback post appraisal .....   | 97  |
| 5.1.6 Most significant and positive aspects of the appraisal system.....  | 98  |
| 5.2 Implications for teaching and learning .....  | 99  |
| 5.3 Recommendations .....   | 100 |
| 5.3.1 Recommendations to the DoBE.....  | 100 |
| 5.3.2 Recommendations to the principals.....  | 102 |
| 5.3.3 Recommendations to the teachers.....  | 103 |
| 5.3.4 Recommendations for further research .....  | 103 |
| 5.4 Significance of the study .....   | 103 |
| 5.5 Conclusion.....   | 104 |
| References .....  | 106 |

**Addendum A**

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Consent letter ..... |  |
|----------------------|--|

**Addendum B**

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| WCED approval letter ..... |  |
|----------------------------|--|

**Addendum C**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Ethical clearance ..... |  |
|-------------------------|--|

**Addendum D**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Interview questions to principals..... |  |
|--|--|

**Addendum E**

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Interview questions to teachers ..... |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|

## Chapter 1

### Overview of the study

#### 1.1 Introduction

This study provides an exploration of the developmental appraisal system and investigates whether it delivers on its desired outcome of promoting teacher development. Van Deventer and Kruger (2011:210) explain that staff development is not possible without staff appraisal. Furthermore, the aim of developmental appraisal is to facilitate the personal and professional development of teachers in order to improve the quality of teaching practice and education management. It is based on the fundamental principle of lifelong learning and development. The Department of Basic Education [DoBE] (1998) and Van Deventer and Kruger (2011:216) emphasise that the appraisal process will be useless if nothing happens after everybody has been appraised and the post-appraisal discussions have been held. It is only after these abovementioned processes have been held that the development programme for the teacher can begin (Van Deventer & Kruger, 2011:216). Many teachers hold negative views about the appraisal process. Steyn and Van Niekerk (2007:252) list the following negative perceptions held:

- It serves as an intimidation tool that can be used to boss teachers around and threaten them with “no pay” increment.
- It is used to oppress teachers, reprimand them and punish them.
- It is questionable whether appraisal instruments are either valid or reliable.

Reflection on the literature led me to want to probe and analyse the perceptions of teachers of the appraisal system, as it appears to be a rather contentious issue in schools, as well as to ascertain whether the appraisal process in schools actually leads to the professional development of the teachers.

This chapter therefore provides insight into the motivation for this research study, as well as an overview of the background to the study. The aspects of the research problem, research questions, research design, methodology and data construction methods are also focused on.

## **1.2 Motivation/rationale for the study**

This study was motivated by a personal interest in the staff appraisal process in schools. My teaching career began in 1999, which was in the period before the implementation of the IQMS in public schools. The school where I held my first post and embarked on my teaching profession was a very large, former model C school. The biggest shock to me was the lack of support I received, as well as the fact that there was no opportunity for professional growth and development, although it was extremely evident that this was what was needed. I felt that I was not accountable to anyone and that no one checked on me to see if the quality of my teaching was sufficient. Although the IQMS was implemented in 2005, public schools were meant to have some form of appraisal, as the developmental appraisal system (DAS) and the whole school evaluation (WSE) were meant to be implemented. A large void in professional growth, development and accountability became very evident to me.

The next few years saw me take up posts at other schools. One particular school, where I taught for many years, placed great importance on the appraisal process. It became apparent to me that mixed perceptions and emotions existed towards the appraisal process. Some colleagues felt that their years of experience were being scrutinised, and a feeling of vulnerability prevailed. Many felt that they were being watched and that, if they admitted in their personal growth plan that there were areas that required development, this would be used negatively against them. On the other hand, some colleagues enjoyed the appraisal process and felt that it was time for them to demonstrate to others their expertise and level of efficiency in the classroom. I wanted to investigate further, so I started to read a great deal of literature on the appraisal process in public schools. When contacting various schools to ask them about whether I could do research on their appraisal process, it immediately became evident from the responses that the appraisal system, namely the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS), created sinister and defensive feelings. I have had a yearning to do research on this topic for many years now, and as my teaching experience has been in former model C schools only, this is where my interest lies. The importance of this research study therefore was, firstly, to gain insight into the experiences, challenges and perceptions of teachers in the appraisal process in former model C schools. Secondly, the study hoped to gain some understanding of whether teacher development is acquired through the appraisal process. To this end, the study hoped to make some recommendations on how to successfully implement or improve the

appraisal system in former model C schools in order to eradicate the negative perceptions felt. Furthermore, this study may prompt future researchers to carry out additional research on aspects of the study findings.

### **1.3 The research problem**

The issue of appraisal in South African schools is a largely contested arena. Nkosi (2010:9) mentions that appraisal is synonymous with assessment in the sense that it is an ongoing process that allows teachers to acquire or refine knowledge, skills and attitudes with the aim of facilitating personal and professional development. The IQMS was implemented in South African public schools in 2005. Many teachers have had bad experiences of staff appraisals, and some still have a very negative attitude towards the present appraisal system. According to Steyn and Van Niekerk (2007:252), teachers display a negative attitude toward the present appraisal system because an honest discussion about weaknesses is unlikely to occur; it is questionable whether appraisal instruments are either valid or reliable; staff appraisal provides evidence that can be used in disciplinary procedures; and appraisal is a source of quarrels, punishments, ridicule and victimisation, rather than professional development. Performance appraisal probably ranks near the top of the “least favourable” work activities for most people, and there often is a sense of dread when appraisals are discussed in staff meetings.

In the light of the afore-mentioned and my own experiences, I will address the following:

#### **Main research question**

Does the developmental appraisal system deliver on its desired outcome to promote teacher development?

#### **Sub-questions**

1. How do teachers perceive and experience the developmental appraisal system as well as the implementation process of it?
2. Does the appraisal system contribute to the development of teachers in relation to the curriculum and their professional development?
3. Are the findings of the developmental appraisal system brought into the strategic planning of the school and how is feedback given after the appraisal process?

4. What is the most significant or positive effect of the appraisal system?

#### **1.4 General aim and objectives**

The general aim of this study was to ascertain whether the developmental appraisal system, as investigated at five former model C schools in the Western Cape, is delivering on its desired outcome of promoting teacher development. This will be done through the following:

- Determining how teachers perceive and experience the developmental appraisal system.
- Determining the teachers' perceptions of the appraisal system.
- Determining how the appraisal system is implemented in public schools.
- Determining if the developmental appraisal findings are brought into the strategic planning of the school.

#### **1.5 Background to the study**

The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is the appraisal assessment tool that is currently in use in South African public schools. This tool was implemented in 2005. During the apartheid era in South Africa, the inspectorate system instilled a feeling of mistrust and fear in teachers. This system was strongly rejected by teachers, as it functioned by coercive force. According to Teu and Motlhabane (in Mosoge & Pilane, 2014:7), this system enforced compliance with rules and regulations in an authoritarian, rigid, ritualistic and legalistic atmosphere. During the apartheid era, it also was evident that the evaluation of teachers, particularly black teachers, did not occur. After 1994 there was a paradigm shift – from the traditional approach of appraisal to a developmental one. Professional growth was to become an important focal point of appraisal. The process of developmental appraisal (Report to portfolio committee on the IQMS, 2006) explains that the process of appraisal commenced in the early 1990s and, after years of research on best practices and consultations with the relevant stakeholders, the process was finalised in 2001. On 27 August 2003, a collective agreement in respect of the IQMS was signed in the Education Labour Relations Council. The collective agreement established performance appraisal standards and processes for institutions to use in the evaluation of teachers throughout the country.

The IQMS is informed by Schedule 1 of the Employment of Educators Act, No 76 of 1998, in terms of which the Minister is required to determine performance standards for teachers in terms of which their performance is to be evaluated.

Global and local research on the appraisal system shows that appraisal is a contentious issue. According to Evans (in Kamlawathee, 2007), it therefore very often does not receive the attention it deserves in schools. De Clercq (2008:13) argues that the use of the IQMS as an instrument for peer appraisal is based on the assumption that a certain level of professional competence, openness and respect towards colleagues exists among school staff. In a perfect setting, schools should have a professional, collaborative climate and culture in which staff work and reflect together on teaching practices. Yet this does not exist in reality. In poorly functioning schools, teachers' values and attitudes may be affected by the school's poor results, making them defensive towards any form of performance monitoring. De Clercq (2008:14) further discusses how, in low-functioning schools in South Africa, the IQMS is viewed as a cumbersome, time-consuming and fruitless exercise that does not bring any benefit and therefore is not treated seriously.

## **1.6 Research context**

The research study was conducted in five public ordinary and former model C schools in the Western Cape. Of this total, four were high schools and one was a primary school. In the interest of maintaining anonymity and confidentiality, these schools are referred to as schools A, B, C, D and E, respectively. For clarification purposes, a former model C school is a state-controlled school that is administrated and largely funded by a governing body of parents and alumni. In the final years of the apartheid era, parents at white government schools were given the option to convert to a "semi-private" form called *Model C*, and many of these schools changed their admissions policies to accept children of other races. Following the transition to democracy, the legal form of "Model C" was abolished; however, the term continues to be used to describe government schools formerly reserved for white children. The following criteria pertain to the selected schools.

- School A was initially founded in the 1800s and therefore is rich in traditional values. It serves an affluent community in the Western Cape and excels in academics. School A is a high school and the medium of instruction is English. It is a single-gender school. For the past twenty years the school has achieved a 100% matric pass rate. School A was one of



the first schools in South Africa to open its doors to all races. It is committed to providing an educational environment that is conducive to effective teaching and learning. The school has a school governing body that consists of 15 elected members. Nine of these members are parents, one is the principal, three are teachers and two are learners. In everyday activities the principal is assisted by two deputies and the school management team (SMT). They, guided by the vision and mission of the school and coupled with the SGB, effectively run the institution. School A comprises the following: a total of 54 teachers, 22 of whom are employed by the Western Cape Education Department (WCED), while the remaining 32 two are employed by the school governing body. Seventeen of these teachers are full time and 15 are part time. There are 27 administrative staff. School A has 729 learners.

- School B is a one of South Africa's oldest and most prestigious single-gender schools. It was founded in the 1800s and serves an affluent community. It offers tuition in English. School B is a high school that offers a nurturing yet progressive environment for its learners and strives towards academic excellence. The school governing body comprises thirteen members made up of seven parents, the principal, two teachers, one member of the school staff who is not a teacher and two members of the school council. The principal is assisted by three deputies in the everyday running of the school. The school has 49 full-time teachers and only one employed in a part-time capacity. Twenty-four of these teachers are employed by the WCED and the rest are employed by the SGB. There are eight administrative staff. One of these is employed by the WCED and the remaining seven are employed by the SGB. The number of learners in School B is 818.
- School C is a co-educational primary school that serves an affluent community. It offers tuition in Afrikaans and was established in 1977. This school has an excellent academic and sporting reputation. A nurturing environment is offered to the learners. The principal is assisted by two deputies and the school has 39 teachers, 19 of whom are employed by the WCED. The SGB employs the remaining 20 staff. There are two administrative staff employed by the WCED and three employed by the SGB. The number of learners in School C is 835.

- School D is a former model C high school which also serves a predominately middle class community. It was established in the 1800s and is rich in tradition. School D is a single-gender school and has a closely knit SGB and parent association. The SGB consists of seventeen elected members. This school offers tuition in a dual-medium environment. The school focuses on academics and strives to provide a learning environment that encompasses quality teaching. The school has 74 teachers, of which 38 are employed by the WCED and 36 by the SGB. Moreover, the school employs 17 administrative staff. A total of 1 240 learners attend the school.
- School E is a former model C school that serves a predominately middle-class community. It offers co-educational high school teaching and the medium of instruction is English. This school offers a rich diversity of academic, cultural and sport activities to develop their students to their full potential. School E has a closely knit SGB and parent association. The SGB comprises 15 elected members. The school has 46 teachers, 23 of whom are employed by the WCED and the remaining 23 by the SGB. The school employs 12 administrative staff, eight of whom are employed by the SGB. A total of 690 learners attend the school.

The interest in and desire to explore the appraisal system at former model C schools has been with me since 1999, when, as a first-time teacher, I was desperately looking for some form of appraisal system to guide and aid me in areas where I needed professional growth. This desire was further ignited by the fact that I have taught at six schools that fall under this former model C category. I have been appraised a number of times at each of these schools, but the appraisal process was distinctly different in each case. Adequate exploration of the scholarly literature and research studies on the South African appraisal system simply highlighted the fact that limited, if any, research had been conducted on appraisal in former model C schools. Given the myriad of challenges experienced by previously (and still) disadvantaged schools in South Africa, it is inevitable that the majority of research – including that on the appraisal system and process – has focused on these schools. Echoing my concerns, Mestry, Hendricks and Bisschoff (2009:16) highlight the following obstacles that stand in the way of a successfully executed IQMS process:

- The National Department of Education’s advocacy programme for IQMS is not intensively driven.

- The provincial departments are not providing sufficient training to teachers in the field of IQMS. In fact, most of the teachers undergo once-off training. In some provinces, training was outsourced to institutions of higher learning and private consultants, who themselves had inadequate knowledge and practical experience to undertake such training. The cascading model of training, the lack of insight into IQMS by facilitators, the untimely implementation of IQMS, the top-down approach of the Department, the poor leadership of principals and school management teams and insufficient resources in previously disadvantaged schools are some of the reasons for teachers not displaying initiative to implement the IQMS. The Department, together with principals, has been severely criticised by teachers for forcing the implementation of IQMS.
- The low morale of teachers due to their poor working conditions and remuneration packages, their inability to deal with massive policy changes, the fact that they cannot get to grips with outcomes-based education (OBE), the Revised National Curriculum Statements (RNCS) and the National Curriculum Statements (NCS), and the top-down approach of the different provincial departments in policy matters has seriously infringed on the successful implementation of IQMS.
- The resistance of the different unions because of the unilateral decisions taken by the Department on IQMS.

## **1.7 Research design and methodology**

### **1.7.1 Type of study**

Yin (2014:28) explains that a research design is the logical sequence that connects the empirical data to a study's initial research question, and ultimately to its conclusions. Yin (2014:29) further describes a research design as a "blueprint" for research. This study's epistemological approach is that of a qualitative nature. A qualitative approach was adopted for this study because it was assumed that it would enable me, as researcher, to obtain the perspectives of the participants concerning the appraisal process and its implementation. Mouton (2001:194) believes that qualitative research focuses on the participants' experiences and, as such, it is considered to be subjective and sensitive to the contexts of the participants.

### **1.7.2 Case study research**

McMillan and Schumacher (2010:489) indicate that qualitative design refers to an in-depth study using face-to-face interviews, observation and document analysis techniques to collect data from people in their natural settings. This study was contextual in that the implementation of the appraisal system was studied at each selected school without interfering in the implementation process. This provided a basis for proposing that the study should adopt a case study approach. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:344) say that a case study is “an in-depth analysis of a single entity”; in this instance, the appraisal system. This research case study represents a “collective case study” due to the study being undertaken in five different schools and the findings combined into one report.

De Marrais and Lapan (2003:227) believe that most case study researchers start with a general issue and, as background research evolves, the researchers try to generate a list of about 15 to 20 questions focused on the issue at hand. In this study, the issue at hand is the appraisal system. De Marrais and Lapan (2003:227) state further that, as the researcher begins to work on the site, other questions may arise. The research questions must set the focus of the study but, at the same time, it must be understood that case study research is an evolving process. Taking this literature into account, I entered the designated research sites with a flexible attitude towards the data collection process. Yin (2014:4) describes how a distinctive need for case study research arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena.

Following this description, I focused on the “appraisal system” in the five schools, whilst retaining a holistic and real-world perspective. What becomes very evident from the literature review is that case study research requires the researcher to devote herself to following a rigorous methodological path. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011:296) describe a good case study researcher as one who is able to gather data that addresses fitness for purpose as well as having skills to probe beneath the surface of phenomena. An effective case study researcher must be an excellent listener, questioner and prober, be able to make informed inferences and adaptable to changing and emerging situations. Taking the above into consideration, I was confident that this case study would prove to be successful in what it set out to achieve.

### **1.7.3 Population and sampling**

McMillan and Schumacher (2010:325) state that the sources of information used by qualitative researchers include individuals, groups, documents, reports and sites. Regardless of the form

of data, purposeful sampling is used. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:138) contend that purposeful sampling is used in order for the researcher to select particular elements from the population that will be representative of or informative about the topic of interest. On the basis of the researcher's knowledge of the population, a judgement is made about which subjects should be selected to provide the best information to address the purpose of the research. The sample identified by the researcher needs to satisfy specific needs or purposes – in this case, the developmental appraisal system. Cohen *et al.* (2011:157) concur that purposeful sampling is used in order to gain “knowledgeable” people who have in-depth knowledge about particular issues. It is noted by Cohen *et al.* (2011:157) that, although the respondents in purposeful sampling may not be representative and their comments may not be generalisable, this is not the concern, as what is important is to acquire in-depth information from those who are in a position to give it.

Three teachers and a principal or deputy from each of five public ordinary schools in the Western Cape formed the sample. They came from four high schools and one primary school.

#### **1.7.4 Instrumentation and data construction techniques**

Yin (2014:105) states that a major strength of case study research is the opportunity to use many different sources of data, namely documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation and physical artefacts. In this study, the principal or deputy from each school were interviewed face to face, while three teachers from each research site were interviewed by email. The interviews were semi-structured in nature. The interviews were recorded manually and documents were sought for analysis and evidence. The IQMS document, as well as additional appraisal documentation implemented in the appraisal process, were studied.

#### **1.7.5 Semi-structured interviews**

Semi-structured interviews provide a clear set of instructions for the interviewer and can provide reliable, comparable qualitative data. In this type of interview, the interviewer follows questions set beforehand, although must be able to follow topical trajectories in the conversation that may stray from the guide when it is deemed appropriate. Bernard (1998)

explains that semi-structured interviewing is best used when the researcher will not have more than one chance to interview someone. In my study, this was applicable due to time constraints.

As the researcher, I prepared thoroughly before the interviews, as this enabled me to feel and appear competent. However, I allowed the participants to express their views in their own terms and to add any additional information – although I did not allow the interview to be side-tracked by irrelevant information. Yin (2014:110) describes how, during the interview, the researcher must follow the line of inquiry as reflected in the case study protocol, but at the same time ask the actual questions in an unbiased manner that also serves the needs of the line of research inquiry. The questions asked in the interview must come across as “friendly and non-threatening” (Yin, 2014:110).

### **1.7.6 Data analysis and interpretation**

Qualitative data analysis is primarily an inductive process of organising data into categories and identifying patterns and relationships amongst the categories (McMillan & Schumacher. 2010:367). This is further supported by Cohen *et al.* (2007:461), who indicate that qualitative data analysis involves organising, accounting for and explaining the data. This involves making sense of data in terms of the participants’ definitions of the situation, and noting patterns, themes, categories and regularities.

In this study, analysis consisted of a systematic process of using the research questions to guide me when creating themes and interpreting data to provide explanations of the phenomenon of developmental appraisal. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:36) suggest that the steps to follow in data analysis are organising data, transcribing data, coding the data, forming categories and developing patterns. Cohen *et al.* (2011:426) explain how massive data loss can occur during an interview if it is not transcribed correctly. Audiotaping the interview may be selective, as it filters out important contextual factors, neglecting the visual and non-verbal aspects of the interview. The respondents might also not allow videotaping, as it raises concerns about anonymity and confidentiality. Therefore I wrote everything down during the interviews and took notes as the questions are answered. Cohen *et al.* (2011:426) believe further that there is no single correct transcription, but that the issue rather becomes whether, to what extent and how a transcription is useful for the research. Cohen *et al.* (2011:427) reiterate that, in qualitative data, the data analysis is almost inevitably interpretative; hence the data analysis is

less of a completely accurate representation (as in the numerical, positivist tradition) and more of a reflexive, reaction interaction between the researcher and the decontextualised data that are already interpretations of a social encounter.

### **1.7.8 Data management**

Field notes and my personal comments taken from the interviews were written in a notebook. After I collected the data from the participants I classified it into manageable themes, relationships, patterns and categories for analysis (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:377). The relevant data was transferred from the notebook to my laptop, where it was stored. A reliable backup system was used. I was the only person who had access to the folder where the data was stored. The folder was protected by a password. No names of the schools or participants were entered in my recordings and no particular facts were given that would allow the identification of the institution as such.

### **1.8 Delimitation of the study**

The study focused on a sample of five schools in the Western Cape and therefore has certain limitations. Moreover, interviews were limited to the principal or deputy principal of each school, as well as only three teachers per school. On the one hand, therefore, it can be argued that, given the small sample of this study, its findings cannot be generalised. On the other hand, however, it can be argued that the study offers some insight into not only how the developmental appraisal system is experienced by principals and teachers, but also how this system is implemented specifically at historically privileged schools in post-apartheid South Africa.

### **1.9 Ethical considerations**

Johnson and Christensen (2008:102) highlight the importance for the researcher to take certain vital ethical measures into consideration, such as informed consent, voluntary participation by the participants, their anonymity and confidentiality, as well as permission to tape record the interviews. Permission was granted by the Research Directorate of the Western Cape Education

Department to carry out this research at the relevant research sites. Permission was also granted by the principal of each school before the premises were entered to obtain data. In addition to this, ethical clearance was granted by Stellenbosch University. Informed consent forms were made available to the participants, which further clarifies the ethical considerations of the research study and the researcher. The participants were assured that their identities would not be revealed in any record or report. It also would not be possible for a link to be made between the data and the participant'. Each participant's participation was totally voluntary and they were allowed to withdraw at any time, with no element of coercion existing.

### **1.10 Overview of the study**

#### **This study consists of five chapters**

Chapter 2 offers a body of relevant reviewed literature on the appraisal tool used in South African public schools, namely the Integrated Quality Management System. Aspects of the appraisal system used in New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Botswana and Zimbabwe are viewed critically. The change in the appraisal system in South Africa over the past number of years is examined. Furthermore, the benefits of a successfully implemented appraisal system are highlighted. An in-depth look at the perceptions and criticisms of the appraisal system is provided. Finally, in relation to the literature studied, professional development as a desired outcome of the appraisal system will be explored.

Chapter 3 describes the research design and methodology. The framework of the research and techniques that guided the research are explained in this chapter.

Chapter 4 offers a crucial presentation of the findings from the semi-structured interviews and IQMS document analysis.

Chapter 5 provides a data analysis and interpretation of the research data in relation to the literature review discussed in Chapter 2. It considers the implications for teaching and learning, and offers conclusions, recommendations and possible topics for future research.

### **1.11 Conclusion**

This chapter has summarised the background of and the orientation to the study. It presented a clear scene of what is to follow in the coming chapters. The following chapter reviews the relevant literature on the research topic.





## Chapter 2

### Literature review

#### 2.1 Introduction

In my study of the available literature on the appraisal process in schools, many issues became apparent, the main one being that appraisal, both globally and locally, is a highly contentious issue. After offering a brief exploration of appraisal processes in other countries, this chapter examines the concept and systems of appraisal in post-apartheid South Africa. Drawing on the highly unequal and socially unjust landscape of apartheid South Africa, the chapter shifts to focus on appraisal against the backdrop of the waves of educational reform that accompanied the beckoning of a democratic South Africa.

Before I embark on this chapter, I think it is imperative to offer some understandings of certain concepts that will be used throughout this literature review, as well as in the rest of my thesis.

#### 2.2. Conceptual overview of performance appraisal, management, evaluation, and professional development

Grobler, Warnich, Carrell, Elbert and Hatfield (2000:260) define performance appraisal as an “on-going process of evaluating and managing both the behaviour and outcomes in the workplace. It is the process of systematically evaluating performance and providing feedback on which performance adjustments can be made”. Performance appraisal is defined by Larsen (2009:1) as the policy that is part of a global complex of accountability, with the primary aim to evaluate the performance of employees. This is aimed at motivating them to perform their tasks to the best of their abilities. To my understanding, performance appraisal aims to bring about a change in actions that occur in the workplace. Performance is evaluated against certain criteria and outcomes. This should lead to positive feedback and discussions on possible changes that could be implemented by those who have been appraised. In turn, it is hoped that these changes in performance would aid the institution in achieving its main objectives.

In a school, the primary aim is to provide an environment that allows for quality teaching and learning. Steyn and Van Niekerk (2007:249) define staff appraisal as a “continuous and systematic approach to help teachers with their professional development and career planning. It ensures the organisations performance and that of staff members”. This definition implies that staff appraisal does not only benefit teachers, but the school as well, as it contributes to

whole-school development. It must be noted that, according to Locke, Grobler and Mestry (2006:61), the word appraisal carries an echo of “praise” and may be used in an effort to make teacher evaluation more palatable. Common synonyms for appraisal are assessment, estimation and evaluation.

Different to performance appraisal, performance management is defined by Grobler *et al.* (in Mathula, 2004:4) as a “systematic approach to managing people, goals, measurement, feedback and recognition as a way of motivating employees to achieve their full potential in line with the organisations objectives”. Performance management appears to be a broader term than performance appraisal and it emphasises the use of all management tools, including performance appraisal. Conceptually, it would appear that, in order for performance management to be successful, it would need to be managed in relation to the four main tasks of planning, leading, controlling and organising. Within the context of a school, the principal would be responsible for ensuring that this management function is fulfilled.

Unlike appraisal and performance management, evaluation is described by Thorpe (in Mathula, 2004:5-6) as the “collections, analysis and interpretation of information about any aspect of a programme of education, as a part of a recognized process of judging its effectiveness, its efficiency and any other outcomes it may have”. In public school education in South Africa, the term evaluation is closely linked to the past inspectorate system of evaluation that existed during the apartheid years. This was viewed as authoritative, ritualistic and inflexible. Teachers tend to favour the word appraisal over evaluation, as it tends to have a less threatening connotation. “Teacher evaluation is a function of human decision-making resulting from a value judgement about how good or weak a particular work performance is using information that compares the actual work performance with a predetermined performance standards and that is followed by feedback to the teacher about how good or weak the work performance is” (Grobler, 1993:92).

Professional development, according to Steyn and Van Niekerk (2002:130), is “the process which includes properly planned learning programmes and individual follow up through supportive observation and feedback, staff dialogue and peer coaching”. To my mind, the ultimate purpose of professional development is for personal, career and organisational growth, which, in turn, is pivotal for the categorical success of any institution.

### **2.3 Making sense of appraisal in public schools**

Evans (in Bertram, 2014: 92) explains that the concepts of teacher development, professional development, teacher change and teacher learning are often used interchangeably, and with a lack of consistency. There are various terms in the literature that are synonymous with appraisal, such as performance appraisal, assessment, review and evaluation, which do not consider the differing contextual factors that affect the teachers' work. The developmental appraisal seeks to build on the strengths of teachers. Nkosi (2010:10) and Monyatsi, Steyn and Kamper (2006b:429) concur that, if structured, the process of appraisal ensures teachers' competence and conscientiousness, and it therefore is an aid to professional development and accountability.

Van Deventer and Kruger (2011:213) share similar sentiments and state that "appraisal and development are closely linked". They go on to elaborate how the significant aim of appraisal is to identify teachers' professional and development needs in order to assist them in reaching their potential. This would be achieved by improving teachers' skills and performance through enabling appropriate development. Van Deventer and Kruger (2011:213) further elucidate that teacher development is essential in today's world, which is characterised by rapid educational change. Teachers must invariably improve their knowledge and skills, as well as keep abreast of developments in education, and likewise in their own field of expertise.

Monyatsi (2003:23) explains that, during the appraisal process, data is based on evidence accumulated from a variety of sources, not only to measure current performance, but also to reinforce strengths, identify deficiencies, give feedback and provide the information needed if there are to be changes in future performance. Appraisal should be an on-going process and not merely a once-off event. Treating the appraisal as a once-off interaction could lead to the system being perceived as judgemental and not as enhancing the growth and development of the individual.

For the purpose of this research, my understanding of appraisal in schools is that it is the continuous assessment of the quality of education that teachers are delivering to the learners, and their overall contribution to the institution. Appraisal places emphasis on developing personal growth plans. In this way, appraisal holds that teachers reflect on the value they add to the school as a whole. It allows them to indicate areas of growth or personal development needed in order to strive continuously to top-quality teaching. In essence, appraisal is an instrument that can assist teachers to grow both personally and professionally. However, the stark reality of appraisal in public ordinary schools is that this process is not delivering on its

desired outcomes. The literature has revealed that, with the enormous amount of pressure placed on public school teachers and the principal, the appraisal process is not viewed in a positive light. In many instances, teachers are afraid to indicate that they need development in certain areas, fearing they will be prejudiced against and alienated.

With a clearer comprehension of the term appraisal and a focus on the literature on appraisal systems in other countries, I have been able to gain a clearer contextualisation of my main research and sub-research questions. This is due to the fact that the problems that exist appear to be experienced in schools both globally and locally. The ensuing discussion will offer some background to the appraisal system in two developed countries and two developing countries. This is offered in order to create awareness of appraisal systems in a global context, as well as to aid my critical analysis of South Africa's appraisal system. Motswakae (in Monyatsi *et al.*, 2006b:427) says that teacher appraisal is receiving attention worldwide as governments become aware of the need to examine the provision of education critically to ensure that it is relevant and appropriate to the needs of the youth.

Teacher appraisals throughout the world all consist of certain issues that lead to negative perceptions among teachers. I have yet to find one country in which the appraisal system is welcomed in its entirety and with acceptance of all the stages of implementation. I have chosen New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Botswana and Zimbabwe as countries that will serve as focal points of my discussion.

## **2.4 Appraisal in New Zealand**

Gratton (2004:293) explains that schools in New Zealand have been required to implement appraisal systems since 1997. Research shows that prior to this date, many New Zealand schools had already developed appraisal systems. Even though the law stipulated that appraisal systems had to exist in schools, there is no evidence that clear consensus actually existed on the purpose of appraisal. Gratton (2004:294) mentions that early appraisal systems in New Zealand appeared to have been orientated towards a professional development purpose, but, as time progressed, there tended to be a shift towards the accountability end of the appraisal spectrum.

Many researchers who have focused on the appraisal system in New Zealand have suggested that the purpose of the appraisal system in the past was extremely vague. (Brinsden: 2011) (Gratton: 2004) Documentation issued by the Ministry of Education has tended to offer

differing viewpoints on the actual purpose of appraisal in schools. The first document, issued by the Ministry of Education in 1997, implied that appraisal swayed towards a professional development orientation. However, later publications suggest a more accountability orientation. This led to a contradiction in focus areas, either professional development or accountability. Schools' documentation resulted in a vague, watered-down purpose of appraisal.

Research by Gratton (2004) on selected New Zealand schools indicated that an element of mistrust and confusion existed amongst teachers about the appraisal system. Gratton (2004:295) explains how an underlying thought in schools among teachers was that appraisal existed merely to meet an external bureaucratic requirement. A study conducted by Brinsden (2011), titled *Improving teacher appraisal through action research*, reinforced this view that teachers experienced the increasing level of bureaucratic control as extremely stifling. Fitzgerald, Middlewood Cardno and Piggot-Irvine (in Brinsden, 2011:12) assert that the bureaucratic approach to appraisal impacted negatively on the previously valued developmental aspects of appraisal. Brinsden's (2011) found in her study that the appraisal process was not a rigorous and reliable approach to managing the performance of staff, that it did not enhance organisational improvement, and there were no clear indicators for the assessment of the achievement of the appraisal objectives. Brinsden (2011:120) also noted that the analysis of the appraisal documentation revealed the process could be enhanced further by providing more detailed guidance to teachers on the requirements and desired layout of the final appraisal report.

Today, the framework for teacher appraisal is seemingly well established. The New Zealand Teachers' Council is the professional and regulatory body for the teaching profession. This Council now explains implicitly that appraisal is based on both elements of accountability and of professional development. The New Zealand Teachers' Council has formulated Registered Teaching Criteria (RTC), which describe the criteria for quality teaching in the country. All fully registered teachers in New Zealand have to meet these requirements. Brinsden (2011:22) states that the current focus on appraisal in New Zealand schools is to shift away from a teacher-centric activity to one that should link to student learning and improving student outcomes. Appraisals include self-evaluation, classroom observation and interviews. Some schools also use parent and student surveys (Stewart, 2013:13).

At the International Summit on the Teaching Profession, which was held in Amsterdam in 2013, New Zealand drew a lot of attention. This was due to a recent review of teacher appraisal in New Zealand and the finding that the appraisal process was quite different across schools. This variability is a result of the design and implementation of appraisal at schools being left to their own devices. The focus now lies on building principals' professional expertise in evaluation, providing good models of appraisal to schools, improving the linkage between appraisal and teachers' professional learning opportunities, and providing opportunities for professional recognition and rewards through career pathways. From the available literature I could ascertain that the appraisal process in New Zealand has not been a cut and dry one. There have been many changes in the implementation process and criteria over the past years. Although the New Zealand Teachers' Council has tried to streamline the appraisal process, in my opinion there still are areas that could be improved upon. This once again affirms my notion that appraisal is a controversial and ever-changing issue in many countries.

## **2.5 Appraisal in the United Kingdom (UK)**

According to Fidler (1995:1), staff appraisal was first formally mentioned in UK government documents in 1983. In 1986, the UK Secretary of State hoped that appraisal would be introduced voluntarily by schools. However, the process was painfully slow and not much progress was made in appraisal implementation. It then was proposed that appraisal should become statutory, meaning that, by law, every school would have to implement the appraisal system.

Pilot appraisal schemes were implemented in the United Kingdom in 1987. Fidler (1995:1) mentions how it became evident that three differing approaches towards appraisal arose, namely a developmental, evaluative and managerial approach. According to Nkosi (2010:15), statutory regulations in 1991 stated the aims of appraisal in the United Kingdom as being able to recognise the achievements of school teachers and to help them to identify ways of improving their skills and performance.

Fidler (1995:4) lists the steps of the basic appraisal process, which evidently still are applicable in some British public schools today, as follows:

- Initial planning meeting
- Classroom observation and feedback
- Collection of evidence

- Self-appraisal
- Interview
- Written statement
- Follow up actions
- Review meeting
- Start of the next cycle

Fidler (1995:4) cites three broad aims of appraisal in England:

- *It should carry credibility with the public as a check on the quality of the work in schools and colleges.*
- *It should lead to greater job satisfaction of all those who work in schools and colleges.*
- *It should lead to improvements in the learning experiences of pupils and students.*

However, the above aims were only realisable if all stakeholders involved understood the framework, how these aims were to be realised and, subsequently, played their part in achieving them. This evidently did not occur.

As with all education systems, change is imperative and continuously assessing and adapting the appraisal process is a vital aid to its success. More recently, the National Union of Teachers (NUT), which is the largest teachers' union in the UK, expressed great concern over a new appraisal system that was implemented in September 2012. (NUT-The largest teachers' union 2015)

From September 2012 Performance Management is being rebranded as Appraisal, and schools will begin to operate new policies. Government changes to the regulations surrounding these issues mean that these new policies could be extremely damaging to teachers and to education. (NUT-The largest teachers' union 2015)

From 2012, schools in the United Kingdom had to develop pay and performance-management policies, which, among other requirements, must link teacher performance to plans for school improvement and school self-valuation, include classroom observations, and provide for training as the need arises. Appraisal is linked to pay progression in each school. A similarity is drawn here to South Africa's current appraisal system, which is linked to a 1% salary increment. Figazzolo (2013:29), an Education International Research Institute consultant, set down the guidelines for the revised appraisal system in the UK. She put forth that the appraisal



period usually operates in line with the academic year. However, it may be shorter if a teacher is employed on a short-term contract, in which instance it will last for the duration of the contract. A newly qualified teacher's induction usually takes one year (or the equivalent of one year) to complete. In maintained schools, teachers are appraised by the school leader or by a teacher with delegated powers to appraise. However, the task may be delegated to the teacher's line manager. Head teachers are also appraised and the school's governing body must appoint an external adviser to provide advice and support. Academies or free schools are able to determine who will carry out their appraisals. There is no requirement for those carrying out appraisals to receive training, although schools may provide some.

Currently, negative perceptions exist among teachers who have been engaged in the appraisal process. Trethewey (2012) sets out a variety of grievances voiced by teachers in the UK:

- The appraisal process has led to an unfair battering of many teachers' confidence.
- Teachers tend to comment favourably on their peers' appraisal instead of being critical. This is done because a negative comment could jeopardise their peer's salary increase.
- Many teachers still feel that appraisal takes up too much time and does not lead to any change.

It would appear that the appraisal systems in both New Zealand and the United Kingdom are not without flaws and are not accepted without reservation by all stakeholders. There are further similarities. In both countries, appraisal has been viewed as contentious in the past and has needed to change based on unhappiness voiced by stakeholders. In both countries, teachers have raised concerns that the system has created an element of mistrust and anxiety. Although changes to the appraisal process have occurred in both countries, it is evident that appraisal is an intricate system that has to be monitored constantly.

As Figazzolo (2013: 9) points out,

Teacher appraisal takes place on a regular basis in many countries and, in the last few years, has become increasingly common. In spite of the widespread application of teacher appraisal, sections of the teaching profession have raised concerns about its use. There are concerns not only about the methods used to perform appraisal but also about its impact on teachers' work and morale and, where it occurs, on teachers' salaries.

Next, I look at appraisal systems in two developing countries, namely Zimbabwe and Botswana. This will provide some insight into the similarities and differences (if any) between developed and developing countries, which include South Africa.

## 2.6 Appraisal in Botswana

Monyatsi et al (2006b:427) emphasise that the policy for teacher appraisal in Botswana places a great deal of weight on ensuring that the process is professional, non-threatening and constructive. The current teacher appraisal system in Botswana was implemented in 1992. In order to strengthen the supervisory roles and performance of teachers, the Botswana Government's White Paper on Job Evaluation for Teachers was implemented in 1998. It emphasised the need for a continuous assessment of teachers (Monyatsi *et al.*, 2006b:430). Job evaluation linked performance appraisal to salary increments and promotion. This is a similarity with the appraisal systems in South Africa and the United Kingdom.

Since its implementation, very little research has actually been carried out to determine if the appraisal process is actually achieving its purpose. Appraisal in Botswana is made up predominately of two models, namely the accountability model and the professional development model. Monyatsi *et al.* (2006b:428) identify that the accountability model is managerial, control orientated, judgemental and hierarchical in nature. This composition leads to many teachers "feeling dissatisfied with the process despite the great deal of weighting which is placed on attempting to make it a non-threatening and constructive process" (Monyatsi *et al.*, 2006b:428). Teachers and unions have felt a sense of defensiveness based on the following:

- They feel it is an extremely judgemental system.
- The capabilities of the people making those judgements are questionable.
- The validity and reliability of the instruments used have been debated.
- There is a feeling that evidence gained in the appraisal process is used in disciplinary procedures (Monyatsi *et al.*, 2006b:428).

For the above reasons, teachers in Botswana tend to favour the professional development model of appraisal. Monyatsi *et al.* (2006b:428) maintain that this model is viewed as a "genuine two way process between appraiser and appraisee". Furthermore, it is there to encourage and

promote professional development, in-service training and career planning, thereby improving teachers' knowledge, skills and confidence.

In his research study, entitled *Teacher appraisal: An evaluation of practices in Botswana secondary schools*, Monyatsi (2003) found that many secondary school teachers did not understand what the purpose of the appraisal system was. Teachers expressed that they felt it was just a formality. In fact, these assertions were shared by the principals, who declared that they saw no purpose in the appraisal exercise. The empirical findings of Monyatsi's study further point out that teachers endure emotional stress as a result of this process, even going as far as calling it an "axe" ready to chop those who were not favoured.

In a follow-up study, Monyatsi (2009) conducted open-ended interviews with teachers about their perceptions of the appraisal system. Their responses seemingly were very negative. Many of them viewed the appraisal process as a tool used to oppress and suppress teachers. Some found it very intimidating and threatening. It often led to quarrels and victimisation and, in many instances, did not promote teacher development. Very little support was offered for teachers to grow professionally post appraisal. Several teachers felt as if they were being reduced to mere loyal subordinates of the management system. On the whole, appraisal was not viewed in a positive light at all. Their responses bore feelings of intense hostility towards the process. Based on the above research, Monyatsi (2009:193) makes the following recommendation:

To ensure the credibility of the appraisal system there should be participation and ownership by the teachers. This may also reduce friction and conflicts. Mechanisms for the evaluation of the appraisal system should be in place as education is always changing and all systems related to it should be able to adjust to the changes.

## **2.7 Appraisal in Zimbabwe**

Wadesango, Nduna and Kurebwa (2013:157) point out that, prior to independence in Zimbabwe, inspectors would 'raid' the school to do their appraisals. The system was strongly associated with a summative and judgmental approach to performance management, rather than a formative and developmental process. The negative implications of a summative and

judgemental system are, as Wadesango *et al.* (2013:157) put forward, “comparative”, “adjudicative” and “final”. In contrast to this system, the formative and developmental approach is on-going, co-operative and non-judgemental, and is directed at improving teacher performance.

Kafunde (in Machingambi, 2013:219) points out that, after independence, Zimbabwe embarked on an ambitious educational expansion at all levels of the education system. The Performance Management System (PMS) was adopted in 1995 as one of the mechanisms to enhance the effectiveness of the education system. Through this system, the Zimbabwean Government set out to maintain and improve the quality of public school education. Enhancing staff satisfaction and development through training was of paramount importance.

Machingambi (2013:223) focuses on the fact that research studies implemented in Zimbabwean schools have recently shown ownership of the Performance Management System was not taken by those who were supposed to implement it, namely teachers and school heads. Similarly, one of numerous findings in the study by Wadesango *et al.* (2013:157) was that:

Insufficient training has been blamed for performance management’s fragile state. It is possible that performance management as an instrument for the average teacher effectiveness may be too sophisticated. Furthermore, school heads charged with its promotion may not be well versed in its intricacies. This means that for any programme to take off smoothly the participants of that programme must receive sufficient training.

In addition to the above-mentioned inefficiencies, studies conducted by both Wadesango *et al.* (2013) and Machingambi (2013) point out several common weaknesses, which in my opinion are detrimental to the successful implementation and outcome of the appraisal process. These are:

- Management presents implementation problems such as lack of time and resources.
- Heads have insufficient time to implement the programme, as they have administrative, curricular and institutional tasks to perform in their schools.
- Teachers are overloaded with records and congested timetables.
- Linking performance management to pay can undermine attempts to provide honest feedback on performance

These problems mirror similar ones to those experienced in New Zealand, the United Kingdom and Botswana.

It is Machingambi's (2013:224) opinion that the main reason for the inefficiencies in the performance management system in Zimbabwe is the lack of funding that is allocated by the Zimbabwean Government to schools. With adequate funding, principals could receive informative training about the implementation of the system. Funding could lead to development programmes being set up to assist in improving teachers' skills, values and attitudes. Machingambi (2013:224) concludes his study by saying that:

The Government of Zimbabwe needs to customise its performance management system to enable it to respond to the training needs of staff in the education sector. The training of staff and principals needs to be prioritized if this system is to work. All stakeholders need to become advocates of the performance management system.

It would appear that Botswanan and Zimbabwean teachers share the concern that their respective appraisal systems might be too judgemental and threatening. Both systems link appraisal to salary increments. This allows for the holding back of truthful statements about their development in fear of being judged and missing out on the monetary reward. Ultimately, this leads to an undermining of the value of the process.

The four countries that have been discussed show no clear evidence that appraisal actually leads to any teacher development as such. In addition, there is no proof that the implementation of appraisal in schools in developed countries is any more successful than in developing countries. It is a process that tends to be viewed in a negative light, regardless of political or socio-economic contexts.

## **2.8 Appraisal in South Africa**

I find it imperative that, in order to get an understanding of the appraisal system currently implemented in South Africa, and to help with the conceptualisation of all the changes in the methods of evaluating teachers in public ordinary schools, I need to discuss what happened prior to 1994 in terms of evaluation – that is, the period before democracy in South Africa. This

literature review will allow the reader to visualise how teachers were evaluated during the apartheid period. This will give rise to a coherent understanding of why these methods might have been considered as undesirable and counterproductive. The following discussion focuses on what was known as the inspectorate system of evaluation.

My conceptual understanding of the inspectorate system is that it was an external body that ensured that an institution complied strictly with certain official rules and regulations. As explained by Naidu (2011:1), during apartheid (1948 to 1994) there were fifteen departments of education, each with its own “peculiarities”. These departments, which were delineated along racial and ethnic lines, were comprised of the following: White students attended schools under the control of the House of Assembly (HOA); coloured students were in schools run by the House of Representatives (HOR); black students were housed in schools of the Department of Education and Training; and Indian students attended schools run by the House of Delegates (HOD). Education for Africans living in townships remained under the control of the Department of Education and Training (DET).

Four additional departments of education ran schools in the “independent” homelands of Bophuthatswana, Ciskei, Transkei and Venda, and separate departments were set up in the six “self-governing” territories that had resisted designation as independent states. A national department with no operating authority brought the total number of separate education departments to fifteen. Each department, as prescribed by the 1983 Constitution of South Africa, Act No. 110, regulated its own affairs specific to each population group. Apartheid policy was formally adopted in 1948, and Mokgalane (in Jansen, 2006:2) highlights the separate racial and ethnic systems of educational administration by stating that white teachers experienced “co-ordinated control” and “regulation”, whilst “benign neglect” and “paternalism” were endured by black teachers.

A brief background to the departments of education is necessary in order to visualise why the inspectorate system failed. Naidu (2011:2) points out that, in most instances, “departments which had the highest number of poorly qualified teachers had the lowest number in supervisory and advisory staff due to constrained resources”. This posed a major threat to the quality of education provided by these departments. Black schools received the least amount in terms of funding – with Bantu Education, introduced in 1953, ensuring that any funding was dependent on schools accepting a racially discriminating curriculum.

In the 1970s the inspectorate system of evaluation was expanded throughout the education system. At this time, evaluation by the inspectorate was focused on assessing teachers with a view to monetary awards, or “merit” awards as they were also known. The inspectorate or department was involved primarily with and divided into management functions and subject advisory service functions. Naidu (2011:2) reveals how “the relationship between these two components varied considerably between and even within departments”. This resulted in certain departments having strong collaborative ties between management and subject advisory functions, whilst other departments saw a large division between the two. This resulted in a less effective and less efficiently run department.

The inspectorate would send inspectors into the schools to ensure that the teaching and learning conformed strictly with the content specifications of the apartheid syllabi. As Jansen (2006:2) puts it, “it was the inspectors, who were responsible for a group of schools in a demarcated area, who had the task of ensuring compliance with apartheid in all aspects of school functioning – from governance and administration, to curriculum and assessment”.

The inspectors enforced strict compliance, which, within an already dehumanising system of education, created more resentment and anger among those teachers who experienced the brunt of apartheid education and its related policies. Naidu (2011:2) describes the inspectorate system as being “top-down”, “closed”, “hierarchical”, “bureaucratic”, “authoritarian” and “focused” on assessing teachers with a view to monetary or so-called merit awards, and was overwhelming about compliance with departmental regulations rather than addressing teachers about their teaching. Naidu (in Mosoge & Pilane, 2014:7) contends that, while the consequences of this inspectorate system were rewards and sanctions, there were no incentives. What was lacking was some kind of pushing factor for teachers to excel.

Chetty *et al.* (in Naidu, 2011:2) cite major criticisms that were directed at the inspectorate system by teachers. These include the prevalence of political bias in the system, as well as the unchecked power inspectors yielded. Teachers tended to be victimised on the basis of their organisational affiliations. Inspectors acted in an incompetent manner and discriminated against women as possible candidates for promotion. Teachers had to spend a copious amount of time preparing record books for inspection. This time could have been used more valuably. Evaluation criteria had a strong sense of irrelevance, and the once-off visits from inspectors gave the impression that it was an insignificant process. The scores given by the inspectors appeared to have elements of arbitrariness. In addition to all these negative perceptions,

teachers found the secrecy that surrounded the evaluation process to be bothersome. Teachers were not allowed to challenge the inspectors' assessments. There was a strong absence of acknowledgment of contextual factors in the evaluation. The granting of merit awards also led to an abusive system and often saw the teachers who were well deserving of a merit award being overlooked.

Naidu (2011:2) explains that, in the light of this growing despair, the "legitimacy of the evaluation system was doubted", and it reached a stage where teachers refused to participate in any form of evaluation or inspection. The growing defiance and aggression among teachers, continues Naidu (2011:3), eventually made it impossible for inspectors and subject advisers to visit schools. Teachers refused to have their work "inspected" or "evaluated" until such a time that the system was democratic and fully participative of all teachers of all races. Furthermore, Mathula (2004:1) stresses that teachers felt "policed" and "victimized" through inspections. It is evident that teachers had no access to any of the reports that were compiled by the inspector's concerning their teaching. Mathula (2004:1) highlights how no developmental support was given to teachers after inspection, leaving them with an inability to develop professionally.

Phele (in Mathula, 2004:1) provides an additional crucial reason for the failure of the inspectorate system, namely the inability of the system to sway teacher perceptions in a positive way. Furthermore, "the prevalence of political bias", "the unchecked power which inspectors wielded", "the victimization of teachers based on their organisational affiliation", "the secrecy which surrounded the system", and lastly "the difficulty in challenging the inspector's report" are cited as detrimental factors to the inspectorate system of evaluation.

In agreement, Teu and Motlhabane (in Mosoge & Pilane, 2014:7) explain how the pre-1994 inspectorate system was rejected by teachers because the inspectorate functioned by coercive force and enforced compliance with rules and regulations in an allegedly authoritarian, rigid, ritualistic and legalistic atmosphere. Consequently, the evaluation of teachers in the majority of non-white schools became non-existent during the late 1980s to early 1990s as they struggled against an education system that continued to undermine and discriminate against them.

In the light of the fact that the majority of teachers employed in black, coloured and Indian, as well as in a number of independent 'homeland' schools, were not being evaluated, it became evident that an urgent need existed for the development of a new appraisal instrument. This instrument would have to be one that would be acceptable to all stakeholders and which would



enhance the quality and effectiveness of public education in South Africa. Jansen (2006:1) attests that a move away from a deeply embedded resistance to and suspicion of the evaluation system would not be easy. This inherent feeling of mistrust was “lodged with the troubled history of apartheid inspection system and the underestimation in policy design of the deep rooted suspicions of state surveillance systems”. (Jansen 2006:1) The next few years, leading up to 1994, saw many negotiations taking place between teacher organisations and unions in order to address the principles, processes and procedures for a new appraisal system. Finally, by 1994, an agreement pertaining to all elements of a new appraisal system was reached.

Mouton, Louw and Strydom (2012:1211) draw attention to the introduction of a radically new historical era for all South Africans and, in particular, for school education. Menzi (2001:6) describes how the

demise of apartheid in 1994 was heralded nationally and internationally as a victory for democracy and human rights. It offered unique opportunities and responsibilities to reconstruct a fragmented and deeply discriminatory education system, and establish a unified national system underpinned by democracy, equity, redress, transparency and participation.

The mission statement of the Department of Education (1996) encapsulated the main objective of the post-apartheid Government with respect to education: “Our vision is of a South Africa in which all people have equal access to lifelong education and training opportunities which will contribute towards improving the quality of life and build a peaceful, prosperous and democratic society.”

The first reforms that took place from 1994 to 1997 saw the dismantling of the apartheid structures and the creation of a unified education system. This was an action consistent with South Africa’s new Constitution. The integration of the former racially and ethnically constructed departments of education into a single national department and nine provincial departments was a step to abolish any system that had been systematically linked to apartheid. Menzi (2001:7) clarifies how the Ministry of Education established a more “equitable basis for the financing of education”. The main focus was one of redress, and this highlighted the Ministry’s focus on social development. The Ministry’s other energies were applied to create and implement a legislative policy framework that would assist educational transformation. This encompassed the introduction of the South African Schools Act (no. 84 of 1996), which ensured the desegregation of schools, the decentralisation of responsibilities to principals, the

establishment of school governing bodies; and a host of policies geared towards equity and the democratisation of schools as a means towards cultivating a socially just society. Furthermore, the introduction of outcomes-based education (OBE) as the vehicle for introducing an equal and more participatory education system was implemented. Within this context came the introduction of a new form of teacher evaluation called the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS).

### **2.8.1 The Developmental Appraisal System (DAS)**

Within a post-apartheid climate, the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) was the first large-scale reform effort in performance management and evaluation to be implemented in South African public ordinary schools. This was done on 28 July 1998 (Resolution 4 of 1998). The DAS is contained in the Terms and Conditions of Employment of Educators, determined in terms of Section 4 of the Employment of Educators Act of 1998. The aim of DAS was to facilitate the personal and professional development of teachers in order to improve the quality of teaching and the professional development of teachers. This, in turn, would improve the quality of the teaching practice.

This appraisal system was actually a criterion-based form of appraisal (Mathula, 2004:6). What this encompassed was a list of criteria consisting of core, optional and additional criteria elements. Core criteria referred to the essential elements of the job descriptions of the teachers; optional criteria consisted of criteria that were listed under core criteria but could be made optional by the appraisal panel due to contextual factors at schools; and additional criteria referred to possible criteria that could be added depending on the specific needs of the school.

In 2001 the Gauteng Department of Education hosted a strategic planning workshop in which the constraints of DAS were discussed. These were grouped together under the headings policy constraints, training constraints, operational constraints and attitude constraints. It was evident that the implementation of DAS in schools had not been very successful.

Policy constraints involved inhibiting factors relevant to the DAS policy itself. These included a lack of user-friendly format and language, resulting in the end user being unable to actually understand the content, and complicated core criteria that lead to teachers and principals not getting a clear perception of what was being assessed. Furthermore, the DAS did not link with other policies and seemed to exist in isolation. A major flaw in the DAS, according to Mathula (2004:7), was the lack of ownership and extremely unclear roles and responsibilities associated

with the policy. Training constraints related to the shortage of resources available to facilitate training and insufficient venue capacity, which resulted in a lack of sufficient knowledge of this policy (Mathula, 2004:7). In terms of operational constraints, poor communication between managers and teachers led to delays in the implementation of the policy and unrealistic implementation plans. Attitude constraints consisted of a fear of victimisation among the teachers, resistance to change and user frustration.

Supposedly, a large contributory negative aspect was the “victim mind-sets” held by teachers, which automatically led to an inhibition of personal development (Mathula, 2004:7). In response, Professor Kader Asmal, the Minister of Education at the time, introduced a new national policy, known as Whole School Evaluation (WSE) (Government Notice No. 695 2001:3). The intention was not to replace the DAS. Rather, the WSE policymakers envisioned that it would serve as an effective monitoring and evaluation process in alignment with the DAS.

### **2.8.2 Whole School Evaluation (WSE)**

Mathula (2004:9) points out that the policy on WSE was contained in a notice in terms of Section 3 (4) (1) of the National Educational Policy Act, 1996 (Act no 27 of 1996), which was implemented on 26 July 2001.

The main purpose of the WSE was to provide a radically different evaluation process to the previous school inspection that existed under the apartheid regime. It focused on being a transparent and interactive process and included facets such as school evaluation, on-going district-based evaluation, support, monitoring, development and external evaluations (Government Notice No. 695, 2001:6).

The reasoning behind the implementation of this new policy on evaluation was that no national system to evaluate the performance of schools had been implemented previously. With the introduction of this new policy, the Minister of Education pointed out that the WSE must align itself with the Developmental Appraisal System. This was essential to allow for the features of good practice sought in the WSE to be consistent with the features encouraged through appraisal and development programmes (Government Notice No. 695, 2001:8).

WSE aimed at improving the overall quality of education in South African schools. Rather than being judgemental and punitive in nature, this policy took the stance of being supportive and developmental. However, this policy experienced numerous implementation problems that

hindered its ultimate success and ability to achieve its desired outcome. These included, amongst others, a flawed advocacy process, a fear of victimisation by schools and a perception among schools that there was a hidden agenda (Mathula, 2004:10).

Bopape (2005:1) shares that the policy framework of WSE caused a lot of unhappiness among the teacher unions, which held the opinion that the Minister of Education was unilaterally implementing a system that was different from the one agreed upon as part of the collective agreement between the Department as an employer and the teacher unions, namely the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS). On further consultation, the matter was taken to the Education Labour Relations Council, a statutory body established in terms of the Labour Relations Act of 1995. Bisschoff and Mathye (2009:1) clarify that the “so-called teacher performance management trajectory in South Africa went through a number of phases after 1994” – the introduction of DAS, followed by WSE, and then an additional performance management policy (PM).

### **2.8.3 Performance Management Policy (PM)**

The performance management policy evaluated individual teachers for salary progression, grade appointment, affirmation, rewards and incentives (Education Labour Relations Council [ELRC], 2003). Seemingly, all three of the policies mentioned above were faced with major implementation problems. These emanated from the incorrect manner in which they were advocated to teachers. As a result of these hindering factors, the Department of Education and the unions agreed on a new system in 2003, called the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS), which incorporated three systems, namely developmental appraisal, performance management and whole school evaluation.

### **2.8.3 Understanding the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)**

Informed by schedule 1 of the Employment of Educators Act (No. 76 of 1998), the aim of the IQMS was to align the different quality management policies – namely the Developmental Appraisal System, the Performance Management System and the Whole School Evaluation system. Each of these policies had a distinct focus and purpose with a view to enhance and monitor the performance of the education system. These policies were “supposed to complement one another, without duplication of structures and procedures”.(ELRC 2003:4) All quality management initiatives had to be planned for in the schools and aligned in a coherent way to avoid duplication, repetition and an unnecessary increase in workload (ELRC,

2003:4). In essence, the IQMS was a way of stepping back and reflecting collectively on the already enacted policies in schools.

Clearly, the three systems (DAS, PMS and WSE) should have informed and strengthened one another, but this only could become possible if they were reconceptualised within an integrated quality management system within which the original purpose of each was preserved, but in which the process of implementation was streamlined and their interrelationships made explicit (ELRC, 2003:19). According to my understanding of the IQMS, it is a single policy that aligns the three policies that were introduced into schools after the demise of the apartheid regime. The ELRC (2003:4) sets out the purpose of the alignment of the three programmes, namely

- To enable the different IQMS programmes to inform and strengthen one another.
- To define the relationship among the different programmes of an Integrated Quality Management System.
- To avoid unnecessary duplication in order to optimise the use of human resources.
- To assure that there is on-going support and improvement.
- To advocate accountability.

Weber (2005:65) avers that the IQMS borrows heavily from a familiar international language. The use of words such as accountability, management, monitoring, performance measurements, quality assurance and competence were discussed when designing the IQMS policy. Weber (2005:70) puts forth the notion that the “IQMS illustrates how contemporary, international discourses on accountability, managerialism and the market, in regards to teachers and schools have migrated to South Africa”.

The philosophy underpinning the IQMS is based upon the fundamental belief that its purpose is to:

- Determine competence
- Assess strengths and areas for development
- Provide support and opportunities for development to assure continued growth
- Promote accountability levels within the school
- Ensure that teachers perform their duties with integrity, and maintain a positive, vigilant attitude towards all learning activities

- Provide a basis for salary progression, rewards and other incentives
- Monitor an institution's overall effectiveness (ELRC, 2003:4)

#### **2.8.4 IQMS objectives**

The Quality Assurance in South African Schools Report states that the tenets of the IQMS are underpinned by the purpose of quality management systems, which are to determine competence, to assess strengths and areas for future development, to ensure continued growth, to promote accountability and to monitor the overall effectiveness of an institution (Hariparsad *et al.*, 2006:1).

Mosoge and Pilane (2014: 8) clarify that the IQMS is implemented through certain structures that work together to evaluate individuals in the school, as well as the school as a whole. They aver that the objectives of the IQMS are to monitor an institution's overall effectiveness, to evaluate a teacher's performance, and to identify the specific needs of teachers for support and development. Accountability must be promoted and the environment for teacher development must be prepared.

In addition to the above-mentioned objectives, teacher development is at the forefront of the ultimate goals of the IQMS. Mahlaela (2012:23) emphasises that the IQMS implemented in public schools in South Africa endorses two purposes, namely professional development, and management. Its ultimate purpose is to identify the specific needs of teachers, schools and district offices for support and development. Middlewood (2002:121) concurs that the key purpose of appraising teachers is two-fold. Firstly, appraisal is used for accountability purposes, and secondly to develop teachers professionally. In addition, the Department of Basic Education ([DoBE], 2004:1) sets out the purpose of the appraisal system as being there to "identify those elements that indicate strengths and those where improvement is needed".

A number of related concepts are used to describe professional development in education. According to Webb, Montello and Norton (in Steyn & Van Niekerk, 2008:224), these concepts include in-service training, professional growth, personal development, training and personnel development. Guskey (2000:17) shares similar sentiments and deduces that professional development refers to the means, activities and processes by which teachers enhance their professional knowledge, skills and attributes. This, he believes, in turn will improve the learning capability of the students. He places considerable emphasis on professional development and maintains that "one constant finding in the research literature is that notable

improvements in education almost never take place in the absence of professional development”.(Guskey 2000:18)

Professional development in any institution should be viewed as an on-going process, providing feedback along the way. Once a teacher has been appraised and a post-appraisal discussion has been held, then the actual development programme for the teacher may commence.

In a study conducted by Menlo and Poppleton (1990, in Mestry *et al.*, 2009:477) it was argued that the single most significant reason why teachers should be developed professionally is based on the conviction that the quality of teachers influences the quality of learners’ experiences and achievements in a positive way. Mestry *et al.* (2009:476) further emphasise that professional development should be seen as a process by which teachers review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to the moral purposes of teaching and by which they acquire and develop their knowledge, skills and attitude.

In the study initiated by Mestry *et al.* (2009:479), involving 50 randomly selected schools in Gauteng province, researchers wished to explore the “perceptions of teachers on the benefits of teacher development programmes in one province of South Africa”. One of the conclusions they drew was that professional development and training are critical to school improvement. Teachers should be positively inclined towards the IQMS, and school management must take responsibility to encourage teachers to attend development programmes that will assist them in improving their knowledge, skills, values and attitudes in order for them to become better equipped in the management of their classrooms (Mestry *et al.*, 2009).

### **2.8.5 How the IQMS should be implemented in schools**

In order for successful implementation of the IQMS in public schools, the following factors are imperative. These factors must be understood in totality by the principal, and this information must be relayed to the staff.

- Developmental appraisal and performance measurement inform and strengthen one another without any duplication of structures and procedures.
- Performance measurement and development appraisal must be linked to an annual cycle, which must be completed within a calendar year (a period when the staff at a school is likely to be most stable).

- Developmental appraisal (DA) and performance measurement (PM) inform and strengthen internal whole school evaluation (WSE).
- The separate purposes of DA, PM and WSE remain intact (ELRC, 2003:8).

The roles and responsibilities of the individuals and structures involved in the implementation of the teacher appraisal system is pivotal to its success and should not be undervalued. It therefore is of grave concern that, in some instances, the principal, who is the key in the IQMS implementation process, is often the one who does not know how to implement it correctly. It is alarming that the people who are central to the success of the IQMS may in fact be the ones who hinder the desired outcomes of this instrument. The principal is expected to be the driver of this process and teacher development should be his or her main focus. Teacher development allows for the learners to receive effective and quality teaching.

Besides the principal as the key role player there are several other important people who play an important role in the process. They are the school management team (SMT) (comprising the principal and, where applicable, the deputy principal, heads of departments and the teachers), as well as the circuit manager. The roles and responsibilities of these role players are set out in the IQMS document (ELRC, 2003) as well as in the personnel administration measures policy (PAM), which is determined by the Minister of Education (Department of Basic Education, 1999) This PAM is “applicable to teachers at schools, technical colleges, colleges of education and education control and auxiliary services that concern themselves with all those activities aimed at educating and teaching pupils/students, in respect of both formal and non-formal education” (Department of Basic Education, 1999:3).

As a key player in the IQMS, the principal, together with the SMT, has the responsibility to ensure that the IQMS is implemented uniformly, efficiently and effectively. Each teacher’s appraisal must be conducted in a consistent, fair and accurate manner. The appraisal of teachers must be included in the school management plan and any grievances regarding the appraisal process within the school must be resolved amicably and timeously. The principal and the SMT need to ensure that the appraisal records and accompanying evidence are authentic and that each teacher receives a copy of the IQMS document, or is shown how to access it electronically. Moreover, the principal and the SMT have the task of setting the appraisal dates and managing accurate record keeping and safekeeping of all documentation. The final scores of the teachers are set by the principal and the SMT. Consistency in the implementation of the IQMS lies



within the SMT roles and responsibilities (South African Democratic Teachers Union [SADTU], 2013:6) Every teacher has to go through the appraisal. The principal is responsible for the advocacy of and training on the IQMS process within his/her school. A workshop must be held by the principal where all teachers have an opportunity to voice any concerns. The principal also has to ensure that all grievances regarding the appraisal processes within the school are resolved amicably (SADTU, 2013:6).

The third role player is the teacher. The teacher has the direct responsibility of familiarising him/herself with the entire appraisal process. A self-appraisal document has to be completed using the IQMS instrument. The teacher is expected to give an honest score that represents the quality of teaching that emanates from the classroom. Often, a teacher may feel compelled to give a false reading for fear of being called in by the principal and reprimanded that for not providing quality education. It may be assumed by the teachers that, if they reveal any weaknesses, they potentially could lose out on the 1% salary increase. All relevant evidence that is important for the appraisal process must be safeguarded by the teacher. The teacher must develop a personal growth plan (PGP) after the lesson observation and evaluation. This PGP forms an important record of the identified developmental needs of the teacher. It is in this PGP that the teacher has to identify four vital levels of growth. The first level of growth is aimed at improving an area in which total control exists. An example of this would be punctuality. The second level refers to areas of growth that require issues that can be attended to by a person in a senior management position. The third level of growth requires attention from the district office. The final level is one that identifies that the teacher is underqualified or lacks certain skills. Funding needs to be accessed in order to train the teacher in this area of deficiency (SADTU, 2013:7). Further attention must be paid to the reality of the situation that teachers are very aware of portraying themselves in a negative light if they have to indicate that they have areas of development.

Lastly, in terms of role players, the circuit manager is another influential key player in the IQMS process. The circuit manager is the immediate supervisor of the principal. The main responsibility of the circuit manager is to provide support to the principal and to manage the principal's performance. Support must be offered in a consultative, supportive and non-discriminatory manner. The ultimate role of this key role player is to enhance school efficiency and accountability (SADTU, 2013:7).

These four role players have numerous duties and responsibilities. Whilst it all looks like a very easy process on paper, it is far from that in reality. As this study will reveal, there are large-scale factors that hinder the success of the IQMS. In terms of the implementation process, SADTU (2013:8) states that the “Principal, Deputy Principal and heads of departments are required to complete and sign a work plan at the beginning of the evaluation cycle”. The work plan consists of several vital components, namely:

- Performance standards: these are the applicable performance standards as reflected in the IQMS instrument.
- Key activities: these are activities to be agreed to in terms of the applicable job descriptions.
- Targets: these are targets to be set for improvement within the appraisal cycle.
- Timeframe: this is the period within which the targets and outputs are to be achieved.
- Performance indicators: these are measures of success to be observed for achieving specific targets and outputs.
- Contextual factors: these are unique and specific circumstances to be taken into account that have the potential to impact on the teacher’s ability to achieve outputs and targets (SADTU, 2013:8).

In order to obtain clarity on the areas in which teachers are assessed, a brief investigation of the performance standards is necessary. A post level one teacher, who is an ordinary subject teacher, has five performance standards that are assessed. These standards are the creation of a positive learning environment; curriculum knowledge, lesson planning and presentation; learner assessment and achievement; continuous professional development, human relations and contribution to school development; and extramural and co-curricular participation. A post level two teacher is a teacher who is a head of department. In addition to the five performance standards by which a post level one teacher is assessed, an additional category, titled management of the curriculum, is appraised. Post level three and four teachers comprise deputy principals and principals. They are assessed on seven performance standards. These consist of leading the learning school; shaping the direction and development of the school; managing and securing accountability; developing and empowering self and others; managing the school as an organisation; managing human resources; and management and advocacy of extramural activities (SADTU, 2013:31-47).

A rating scale is used when assessing each performance standard. A rating of one to four is allocated to each criterion in the appraisal instrument, as indicated in the WCED documents on the Integrated Quality Management Systems (IQMS) for school-based educators (SADTU, 2013:11):

#### Rating scale

- Rating 1: Unacceptable. This level of performance does not meet the minimum expectations and requires urgent attention.
- Rating 2: Satisfies minimum expectations. This level of performance is acceptable and is in line with minimum expectations, but development and support are still required.
- Rating 3: Good. Performance is good and meets expectations, but some areas are still in need of development and support.
- Rating 4: Outstanding. Performance is outstanding and exceeds expectations. Although performance is excellent, continuous self-development and improvement are advised.

A teacher has to be evaluated on every performance standard according to whether they are rated 1, 2, 3 or 4. An adjustment of a score can occur only in exceptional circumstances. There needs to be compelling evidence to allow the score to be adjusted. The relevant factors have to be recorded as “contextual factors” and have to be addressed as a matter of priority in the school management plan. An example of a contextual factor would be that the school does not have adequate facilities to allow for the teacher to conduct lessons in an efficient and competent manner.

At a full staff meeting, the principal should explain to the staff what the IQMS is, the benefits of its implementation and the exact process of how it will be implemented effectively in the school. Training must be given to the teachers to ensure that they have a thorough understanding of the purpose, principles, processes and procedures of the IQMS. Appraisal timelines need to be set out. These timelines set out the prescribed dates of implementation, and comprise a mid-year and annual appraisal.

The appraisal process consists of a self-appraisal by the teacher, a lesson observation and pre- and post-appraisal discussions (SADTU, 2013:9).

During the self-evaluation phase the teacher must reflect critically on his or her performance and set targets and timeframes for improvement. Key areas that need growth and/or assistance must be identified in order for them to be developed positively. In doing this self-evaluation,

the teacher becomes familiar with the instruments that will be used for both developmental appraisal and performance management. It is imperative that teachers familiarise themselves with the performance standards in order to get a clear understanding of the minimum criteria that need to be met in order for salary progression (SADTU, 2013:10).

Lesson observations are a vital assessment tool used in the appraisal process. It is in these observations that the performance of the teacher can be appraised and the perceptions that the teacher has of his or her teaching performance can be confirmed or repudiated.

A fundamental constituent of the success of the appraisal process is the discussions that are held before and after the actual appraisal process. During the pre-appraisal encounter, the discussion between the appraiser and teacher must focus on the performance standards and ratings. It is essential that the teacher has a solid understanding of how appraisal will take place and the criteria that are expected to be met. The teacher must use this time as a forum to bring up contextual factors that could be hampering performance and teaching ability. These factors must be recorded and could possibly be used later to adjust a certain mark in respect of a particular criterion. Over and above the already mentioned factors, the expectations that the observer has of the classroom observation process must be clarified. Once the lesson observation has transpired it is of the utmost importance that a post-appraisal discussion is held. The teacher must be made aware of the scores given for the classroom teaching and documents must be signed. It is crucial that feedback given in the post-appraisal discussion focuses on performance, not personality as well as observations and not assumptions. Furthermore, feedback should be objective and not subjective, and the core focus should be on the specific and concrete rather than the general and abstract (SADTU, 2013:10). Evidently, attention must be placed on the fact that public schools employ many teachers. Discussion is seen as vital to the success of the IQMS. In reality, there is not enough time to see each and every teacher and discuss all the aspects that the IQMS policy stipulates. Once again, the IQMS has a tendency to look simple on paper, but this is not the case in practice.

Once the appraisal process has been completed, all the relevant information must be recorded on the relevant instruments. The supervisor and teacher must capture all applicable comments on the appraisal instrument. Both parties must sign the documents, which are then submitted to the principal, who should thoroughly check through all the paperwork.

Teachers are required to be evaluated once a year. The summative assessment at the end of the year becomes the baseline evaluation for the next year. In order to ascertain whether progress

and growth have occurred, the summative evaluation of the previous year must be compared to the summative evaluation at the end of the year.

## **2.9 Negative perceptions of the IQMS**

A focus on teachers' negative perceptions of the IQMS is fundamental to this study. The available literature reveals that the negative perceptions that teachers and principals hold towards the IQMS far outweigh any positive ones. The exploration of the stages and implementation process of the IQMS in the foregoing section demonstrates that there is high risk that the IQMS will not be implemented as efficiently as the document expects. It appears to be too prescriptive and requires strict compliance. Furthermore, it is a lengthy process and consists of much paperwork and administrative requirements. According to Steyn and Van Niekerk (2008:252), some negative perceptions held by teachers of the appraisal in public ordinary schools are due to the following factors: Teachers are inclined to feel pessimistic as, in many instances; an honest discussion about weaknesses is unlikely to occur. Teachers inevitably are inclined not to point out any frailty in their teaching. Furthermore, principals do not have the time to see each and every teacher in order to provide valuable feedback.

Hariparsad *et al.* (2006:9) explain that, whilst this instrument in its entirety looks very effective, it was actually designed by the ELRC together with the National Department of Education using minimal teacher input via the teacher unions. The principal and the school management team (SMT) who are in charge of implementing this process have in fact, in all probability, never been involved in the design in any way, and more than likely have received very little training. Furthermore, if principals and teachers had received training, continues Hariparsad *et al.* (2006:9), it was more than likely from officials who "have very little knowledge of performance management". So, whilst following the implementation process on paper seems to tick all the boxes, there are major flaws and inconsistencies in the implementation process, as several research studies have discovered (Mchunu, 2014; Mosoge & Pilane, 2014; Namuddu, 2010).

A debatable element of the IQMS is the performance management instrument. According to Mathula (2004:25), this instrument suffers severe shortcomings. Five performance areas of a post level one educator are evaluated in this appraisal process. These areas are: 1. Creation of a positive learning and teaching environment; 2. Curriculum knowledge, lesson planning and presentation; 3. Learner assessment and achievement; 4. Professional conduct; and 5. Extramural and co-curricular participation (ELRC, 2003:29). The IQMS provides

“descriptors” for each criterion. A rating scale of 1 to 4 is used, with 1 being unacceptable and 4 outstanding performance in a certain area. Mathula (2004:25) believes that “unacceptable” and “outstanding” are hardly logical opposites of one another, and hence regards the scale as not acceptable to start with. Furthermore, Hariparsad *et al.* (2006:25) put forth the notion that, “by attempting to make the instrument person-proof, one falls into the trap of being subservient to the evaluation system and hence bureaucratic accountability, which seeks to ensure teachers measure up to the same predetermined uniform standard, takes over”.

In addition to the above statements by Mathula (2004), it also is questionable whether appraisal instruments are valid and reliable. The term validity refers to whether or not, in this instance, the IQMS measures what it claims to measure. If the instrument has true validity, then the items and questions asked will be closely linked to the actual, intended focus. Reliability is one of the most important elements of an instrument’s quality. It has to do with the consistency or reproducibility of the instrument.

The instrument below, labelled Diagram 1 (ELRC, 2003:17) is one facet of the IQMS instrument that has to be completed by the person who observes the teacher in the classroom. This particular score sheet is used to assess whether the teacher creates a positive learning environment. One has to ask if this desired outcome can be assessed accurately by answering only four questions. The levels of performance consist of four standards, ranging from unacceptable to outstanding. The subjectivity of the appraiser can come into play here. It is also questionable whether the appraiser can make an accurate judgement on, for example, learner involvement in the lesson from one observation only. A closer study of this particular assessment tool can help to identify why teachers have negative perceptions of this process. The tendency for the IQMS instruments to be viewed as invalid and unreliable can be justified by a study of the actual score sheets.

When studying Diagram 1 below, further causes for concern become apparent. What factors actually constitute a “good” score? The teacher observing the lesson and scoring could have different perceptions of the levels of performance than another colleague. An in-depth look at the criteria shows that they are vague and do not take into account any contextual factors. A look at the discipline criteria makes me think to the different classes and grades I teach. If an observer scored my one Grade 10 class, I would probably get outstanding for all levels of performance; however, if my Grade 9 class was observed, this would differ, as the dynamics

of the class are very different from that of the Grade 10 class. Therefore, this instrument is unreliable as it is not consistent. My Grade 9 learners are not motivated or self-disciplined, but this does not make me any less of an outstanding teacher. Another drawback of this instrument is that it is used for all public schools, despite the huge disparities in financial and socio-economic terms. A well-resourced former model C school could make a very positive learning space in comparison to a financially struggling school with 50 learners in a class and only 25 desks and chairs.

Diagram 1 (ELRC, 2003:17)

| <b>Performance Standard: 1 Creation of a positive learning environment</b>  |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Expectation: The educator creates a positive working environment that enables learners to participate actively and to achieve success in the learning process.</b> |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Question: Does the educator create a suitable environment and climate for learning?</b>  |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Criteria (A) Learning space (B) Learner involvement (C) Discipline (D) Diversity</b>   |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Levels of performance (1) Unacceptable (2) Satisfies minimum expectations (3) Good (4) Outstanding</b>   |   |  |  |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>   | <b>Unacceptable</b>   | <b>Satisfies minimum expectations</b>  | <b>Good</b>  | <b>Outstanding</b>  |
| (A) Learning space  | No effort to create a learning space                            | There is evidence of an attempt at creating and organising a suitable learning environment | Organisation of learning space enables the effective use of teaching resources and encourages and supports individual and group activities | Organisation of learning space shows creativity and enables all learners to be productively engaged in individual and co-operative learning |
| <b>Comment</b>  |   |  |  |   |
| (B) Learner involvement   | Teacher and learners appear uninterested                        | Learners are engaged for most of the lesson  | The environment is stimulating   | Learners participate actively   |
| <b>Comment</b>  |   |  |  |   |
| (C) Discipline  | No discipline and much time is wasted                           | Learners are disciplined   | Learners are encouraged  | Learners are motivated and self-disciplined   |
| <b>Comment</b>  |   |  |  |   |
| (D) Diversity   | Teacher is insensitive to racial, cultural and gender diversity | Learning environment is free of obvious discrimination                                     | Teacher acknowledges and respects individuality and diversity  | Teacher uses inclusive strategies and prompts respect for diversity   |
| <b>Comment</b>  |   |  |  |   |



A further criticism of the IQMS is that an error may occur when giving a rating. When looking at the score sheet labelled Diagram 1, it becomes apparent how errors can transpire. An error is best explained as an attitude, response, tendency or inconsistency in the rate that interferes with the ability to produce accurate performance ratings. There are many other factors, such as personal preferences, prejudices and inherent biases that can cause errors in performance appraisals, which, in turn, contribute too many negative feelings towards the appraisal process.

These criticisms of the appraisal rating are discussed by Steyn and Van Niekerk (2008:267), who explain the five rating errors that can occur during the staff appraisal. The first rating error they consider is that of stereotyping. Stereotyping refers to “judgements of other people based on group membership and attributes such as sex, race, ethnic groups and age are the basis of commonly held stereotypes”. In order to prevent a rating error based on stereotyping a teacher, Steyn and Van Niekerk propose that it is vital that the appraiser realises that each teacher has varied character traits and teachers must not be labelled according to certain personal characteristics.

Additionally, Steyn and Van Niekerk deliberate over the “halo effect”. This rating error is based on the appraiser using a “favourable or unfavourable general impressions of a teacher”. This could lead to an impression being created in one area of the teacher’s rating that could then influence the opinion or judgement in another area. This potentially could lead to many teachers feeling opposed to the appraisal process and can contribute to them perceiving it as a threatening practice.

Steyn and Van Niekerk (2008:268) also analyse the regency error. This is a result of the “appraisers being influenced by recent events rather than basing their judgement on what has happened during the entire period since the last appraisal. “Involving the appraisee throughout the appraisal process” can, as suggested by Steyn and Van Niekerk, serve as a countermeasure to minimise the risk of this problem.

The central tendency error occurs when appraisers assign all teachers to the “average” or “satisfactory” range. Appraisers steer clear of rating a teacher as excellent. This creates a safe rating and is easier to justify by the appraiser later in the process.

The final rating error pointed out by Steyn and Van Niekerk (2008: 268-269) is the leniency error. This refers to how each and every appraiser has his or her own value system that is used to appraise others. This leads to the appraiser either giving very high or very low scores. It is believed that some appraisers feel that, by giving a low rating, the teacher will feel motivated to improve. In most cases this perception is not achieved, resulting in an unpropitious perception of the appraisal process.

As a result of these potential errors, it is quite understandable that, as studies reveal, performance appraisal probably ranks near the top of the “least favourable” work activities for most people, and there often is a sense of dread when appraisals are discussed in staff meetings. This sense is shared by those involved in performance management, as well as those conducting the process. According to Evans (in Kamlawathee, 2007) it therefore very often does not receive the attention it deserves in school institutions. Teachers fear that appraisal can provide evidence that will be used in disciplinary procedures. In addition, appraisal can lead to quarrels, punishments, ridicule and victimisation, rather than professional development.

De Clercq (2008:13) argues that the use of the IQMS as an instrument for peer appraisal is based on the assumption that there is a certain level of professional competence, openness and respect towards colleagues among school staff. In a perfect setting, schools should have a professional, collaborative climate and culture in which staff work and reflect together on teaching practices. Yet, in reality, this is not the case. In poorly functioning schools, teachers’ values and attitudes may be affected by the school’s poor results, making them defensive towards any form of performance monitoring. De Clercq (2008:14) further discusses how, in low-functioning schools in South Africa, the IQMS is viewed as cumbersome, time consuming and a fruitless exercise that does not bring any benefit and therefore is not treated seriously.

Anecdotal evidence provided by Queen-Mary and Mtapuri (2014:2), in their qualitative research that took place in Mpumalanga, shows that teachers were “uneasy” about the IQMS. Instead of focusing on development, Queen-Mary and Mtapuri expose how teachers merely scored themselves highly in order to receive the 1% increase in remuneration. They refer to this blatant cheating as a force that undermines the value of the IQMS and that leads to many teachers losing confidence in the IQMS. Furthermore, morale was low and some teachers felt that the IQMS did not meet their developmental expectations, as those who were supposed to develop them did not know how to do so.

Mboyane (in Queen-Mary & Mtapruri, 2014:4) cites further problems, some recurrent, with the IQMS. These are expressed as:

The National Department of Education's advocacy programme on IQMS is not intensely driven: the approach is top-down, principals and management display poor leadership skills, insufficient resources in previously disadvantaged schools, the department and principals forcing the implementation of IQMS on teachers, the low morale of teachers due to poor working conditions and remuneration packages and the teachers' inability to deal with massive policy changes, resistance by different unions to the unilateral decisions taken by the Department on IQMS as factors militating against the implementation of IQMS.

Feedback reports from a seminar on teacher development in South Africa, presented by the South African Council for Educators (SACE, 2014) on 28 October 2014, highlight the major challenges faced by schools in the implementation of the IQMS. Amongst others, these challenges include inadequate support and information given to teachers about compiling their personal growth plan (PGP). This support is evidently meant to come directly from subject advisors and circuit managers; however, the level of support is gravely inadequate. Another cause of concern is the irregular monitoring of teachers' personal growth plans, coupled with a general lack of support from school management teams.

Furthermore, Monyatsi (2002:215) shares the sentiments that appraisal is viewed by teachers as an interference in their work, which displays an element of mistrust from the DoBE's side. Teachers believe that this appraisal process shows that the DoBE does not have confidence in the teachers' abilities. Monyatsi explains further that the appraisal tool can be used to bully teachers and can be seen as something with which to threaten them in relation to no salary increase. It is evident that some teachers assume that the IQMS is there to oppress, reprimand and belittle them, rather than to encourage development. Monyatsi describes how teachers perceive the appraisal process as something that leads to conflict, punishment, ridicule and victimisation, instead of professional development and growth.

Mji (2011:57) found that the only motivation teachers have to comply with the IQMS process is the 1% salary progression. Ramnarain's (2008) study found that the general view on teacher assessments was they are not a reliable means of measuring performance.

## **2.10. Chapter summary**

In summary, appraisal, like elsewhere, has been shown to be a problematic process in South Africa – both during and after apartheid. A closer look at the appraisal processes in developing and developed countries has reinforced my view that there is no single country that has a perfect appraisal process and one that is accepted by all stakeholders. The inspectorate system during apartheid was replaced with the post-apartheid DAS and WSE systems. However, in response to the numerous contentions and inconsistencies associated with the DAS and WSE, the Department of Education introduced the IQMS. But, like the DAS and the WSE, it would appear that what the IQMS aims to do in terms of policy might not necessarily be the practical experience thereof in schools. This indicates the necessity and importance of this research study, which seeks to understand whether the developmental appraisal system is delivering on its desired outcome to promote teacher development.

The next chapter contains an exposition of the research methodology and design that I used to gather information from each of my five research sites.

## Chapter 3

### Research design and methodology

#### 3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I present the research design and methodology that I used to investigate whether the developmental appraisal system in public ordinary schools achieves its desired outcome of promoting teacher development. This chapter also includes aspects such as sampling and population, data construction methods, as well as a description of the socio-economic context of the five schools that served as my research sites. The confidentiality and reliability of the data will also be examined, and an account will be provided of the ethical considerations and limitations of this study.

The research problem and questions served as a guide to the research methodology that I implemented in my study. It was essential that I kept my focus on my research question due to the fact that it is easy to get side-tracked during interviews. The later could result in a focus on information that is interesting, yet not vital to my study. In order to ground my study, my research question and sub-questions are briefly stated below.

#### 3.2 Statement of the research question

Springett and Campell (2006: 2), the research question should be described as one that “aides memoire”. It helps if you keep focused on your area of enquiry. Punch (2005:37) concurs, stating that the research question gives direction and coherence to the investigation. The research question that I am exploring is, ‘Does the developmental appraisal system achieve its desired outcome of promoting teacher development?’ The aims of this study were to determine how teachers perceive and experience the developmental appraisal system, how the appraisal system is implemented in public schools, and whether the developmental appraisal findings are brought into the strategic planning of the school.

#### Sub-questions

The following sub-questions were informed by the research question:

- How do teachers perceive and experience the developmental appraisal system as well as the implementation process of it?

- Does the appraisal system contribute to the development of teachers in relation to the curriculum and their professional development?
- Are the findings of the developmental appraisal system brought into the strategic planning of the school and how is feedback given after the appraisal process?
- What is the most significant or positive effect of the appraisal system?

### **3.3 Research paradigm**

Every study is performed and defined by a particular paradigm. Mertens (2005:5) defines a paradigm as “a tool used to identify one’s own worldview or, in research terminology, a metaphysical construct associated with specific philosophical assumptions that describe one’s worldview”. The paradigm that a researcher uses guides the process of enquiry and ensures that the correct research methods are implemented. McGregor and Murnane (2010:419) refer to a paradigm as the methodology used which relates to the rationale and philosophy, while the methods refer to the technical procedures applied to conduct the research. Given the nature of my study, I used an interpretive paradigm with a qualitative research redesign. An interpretive paradigm gives rise to researchers using systematic procedures, but maintaining that there are multiple socially constructed realities. There is less emphasis on numbers and a large volume of focus on values and content (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:6). An interpretive approach was used to understand how the teachers and principals experience and perceive the appraisal process. Merriam (2009:5) explains how this paradigm best “describes”, “understand” and “interprets” social phenomena.

### **3.4 Research design**

Yin (2014:28) explains that a research design is the logical sequence that connects the empirical data to a study’s initial research question, and ultimately to its conclusions. Yin (2014:29) further describes a research design as the “blueprint” for research. TerreBlanche and Durrheim (1999:44) draw attention to the purpose of a research design. It is there to develop an explicit plan of action and sets out how the activities of sampling, data collection and analysis will be conducted.

A qualitative research design was adopted for this study because I assumed that it would enable me to gain the perspectives of the participants concerning the appraisal system and its implementation. Mouton (2001:194) adds that qualitative research focuses on the participants’ experiences, and due to this, it is considered to be subjective and sensitive to the contexts of

participants. Furthermore, McMillan and Schumacher (2010:489) indicate that a qualitative design refers to an in-depth study using face-to-face interviews, observation and document analysis techniques to collect data from people in their natural settings. This study will be contextual in that the implementation of the appraisal system will be studied at each selected school without interfering in the implementation process. Qualitative research is interested in understanding the meaning people construct about their own experience of their world. My research was aimed at developing a more coherent understanding of teachers' and principals' perceptions of the appraisal process and whether it actually brings about teacher development.

Merriam (2009:14, 15, 16) puts forth four characteristics that highlight the main reasons why qualitative research designs are implemented. Through these, a better understanding of why I applied this type of design in my study becomes apparent. The focus of a qualitative design is on process, understanding and meaning. In my study I explored the process of the appraisal system, perceptions of it and whether it brings about teacher development. Secondly, in research that adopts a qualitative design, the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis. In my study I personally conducted the interviews and immediately afterwards I transcribed them and analysed the data obtained. Qualitative research also leads to an inductive process. What this refers to is the gathering of data to build concepts, hypotheses or theories, rather than deductively testing hypotheses as in positivist research. In my study, data was gathered through semi-structured interviews. Finally, qualitative research is richly descriptive. Words are used to convey and describe what was learned about the phenomena of appraisal. The participants freely used verbal terminology to explain their perceptions of the appraisal process.

The aforementioned information about my qualitative research provides the basis for further explaining why my study can also be defined as a case study. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:344) define a case study as "an in-depth analysis of a single entity". Yin (2014:4) describes how a distinctive need for case study research arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena. My study views the appraisal system implemented in public schools as the single entity to which McMillan and Schumacher make reference. This research case study represents a collective or multiple case study due to the study being undertaken at five different schools and the findings combined into one thesis. Yin (2014:57) avers that evidence from multiple cases is often considered more compelling, and the overall study therefore is regarded as being more robust than a single case study. I was of the opinion that

gathering data from five different former model C schools would offer more significant findings than if I had researched appraisal at one school only.

De Marrais and Lapan (2003:227) believe that most case study researchers start with a general issue, and as background research evolves, the researchers try to generate a list of about fifteen to twenty questions focused on the issue at hand. In this study, the issue at hand is the appraisal system. De Marrais and Lapan (2003:227) state further that, as the researcher begins to work on the site, other questions may arise. The research questions must set the focus of the study but, at the same time, it must be understood that case study research is an evolving process. Taking this literature into account, I entered the designated research sites with a flexible attitude towards the data collection process. Cohen *et al.* (2011:296) describe a good case study researcher as one who is able to gather data that addresses fitness for purpose, as well as having the skills to probe beneath the surface of phenomena. An effective case study researcher must be an excellent listener, questioner, prober, must be able to make informed inferences, and must be adaptable to changing and emerging situations. Yin (2014:73) lists the desired attributes of a case study researcher. These are the ability to have a firm grasp of the issues being studied, as well as being able to avoid bias. I bore all of these in mind when conducting my actual fieldwork.

### **3.5 Population and sampling:**

McMillian and Schumacher (2010:325) state that the sources of information used by qualitative researchers include individuals, groups, documents, reports and sites. The form of data used in my study based on the method of purposeful sampling was individual interviews. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:138) contend that purposeful sampling is used in order for the researcher to select particular elements from the population that will be representative or informative about the topic of interest. On the basis of the researcher's knowledge of the population, a judgement is made about which subjects should be selected to provide the best information to address the purpose of the research. The sample identified by the researcher needs to satisfy specific needs or purposes – in this case, the developmental appraisal system. Cohen *et al.* (2011:157) concur that purposeful sampling is used in order to gain “knowledgeable” people who have in-depth knowledge about particular issues. It is noted by Cohen *et al.* (2011:157) that, although the respondents in purposeful sampling may not be representative and their comments may not be generalisable, this is not the concern, as what is important is to acquire in-depth information from those who are in a position to give it.



The selection of a sample refers to the unit of analysis, states Research Methods Knowledge Base (2015). Before I embarked on my study I emailed fifteen public ordinary schools in the Western Cape region. I purposefully chose former model C schools as my sample selection. There is very little, if any, research that has been conducted on appraisals in former model C schools. This is the factor that essentially gave rise to my exploration of the appraisal system. I decided that my research question was one that would explore whether the development appraisal system was achieving its desired outcome of promoting teacher development in former model C schools. To aid any readers of my study who may be unaware of what a former model C school is, I offer a brief background to this term. In the 1990s, during the final years of apartheid, the Minister of Education at the time was pressurised into opening “white” schools to all races. In addition to this, he had to reduce state spending on “white” schools. Hofmeyer (2000:5) highlights the fact that white schools at the time were given a choice, based on parent votes, of which model of schooling they would prefer. A model A school meant that the school would change its public status to private and would lose all state funding immediately. A model B school would be one that retained the status quo. If this was chosen, then state funding would automatically be reduced to 70%. A model C school would allow admission to other races. They would receive state funding and would form a school governing body, which is a juristic body consisting of elected members. A model C school would be allowed to determine its own admission policies. My interest therefore lay in the appraisal process in former model C schools and, for this reason, I purposefully only emailed schools that were formally classified as model C institutions.

From my initial sample of fifteen former model C schools, only eight principals responded to my requests. Two principals declined my request to conduct fieldwork at their institution. In total, six schools – four high schools and two primary schools – indicated that they would like to participate in my study. The principals showed a genuine interest in my study and all emphasised that they found appraisal to be a most contentious issue. They indicated that they would like to participate and make a contribution to my study. They also revealed great interest in what my findings would reveal about appraisal. I therefore had my six former model C schools. These schools were easily accessible to me and all were within half an hour’s drive from my residence. I also thought that having a sample that consisted of both high and primary schools would provide better representation than just a high school.

My research plans took a slight change in direction when one primary school made it extremely difficult to set up interview times. I decided to abandon the idea of using this school as my

research site and therefore had four high schools and one primary school. I interviewed three principals, two deputies and, in addition to this, three teachers from each school. These teachers were purposefully chosen by the principal. This sample was based on criteria that a teacher who took part in this study had to have taught for a minimum of three years. This inevitably would give them the experience necessary to assist them in answering questions on the appraisal process. A first-year teacher would not be a key informant, as this individual would not have any knowledge or perceptions of the appraisal process in schools. The years of teaching experience of each teacher is indicated in the table below.

| <b>Participant (teacher)</b> | <b>Years of teaching experience</b> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| School A – Teacher 1         | 7 years                             |
| School A – Teacher 2         | 24 years                            |
| School A – Teacher 3         | 26 years                            |
| School B – Teacher 1         | 25 years                            |
| School B – Teacher 2         | 8 years                             |
| School B – Teacher 3         | 26 years                            |
| School C – Teacher 1         | 25 years                            |
| School C – Teacher 2         | 9 years                             |
| School C – Teacher 3         | 25 years                            |
| School D – Teacher 1         | 13 years                            |
| School D – Teacher 2         | 6 years                             |
| School D – Teacher 3         | 35 years                            |
| School E – Teacher 1         | 20 years                            |
| School E – Teacher 2         | 21 years                            |
| School E – Teacher 3         | 10 years                            |

### **3.6 Data construction methods**

For my study I chose to focus on semi-structured interviews. Keller and Conradin (2010) believe that semi-structured interviews provide a clear set of instructions for the interviewed and can provide reliable, comparable qualitative data. In this type of interview, the interviewer follows the questions set beforehand, but is able to follow topical trajectories in the conversation that may stray from the guide when it is deemed appropriate. Bernard (1998) believes that semi-structured interviewing is best used when you will not have more than one

chance to interview someone. This was applicable in my study due to time constraints. Semi-structured questions have no choices from which the participant can select. Rather, as McMillian and Schumacher (2010:206) point out, the question is structured to allow for individual responses. Open-ended questions are asked, but they are fairly specific in their intent. Cohen et al (2011:423) believe that the interviewer must ensure that the interview is a positive, pleasant and beneficial experience and convince the participant of their own worth and the importance of the topic. During the interview it is important for the interviewee to speak more than the interviewer, for the interviewer to listen attentively and for the interviewer to be seen to be enjoying or at ease with the interview.

I used a twofold approach with regard to the interviews. I emailed the six principals and sent them the list of my interview questions beforehand. This was done in order for them to familiarise themselves with the content of my interviews. I then gave them possible times that I could interview them and emailed them a schedule. The principal of one of the schools referred me to the deputy who dealt with the appraisal process and implementation in that particular school. There was no suitable time for this particular person to meet with me and it became evident that they were very apprehensive about being interviewed by me. As I only wanted to conduct interviews with participants who would be rich in information and who wanted to participate willingly, I decided to exclude this school from my fieldwork. Yin (2014:74) refers to an attribute of a good researcher as being the ability to remain adaptive. Not every study goes exactly as planned and changes inevitably have to occur along the way. Yin (2014) points out that the skilled researcher must remember the original purpose of the case study, but must be willing to adapt procedures or plans if unanticipated events occur. Based on this advice from Yin, I did not let this deter me in my research. My research sites now consisted of four high schools and one primary school. Once I had emailed the questions to the principals and prepared a schedule, I ensured that I was adequately equipped before the interviews. This enabled me to feel and appear competent.

My interviews with the principals and deputies all took between 40 to 60 minutes. I did not feel comfortable audiotaping the interviews and neither did the participants. Yin (2014:124) explains that field notes may be handwritten, typed, audiotaped or presented in word-processing or other electronic files. Fortunately I am skilled in shorthand and was able to capture the contents of the interview as well as record body language, facial expressions and the ambience of the interview. In addition to the interviews I requested whether I could analyse any additional policy documents on appraisal other than the IQMS policy documents which

are mandatory in public schools. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:360) refer to this as artefact collection, and it is defined as the non-interactive strategy for obtaining quality data with little or no reciprocity between the researcher and the participant. I had already thoroughly analysed the IQMS policy documents and my intention was to enquire if there were any additional appraisal processes used in the evaluation. The IQMS is an appraisal process implicitly meant for teachers employed by the WCED. I was curious to explore any appraisal documents that were intended for teachers employed by SGBs. Only one school used an additional policy document to supplement the IQMS policy. This was a document put together by the SGB and used to appraise both WCED and SGB teachers. I was not permitted to view this document. It was explained to me it was a highly confidential document and the SGB did not want it perused.

During the interviews I allowed the participants to express their views in their own terms and add any additional information – but did not allow the interview to be side-tracked by irrelevant information. Yin (2014:110) describes how, during the interview, the researcher must follow the line of inquiry as reflected by the case study protocol; however, at the same time actual questions should be asked in an unbiased manner that also serves the needs of the line of research inquiry. The questions asked in the interview must come across as “friendly and non-threatening” (Yin, 2014:110).

Once the data from the interview had been collected I went straight home to analyse it. Transcribing, as contended by Cohen *et al* (2011:426), is a crucial step in interviewing, for there is a potential risk for a massive loss of data. The interview should be treated as a social encounter. Audiotaping is selective, as it filters out important contextual factors, neglecting the visual and non-verbal aspects of the interview (Cohen *et al*, 2014:426). Due to the fact that I did not audiotape the interviews, I took into consideration how imperative it was to make notes on the tone being used, the inflection in the participant’s voice, emphasis on certain words, and the speed of the talk, pauses and interruptions.

Cohen *et al* (2014:427) put forth the notion that, in qualitative studies, the data analysed inevitably is interpretive and is a reflexive, reactive interaction between the researcher and the decontextualized data that are already interpretations of a social encounter. The data that I obtained from my five interviews was then used to create themes. I then was able to analyse it. In order for raw data to be interpreted, it has to be put, according to Tuckman (1994:271), into relevant themes. Once this has been done, the analysed data becomes meaningful. The data I

obtained from the five principals was categorised according to themes based on my sub-research questions.

Once I had completed my interview with each principal I requested to interview the three teachers based on the criteria already discussed. I had the interview questions for each teacher together with the consent form in a file, labelled ‘Teacher 1 School A’ and so forth. All five principals agreed to purposefully select the teachers and that I could phone or email the teachers, once selected, to set up interview times. An exceptionally strange phenomenon occurred. All three principals and two deputies let me know that the teachers did not want to be interviewed face to face. The reasons cited for this, as given by the teachers, ranged from “I don’t feel comfortable talking about appraisal in an interview situation” to “I don’t have the time”. The teachers did not collude to come up with these reasons. The teachers are not related in any way and the research sites in this study are confidential. So it draws attention to the fact that teachers are very apprehensive about talking about appraisal. Cohen *et al* (2011:424) explain that, often during research, it is common to find that once-willing participants turn to refusing to be interviewed. Many do not give a reason, but others see the interview as intrusive, they feel they dislike the topic, they feel embarrassed or ignorant, they are afraid of the consequences of participating, they feel inadequate that they do not know the right answer, or they are just too busy. Cohen *et al* (2011) believe it is the onus of the researcher to try to overcome these factors whilst recognising that they may be legitimate. I did not want to press the issue and felt relieved to discover that this is a common occurrence during research studies. I reflected on this and was drawn to the thought that appraisal indeed is an issue that appears to cause anxiety and perhaps even a sense of mistrust. Perhaps it had to do with the fact that appraisal is linked to salary increments. Fear of this being jeopardised may have had a major impact on the teachers refusing to meet with me. Nevertheless, I did not let this occurrence deter me from study.

I was given names, email addresses and contact numbers of the teachers and conducted my interviews via email. Email interviews also are a powerful method of data collection. Cohen *et al* (2011:440) put forth the notion that email interviewing as a qualitative method in educational research enables the researcher to contact hard-to-reach groups. James and Busher (in Cohen *et al*, 2011:440) state that email interviews can “generate fuller, richer, more reflective, thoughtful and longer answers than telephone interviewing”. Email interviews also reduce transcription time, as the email is already transcribed. Some may argue that the absence of non-verbal cues may reduce reliability; however there is no proven evidence to back this train of

thought. I ensured that each teacher kept to the point, fully understood the nature, focus and purpose of the interview and knew the timeframe in which to reply to an email. I sensed that interviewing the teachers in this manner ensured that they did not feel intimidated and the responses I received to my interview questions were rich in information. I obviously could not see their body language as such, but in some of their answers I could get a really good feeling of their perceptions of appraisal. Punch (2009:145) points out that, although the most common type of interviewing is an individual, face-to-face verbal interchange, it can also take the form of face-to-face group interviewing, mailed and self-administered questionnaires and even telephonic surveys. I felt that, as my interview consisted of open-ended questions, the teachers would have freedom to write down lengthy narrations of the appraisal process. There were a few participants whom I emailed after receiving their responses in order to probe a response further.

As I did not have to transcribe the emailed responses from teachers, this saved me time. Once I had received all emails from the fifteen teachers I labelled the data for storage and retrieval. I coded and categorised the data from the teachers' responses based on themes.

### **3.7 Research context**

As has already been indicated, this study was conducted at five public ordinary schools. Initially I had wanted to include two primary schools and three high schools in my study. However, as explained under the heading "Population and sampling", this was not possible. Therefore, four high schools and one primary school, all former model C schools, were included in this study. Although there were similarities between the five schools, there also were evident differences. The similarities were that they are all former model C schools and are found in seemingly affluent suburbs in the Western Cape. They serve a predominately middle to upper class. All have a well-established school governing body and there is a close-knit relationship between the SGB and the parent association. All the schools had WCED-employed staff as well as teachers employed by the school governing body. The main difference was found in the medium of instruction. The primary school offers tuition in Afrikaans only. One of the four high schools is a dual medium school, offering tuition in both English and Afrikaans. The other three high schools use English as their medium of instruction.

School A was initially founded in the 1800s and therefore is rich in traditional values. It serves an affluent community in the Western Cape and excels in academics. School A is a high school and its medium of instruction is English. It is a single-gender school. For the past twenty years

the school has achieved a 100% matric pass rate. School A was one of the first schools in South Africa to open its doors to all races. It is committed to providing an educational environment that is conducive to effective teaching and learning. School A has a school governing body that consists of fifteen elected members. Nine of these members are parents, one is the principal, three are teachers and two are learners. In everyday activities the principal is assisted by two deputies and the school management team (SMT). They, guided by the vision and mission of the school and coupled with the SGB, effectively run the institution. School A comprises the following: It has a total of fifty-four teachers, twenty-two of whom are employed by the Western Cape Education Department (WCED) and the remaining thirty-two teachers are employed by the school governing body. Seventeen of these teachers are full time and fifteen are part time. There are twenty-seven administrative staff. School A has seven hundred and twenty-nine learners.

School B is one of South Africa's oldest and most prestigious single-gender schools. It was founded in the 1800s and serves an affluent community. It offers tuition in English as the medium of instruction. School B is a high school that offers a nurturing yet progressive environment for its learners and strives towards academic excellence. The school governing body comprises thirteen members made up of seven parents, the principal, two teachers, one member of the school staff who is not a teacher and two members of the school council. In the everyday running of the school, the principal is assisted by three deputies. The school has forty-nine full-time teachers and only one employed in a part-time capacity. Twenty-four of these teachers are employed by the WCED and the rest are employed by the SGB. There are eight administrative staff members. One of these is employed by the WCED and the remaining seven are SGB employed. The number of learners in School B is 818.

School C is a co-educational primary school that serves an affluent community. It offers tuition in Afrikaans and was formed in 1977. This school has an excellent academic and sporting reputation. A nurturing environment is offered to the learners. The principal is assisted by two deputies. The school has thirty-nine teachers, nineteen of whom are WCED employed. The SGB employs the remaining twenty teaching staff. There are two administrative staff members employed by the WCED and three employed by the SGB. The number of learners in School C is 835.

School D is a former model C high school that also serves a predominately middle-class area. It was formed in the 1800s and is rich in tradition. School D is a single-gender school and has

a close-knit SGB and parent association. The SGB consists of seventeen elected members. This school offers tuition in a dual-medium environment. The school focuses on academics and strives to provide a learning environment that encompasses quality teaching. The school has seventy-four teachers, of whom thirty-eight are employed by the WCED and thirty-six by the SGB. Moreover, the school employs seventeen administrative staff. A total of 1 240 learners attend the school.

School E is a former model C school that serves a predominately middle class. It offers co-educational high school teaching and the medium of instruction is English. This school offers a rich diversity of academic, cultural and sport activities to develop its students to their full potential. School E has a close-knit SGB and parent association. The SGB comprises fifteen elected members. The school has forty-six teachers, of whom twenty-three are employed by the WCED and the remaining twenty-three by the SGB. The school employs twelve administrative staff, eight of whom are SGB employed. A total of 690 learners attend the school.

### **3.8 Reliability and validity of data**

There are numerous interpretations of the terms validity and reliability. Kumar (2011:181) refers to reliability as a research tool being consistent and stable, and hence predictable and accurate. Merriam (2009:220) states that reliability refers to the possibility that research findings can remain the same under similar conditions. Yin (2014:48) shares similar sentiments and believes that a true test of reliability would be if another researcher conducts a study already done and arrives at the same findings and conclusions. Cohen *et al* (2011:204) believe that, by ensuring reliability in the interview environment, the researcher must have a highly structured interview, with the same format and questions for each participant. Although I conducted semi-structured interviews, each interviewee was asked the exact same questions. To ensure that I adhered to the principal of reliability when conducting my study, I did so by pretending that someone was always looking over my shoulder. I am assured that if someone was to repeat my fieldwork that they would find the same results if they carefully adhered to the procedures that I carried out. The reliability of the data received from my interviews with the five principals was ensured, as I transcribed them immediately after the actual interview. The emailed interviews with the teachers did not have to be transcribed but were analysed and the results interpreted immediately. If I had to carry out the same interviews, but at a different time, I should achieve the same results. This is a test for reliability.



McMillan and Schumacher (2010:330) aver that validity refers to the degree of congruence between the explanations of phenomena and the realities of the world. My understanding of validity is whether I, as a researcher, actually observed what I thought I was seeing or just interpreted it that way. To ensure that I had interpreted what I understood the meanings of the answers given by the principals to be, I emailed them the transcripts once completed. In this way they could read through what I had recorded and verify that it in fact was what they had said. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:332) refer to this as participant review. Cohen (2011:204) states that the most practical way for achieving validity is to minimise the amount of bias as much as possible. In my fieldwork, the element of bias was not a factor. Throughout my interviews I maintained the composure that Cohen *et al* (2011:181) suggest in order to allow for the validity of research. In other words, validity attaches itself to accounts, not to data or methods. It is the meaning that subjects give to data and inferences drawn from the data that are important. I ensured that I wrote down exactly what the principals were saying about appraisal and the perceptions of it.

### **3.9 Ethical considerations**

McMillan and Schumacher (2010:117) describe research ethics as being open and honest with participants about all aspects of the study. In addition, they state that qualitative research is more likely to be personally intrusive than quantitative research. As the subjects of my research are human, I had to treat this concept as exceptionally important. With regard to my study, the main ethical issues were informed consent, privacy and confidentiality, risks and discomforts, reciprocity, and the rights of participants to withdraw from the study.

#### **3.9.1 Informed consent**

McMillan and Schumacher (2010: 339) refer to how researchers must give assurances of confidentiality and anonymity when gaining permission from participants. Many institutions require a protocol for informed consent to be signed by each participant. Full disclosure must be made about the nature of this study. Cohen *et al.* (2011:442) indicate that interviews have an ethical dimension; they concern personal interaction and produce information about the human condition. Therefore informed consent, confidentiality and the consequences of the interviews need to be “unpacked”, as each is not unproblematic. The participants cannot be “compelled, coerced or required to participate” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010:118).

Informed consent occurs when subjects agree to participate with knowledge of the study. This term has been defined by Dieer and Crandall in (Cohen *et al* 2011:78) as the “procedures in which individuals choose whether to participate in an investigation after being informed of the facts that would be likely to influence their decision”.

In order to carry out my study at the former model C schools, written permission was sought from the WCED (refer to Appendix B for the approval letter from the WCED). In addition, permission was granted by the principals of the schools for me to conduct my fieldwork at their relevant institutions. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Stellenbosch University.

Informed consent forms were given to each participant and they were signed and filed. I then explained the aims and purpose of my study to all the participants. A copy of my research proposal was sent to the principals. The teachers had access to this on request from their principal. I explained to all the participants that participation was voluntary and that, if they felt uncomfortable, they could withdraw at any time. When the teachers did not want to be interviewed face to face, I did not press the issue. I merely adapted my interview technique. In this manner I showed respect for their human freedom and did not try to coerce them further. I explained to them that their identities would be protected; however, I did not appear forceful. From the outset I strived to establish rapport, trust and reciprocity with the participants. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:339) point out that most participants can detect and will reject insincerity and manipulation.

### **3.9.2 Privacy and confidentiality**

I assured each participant, in writing and verbally, that all conversations were strictly confidential. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:339) believe that the settings and participants should not be identifiable in print. The locations and features of settings must typically be disguised to appear similar to several possible places. In acknowledgement of this important concept of confidentiality, I refer to the schools as School A, B, C, D and E respectively. The participants were told that I would be the only one who has access to the data I obtained from them and that all transcripts and emails sent would be stored in a folder on my hard drive, which would be password protected. The emails sent from the teachers were saved in a Word document and then deleted from my email. The principals also received copies of my transcripts taken from their interviews. This was done so that they could check that it was indeed exactly what they had said and had intended to say. I explained to all the participants

that once my thesis was completed successful, the folder storing all the data on my hard drive would be deleted.

### **3.9.3 Risks and discomforts**

Before I met with the principals I emailed them a copy of my interview questions. I did this in order to avoid a situation that could have placed the principal in an awkward or uncomfortable position. However, I did ensure that the questions I asked more than likely would not allow this to happen. I do not think that any of my interviews were regarded as risky by the interviewees.

### **3.9.4 Reciprocity**

I was truly grateful towards the principals and deputies who gave up their time to meet with me. In addition to our interviews, there was a large amount of correspondence between us. They had to ensure that three teachers were selected and contact details were given to me so that my email interviews could take place. No reward or form of payment was made to anyone, either directly or indirectly. The principals and deputies all did note, however, that they did not intend to receive any reward other than the fact that their perceptions and experiences of appraisal were authentically conveyed in my study. I ensured that I captured all data obtained correctly. I also ensured that I did not divulge any information about the schools that would give their identity away. As a gesture of gratitude, once I have received my Master's degree I will write them a thank you card and explain to them how they can access my thesis.

### **3.9.5 Participation and withdrawal**

I reminded the participants throughout my study that they could choose to withdraw from the study at any time. My choice to not carry out research at one of my selected institutions highlights this fact. As already mentioned, this school was not one hundred percent committed to my study and I felt that, instead of coercing them the whole time, I would choose another research site.

## **3.10 Limitations of the study**

Griffin (2011:1) believes that there are certain limitations to a qualitative research design. She points out that the strongest objection to qualitative research is that the quality of the research depends too greatly on the individual researcher. Due to the researcher designing the type of questions that will be asked, the researcher inadvertently might influence the results due to own personal beliefs. In order to avoid this, once I had transcribed the interviews with the principals I sent a copy of the transcription to verify that I had interpreted their answers correctly and had not inadvertently added detail that actually did not exist. There was no need to email the teachers as, in essence, they had actually transcribed their own interviews when they emailed me their answers.

I do believe that my findings could be seen as a generalisation of results. I used five former model C schools as my research sites, interviewed five principals, as well as three teachers from each school. It is my understanding that these are sufficient participants to provide findings that are true and not just a generalisation of appraisal in former model C schools.

Perhaps the most obvious limitation was the fact that I was denied the ability to read through the one research site's additional appraisal documentation. The fact that the teachers did not want a face-to-face interview cannot be viewed as a limitation, as the teachers answered the questions in a much more open and deeper manner.

### **3. 11 Conclusion**

This chapter clearly sets and discusses the methodology and qualitative research design that I implemented in my study. Within this framework, I also discussed the data-gathering and sampling techniques. The research context of where I conducted my fieldwork was given. In the following chapter I will present my research findings, linking these to my research questions.

## Chapter 4

### Presentation of data

The purpose of this chapter is to present my research findings, which consist of an analysis of and presentation of the data as constructed from the interviews with the three principals, two deputies and fifteen teachers from five former model C schools. The principals, deputies and teachers have first-hand experience of the appraisal process, which makes them rich informants. McMillian and Schumacher (2010:367) note that qualitative data analysis is primarily an inductive process of organising data into categories and identifying patterns and relationships among the categories. Furthermore, qualitative analysis is a relatively systematic process of coding, categorising and interpreting data to provide explanations of a single phenomenon of interest. Taking this into consideration, the interviews were analysed in terms of themes based on the main and sub-questions for my research. Therefore the data constructed in this study was aligned with my research question, namely ‘Does the developmental appraisal system achieve its desired outcome of promoting teacher development’, as well as my research sub-questions:

- How do teachers perceive and experience the developmental appraisal system as well as the implementation process of it?
- Does the appraisal system contribute to the development of teachers in relation to the curriculum and their professional development?
- Are the findings of the developmental appraisal system brought into the strategic planning of the school and how is feedback given after the appraisal process?
- What is the most significant or positive effect of the appraisal system?

In line with the ethical considerations, the schools are referred to as schools A, B, C, D and E respectively. The principals/deputies are referred to as principal A (of school A), principal B (of school B), principal C (of school C), principal D (of school D) and principal E (of school E). The teachers are referred to as teachers 1, 2 and 3 of Schools A, B, C, D and E respectively. As mentioned in Chapter 3, all five schools are former model C schools. In school A, C and E the principal was the primary person in charge of implementing the appraisal process. In schools B and D, this responsibility is delegated to the deputies, although overseen, in practice, by the principal. The teaching experience of the fifteen teachers (nine female and six male)

who were interviewed ranged from a minimum of six years to a maximum of 35 years. Two of the principals were men, whilst the other was a woman. Both deputies were men. Principal A has taught for 29 years and has been the principal of school A for five years. Deputy B has taught for 20 years and has been deputy of school B for two years. Principal C has 34 years of teaching experience and has been in the position of principal at school C for 12 years. Deputy D from school D has been teaching since 1976 and has been a deputy at school D for 17 years. Principal E has taught for 27 years and has been principal of school E for 10 years.

I present the following findings based on my document analysis.

#### **4.1 Analysis of IQMS policy**

Before I embarked on the interviews with the principals/deputies I examined the IQMS policy document, which is informed by ELRC resolution no 8 of 2003. The appraisal process in public ordinary schools is implemented using the IQMS policy document. The Department of Education's main objective is to ensure quality public education for all and to constantly improve the quality of learning and teaching (ELRC, 2003:3). The philosophy underpinning the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is based on the fundamental belief that the purpose of the IQMS is fivefold, namely:

- To determine competence;
- To assess strengths and areas for development;
- To provide support and opportunities for development to assure continued growth;
- To promote accountability; and
- To monitor an institution's overall effectiveness.

As already discussed in Chapter 2, it is the responsibility of the principal to ensure that all the teachers have access to this document and that it is fully understood. This policy document sets out the implementation process of the DAS, PMS and WSE in schools. The IQMS policy document provides guidelines on the protocol pertaining to teacher observation, issues of confidentiality, information control, resolution of differences and grievances, and the structures, responsibilities and record keeping. In addition, it offers an implementation plan and an appraisal instrument, comprising the criteria and rating scale. While the policy is detailed, it does not seem to take into account any contextual factors when the actual observation of teachers occurs.

Based on my ensuing discussions it became clear that schools A, B and E all have various types of additional processes that can be classified as forms of appraisal or evaluation. I was denied access to any form of written documentation as proof of these policies; however, I was given descriptions of what they entail.

#### **4.1.1 School A**

At school A it is compulsory for the WCED teachers to complete the IQMS appraisal process, but voluntary for the SGB-employed staff. Principal A does not force the SGB teachers to complete the process; however, if they do, they also receive the 1% salary increase. Consequently, all SGB staff have, in the past few years, completed the process. Principal A of school A explained that they do not have an additional appraisal policy, but they have a system that requires the learners to fill in reflection sheets on every teacher that taught them for the year. Principal A refers to this as an evaluation process that allows him to identify any issues related to teaching. Together with the evaluation sheets completed by the learners, principal A analyses the academic results of every single class per subject to identify if development is necessary for some staff members. The system that is used is not linked to any form of salary increment and there is no actual policy that exists on paper to put this system into an actual format. In developing additional evaluation tools and implementing additional processes, principal A drew attention to the fact that, while the school recognised the importance of developing staff, the IQMS system did not assist in teacher development.

#### **4.1.2 School B**

At School B, only WCED-employed teachers complete the IQMS process, but both WCED- and SGB-employed teachers are required to complete the appraisal process that has been designed by the SGB. I was told that this is a highly confidential document and I could not have access to it. In lieu of this, I was provided with a verbal explanation of this document by deputy B of school B. Deputy B explained that the school's reason for using additional appraisal documentation was because:

*We do not promote the IQMS in our school as it requires us to chase compliance. We cannot invest our energy into compliance and excellence. We are a school that wants to achieve excellence and excel in academics. Our appraisal system allows for the desired flexibility that is not given by the IQMS.*

In addition, he clarified that

*We have to ensure that we keep the good teachers and do not lose them to private institutions. We realise we have to nurture our top-achieving teachers and we can do this by acknowledging their success and paying them more. In some cases our very top achievers are young teachers who have no chance for promotion yet, as they are too young. We call this talent management.*

The appraisal document used by school B, according to deputy B, requires much less paperwork and moves away from the mere *box-ticking* that the IQMS prescribes. He explained that the school's appraisal system contains certain categories that are used to assess the teachers. The data from these categories are loaded onto a spreadsheet, which is then used to calculate the salary increase of the particular teacher. This is in addition to their annual increase. It can be quite a substantial amount, and could mean an increase of up to an extra R4 000 per month for a top-achieving teacher.

Deputy B shared: *I have been deputy at a few schools and this appraisal process is by far the best I have seen. It is a very informal process and does not have loads of paperwork like the IQMS. I feel it is sincere, credible and real. We do not hide behind ticked boxes. We try to focus on teacher strengths.*

Deputy B was emphatic that the IQMS did not bring about teacher development. In support of the school's own appraisal system they have implemented a concept called *The Freshman Development Unit*. The main aim of this concept is to aid the growth and development of newly qualified teachers. Their lessons are videotaped and then a senior member of staff sits with the new teachers and goes through the taped lessons. Advice is given in a constructive manner and it is not an intimidating process. He explained that teachers have to complete a growth plan and indicate areas they would like to improve upon. They also have to include a timeframe highlighting when they would like to reach this level of development. As head of academics, deputy B ensures that these teachers are being assisted in the specific areas where development is required. His enthusiasm about this system made me realise that, if the person responsible for implementing the appraisal process in a school is positive and passionate, it will automatically filter down to the teachers. This, in turn, will create a positive perception of appraisal and help the teachers to accept the concept. The teachers in school B do not view it as a threatening experience, but rather as a constructive, affirmative process. School B has turned appraisal into a positive phenomenon through the development of its own policy.



### **4.1.3 Schools C and D**

Evidently, schools C and D do not have any additional form of appraisal or evaluation and only implement the IQMS for all their teachers. After I had ascertained this information regarding additional policies, I commenced with my interviews.

### **4.1.4. School E**

Principal E of school E reported that, aside from the IQMS, they have their own in-house evaluation system that is used for both WCED and SGB teachers. Although he could not provide me with any policy documentation, he explained that they preferred referring to their system as a short, informal evaluation programme, rather than an appraisal process. This evaluation programme does not bring about teacher development. Rather, according to the principal:

*This evaluation programme is linked to a salary increase on top of the annual salary increase. We evaluate teachers in respect of their value added to the school. There is no paperwork involved, we look at learner results. There are some teachers who now earn an extra R500 a month because of their contribution to the school. But we can't really classify this as an appraisal process.*

### **4.1.5 Interviews**

I interviewed the principals or deputies who were directly responsible for the implementation of the IQMS in their schools, as well as three teachers from each institution. The interviews with the three principals and two deputies were conducted over a two-week period. It was exam time and I was fortunate, as their schedules allowed them to be flexible in the times that they saw me. The information was gathered through semi-structured interviews. These interviews lasted about 40 to 60 minutes each. None of the interviews was audiotaped, because the participants felt uncomfortable about being recorded – specifically due to the contention regarding appraisal in schools. I therefore took notes, ensuring all elements of the interviews were captured. I transcribed my own interviews as soon as I left the institution so as not to lose momentum or any valuable facts obtained and body language. These transcriptions were then emailed to the three principals and two deputies for them to verify the contents thereof.

The teachers who were interviewed were selected by the principals on the basis of their years of teaching experience, and hence their familiarity with the appraisal process. I needed to have

information-rich informants and a first-year teacher would have no knowledge of the appraisal process. I also needed to ensure that the teachers whom I interviewed were employed by the WCED and not the SGB – since it is not a mandatory requirement that teachers employed by the SGB have to be appraised using the IQMS policy documentation. It is the school's choice whether SGB-employed teachers complete the IQMS process. The principals' assistance in the identification and selection of teachers to participate in the interviews therefore was appreciated. However, after the completion of the interviews with the principals and deputies, an unforeseen problem arose. All the teachers from the five schools indicated an unwillingness to participate in the interview. It was perplexing to find that none of the teachers was willing to be interviewed – especially since none of the principals, deputies or teachers was aware of any the other schools involved in the research study. It therefore was impossible for any of the participants to have had any contact with one another. In my opinion, their preference to respond in writing to my questions was indicative of the common feelings of mistrust and anxiety that often are associated with the appraisal process. Email interviews therefore were conducted. The teachers did, however, provide meaningful answers to my questions and the impression they created was that they felt more at ease and therefore made a greater contribution to my study. The email interviews with the teachers did not have to be transcribed, as the data came directly from them.

I used a different set of interview questions for the principals/deputies and teachers. This was done because the principal has the overall responsibility of ensuring that the IQMS is implemented uniformly and effectively in the school. Based on this responsibility I felt it necessary to ask slightly different questions. However, all questions were centred on similar themes. (Kindly refer to Addendum A for the principal and deputy interview questions, and Addendum B for the teacher interview questions.)

After ascertaining whether additional appraisal systems were in place, and having obtained the information I needed, I then commenced asking my actual interview questions of the principals, and analysed the data to ensure the answering of my research questions. McMillian and Schumacher (2010:369) believe that each analyst must find his or her own style of intellectual craftsmanship. However, the technique of comparing and contrasting is used in practically all intellectual tasks during analysis. The goal is to identify similarities. I identified themes that were based on my main and sub-questions of my research. The following section deals with the findings discussed under the following themes: perceptions and experiences of the developmental appraisal system; the implementation of the appraisal system; teacher

development in terms of curriculum and professional development; strategic planning; feedback; and positive aspects of appraisal and teacher development.

#### **4.2 Perceptions and experiences of the developmental appraisal system**

Monyatsi (2003:215) puts forth the notion that the circumstances in a school will largely determine why teachers view the appraisal process in a negative light. He provides a few of the many reasons teachers are apprehensive about the appraisal system, namely that they view appraisal as a source of quarrels, punishment, ridicule and victimisation, rather than as professional development; it can be used by seniors to oppress and intimidate juniors; it is seen as an interference in work activities; and it is questionable whether the appraisal instruments are either valid or reliable.

My findings bear a close resemblance to the abovementioned findings of Monyatsi. This became evident from the responses I received from the principals and deputies when asked what their general perceptions and experiences of the IQMS developmental appraisal system were. Principal A made it very clear that she does not support the IQMS and feels that every school interprets it differently and it therefore is open for abuse. She explained how appraisal makes the staff feel anxious and as if they are being judged. She elaborated that, due to the fact that there is no getting away from the IQMS, she tries hard to make it a positive process, although she does not buy into it: *I really do not support the IQMS system at all, but do it because we have to. I have decided to motivate staff to do it once a year as fair as possible, as positive as possible. I do not use this system to judge any teacher.*

This positive approach taken by principal A allows the staff to feel more at ease and does not create a sense of mistrust between her and the teachers. Perhaps principal A's greatest concern about the IQMS can best be summarised by what she stated when asked to sum up her perceptions and experiences of the IQMS: *It is open to abuse and this has been seen by the fact that all teachers in South Africa receive a 1% increase at the end of the IQMS cycle each year. Every year we all see in the media how poor the matric results are – how is this possible that every teacher receives a 1% increase then? This implies that every teacher in the country is good enough to teach. 1% is not really a substantial increase, but year after year it makes a difference to a teacher's salary. It is not a true reflection of any teacher's ability.* Principal A therefore is very sceptical about the IQMS and doubts its true value.

Deputy B had similar views to Principal A and noted that the teachers view the IQMS in a very negative light. It is seen as a very bitty, time-consuming and worthless exercise. By contrast, the school's own appraisal system, according to deputy B, enjoyed more support and evoked positivity from the teachers: *The general impression in our school is that our own unique appraisal system is highly accurate and honest. We have not received any negative comments about it. Our appraisal process is quite informal and does not consist of loads of paperwork like the IQMS. I feel, and so do the rest, that the system is sincere, credible and real.*

In agreement with principal A and deputy B, deputy D explained how not all teachers in his school bought into the appraisal system. This was due to the fact that there are just too many forms to complete. According to deputy D, the younger teachers appeared to be more tolerant of the appraisal system than the older teachers, who had been appraised year in and year out since 2005.

Principal E's negative attitude towards the IQMS appraisal process was captured as follows: *There is a very negative feeling towards appraisal and it's very difficult to make it a positive thing. Teachers do not want to have conversations about practice. The IQMS is an imperfect tool. It is paper heavy and does not ask the right questions. It is way too time consuming and principals don't buy into it. It is very prescriptive.*

In contrast to principals A and E and deputies B and D, principal C found the appraisal system to be valuable and worthwhile process. While he expressed enthusiasm about the IQMS appraisal process, he did, however, point out aspects of the process that he felt were drawbacks to its success – *The general impression of appraisal by my staff is very positive. The only drawback and negative perceptions created are around the fact that it is a very lengthy and cumbersome process. I find it way too long. I could cut out lots of repetitive questions that are asked.* He went on to explain what he had observed in his years as principal:

*The biggest problem of the IQMS is the length of it. It is a large policy document and is divided into three different systems that need to be assessed. The administration is a headache for us and there is a great deal of paperwork. It does not appear to be a streamlined process at all and is quite repetitive. The class visits are also difficult to co-ordinate as it is essential that no teaching time is lost as a result of this peer assessment. Teachers are extremely busy with co-curricular activities, marking, lesson planning, and all the paperwork that is required places a great deal of strain on them. Due to the length of all the policy, certain aspects may be rushed. This is the only negative aspects that I can think about.*

The data discussed so far implies that all three principals and two deputies were of the opinion that the IQMS is a lengthy document and extremely prescriptive. Principal A, although not convinced that the IQMS is a worthwhile process, attempted to treat it in a positive light in order to motivate her staff. She felt that she could not hide away from the process and, as a result, could not let her perceptions of the IQMS filter down to her teachers. Deputy B and principal E share similar negative sentiments regarding the IQMS. They were upfront about their dislike of this system. Principal C saw the appraisal process in a positive light, yet found the length of the process unsubstantiated and unnecessary. Deputy D had a rather neutral stance towards appraisal and did not commit himself to intricate descriptions of appraisal in his school.

In the light of the teachers' decisions not to be interviewed, instead sending their responses via email, I was rather apprehensive about what their answers would reveal. The fifteen teachers from schools A, B, C, D and E shared a number of common perceptions and experiences in relation to the appraisal process, which included that they found the appraisal process:

- *to be a frustration and a waste of time*
- *not streamlined and rather rigid*
- *does not give a true reflection of a teacher's ability or dedication in the classroom*
- *is not an honest process*
- *has a great deal of admin*
- *is a very exposing process*
- *consists of too much paperwork*
- *is time consuming and complex*

Teacher 1 from school C expressed that *a negative attitude is experienced because of the large amount of paperwork and it is very time consuming. There are too many forms and one-size-fits-all mentality. This causes people to just want to finish the process instead of doing it properly – people rush through it.*

Interestingly, teacher 2 from school C noted, *If done correctly it could work but it just takes way too long and as a result of this large portions of the process are ignored. The evaluation points are too generic and fixed and do not cater for individual circumstances.*

Teacher 3 from school C pointed out that it made you feel as if you were being checked up on, even though you have many years of teaching experience. He had 25 years' teaching experience and said that the feeling that he was being "policed" was very off-putting. Furthermore, he

added that *the process is dependent on the surroundings and environment. It is different at every school and is applied differently as it is an internal process. It gets interpreted differently. The process is dependent upon the person who implements it. I doubt the accuracy of the results.*

While the three teachers from School B were negative about the IQMS appraisal process, they were positive about their school's internal process – possibly because their own in-house appraisal process meant a substantial increase in salary.

Teacher 2 from school D responded: *It is an exercise in futility, it in no ways determines a teacher's worth. You can be a brilliant and engaging teacher and do poorly in IQMS and be a terrible teacher and still do well. There is a lot of emphasis placed on admin and preparation and some of the best teachers I know are terrible at admin but brilliant in engaging a class and not just teaching a subject, but encouraging learners to truly learn and enjoy it! It is also an absolute waste of paper and time. It should be streamlined and simplified. The paperwork is immense!*

Furthermore, she wrote: *I think the idea of appraisal is very important. I think the old system of school inspectors is brilliant. I know you are not allowed to do that anymore because of unions that have championed the rights of teachers and have labelled it as a type of intimidation, but I am convinced that the lack of supervision in schools has led to an absolute crisis in underprivileged schools. I think a peer review system would be better. No marks. To quantify evaluation for some teachers can sometimes feel a bit demeaning. Furthermore, the marks can be manipulated, because everything is so subjective. So it doesn't give you a good idea of what is going on anyway. It would be better to do peer review on a monthly or termly basis which gives you an excuse to sit in someone else's class and learn from someone else and also to give constructive criticism or pass on good practices that you have learnt in your teaching.*

Teacher 3 from school D was extremely opposed to the IQMS. Having taught for a total of 35 years, she emanated a sense of aggression towards the appraisal. She believed that it was carried out in order to give people in administration a job to do and aired her resentment of the system. She said that it was pointless, created window dressing and was a waste of resources – all for a mere 1% salary increase.

Positive comments about the appraisal system were made by teacher 3 from school A. She felt that appraisal is a *necessary evil* and allowed her to evaluate her own progress. She did, however, admit to the fact that *once the forms are handed out, they mostly just lie around until we get around to doing it*. Her colleagues, teachers 1 and 2, shared similar sentiments. I immediately thought back to the interview with principal A of school A and distinctly remembered that, although she did not buy into the idea of the appraisal, she nevertheless implemented it and remained positive about it. This positivity certainly filtered down to her staff, as although the three teachers saw it as a cumbersome process, they still were the only three teachers who actually had outright positive comments about the appraisal.

The teachers felt that the appraisal process, in theory, should effectively bring about teacher development. However, on paper, this is not what actually occurs. Teachers from schools A, C, D and E all found the IQMS appraisal process to be long and cumbersome. They expressed that it was impractical and not a user-friendly document, and that the outcomes of the appraisal process were hugely dependent on how it was implemented in the school. The teachers from school C, in particular, where all the steps were followed effectively and efficiently, felt agitated due to the knowledge that other schools did not follow all the steps adequately and consistently, yet still received the 1% salary increase. They questioned the uniformity of the system, as it is an internal process. Negativity was also expressed as, in some cases, a young staff member may be in a higher post-level category than an older teacher. The older teacher has to be assessed by someone his or her junior and this can create a sense of defensiveness and apprehension. There also was a sense that the WCED teachers felt they were being policed, as in some schools it was not compulsory for SGB to be assessed using the IQMS policy documentation.

In summary, the IQMS appraisal process generally evokes negative feelings and experiences. None of the five principals/deputies or 15 teachers interviewed could state that the appraisal process in their schools actually achieved its purpose as set out in the policy documentation. The overall sense was that the appraisal process was being implemented because it had to be, and not because the schools saw any value in it.

### **4.3 The implementation of the appraisal process**

When questioned about the implementation process, the principals/deputies responded in the followings ways. Principal A noted that they adhered strictly to the stipulations of the IQMS

policy document. Although she did not support the system, she followed each and every step to ensure that it was implemented uniformly and consistently. Principal A stated:

*The principal and senior SMT is in charge. From July to October is the start of the IQMS. Staff need to identify a senior and a subject peer to meet beforehand to discuss personal growth and then to visit the class. Meetings should be held after the class visit as well. The academic head and principal visit most of the teachers during the year and most of the staff use this opportunity as their senior peer for appraisal. I think it is important that the principal and academic head know what is happening in classes and feedback must be given after the lesson observation.”*

On the other hand, school B follows a different line of implementation for the IQMS. Deputy B noted that:

*The IQMS process for the WCED teachers is implemented by a teacher who is very organised and enjoys the paperwork. He has files for each WCED teacher in the staff room and ensures that all the requirements are followed and the paperwork is complete. We leave this implementation to him.*

He went on further to explain how their own appraisal system was implemented for both WCED and SGB teachers:

*In terms of our school appraisal, the different line managers implement it. It consists of a self-appraisal by the teachers and then reports by the subject heads. I am the head of academics and I meet with the subject heads, for example the subject head of history. She then reports back to me about the teachers in her department. We also assess co-curricular activities. This process runs throughout the year.*

Principal C applies the same stance as Principal A and adheres to all implementation criteria. He noted that:

*The process of appraisal is implemented by the deputy principal. He adheres to the exact requirements of the IQMS and does not deviate from the implementation process. We start the process in the third term and it runs for the duration of a full school year. The procedure is explained at a staff meeting and all staff have access to a copy of the complete IQMS policy document. The class visits take place in the third term. The staff comprises of WCED teachers and governing body-employed teachers. The governing body teachers go through the same appraisal process as the WCED-employed teachers. The only difference is that the*



*scores/results of the WCED staff are reported to the Department, whilst the governing body receives the outcomes of the governing body-employed staff. The 1% allocation to GB teachers is discussed at the budget meeting and, in most cases, if the budget allows, is granted to GB teachers.*

Deputy D explained that *The IQMS is implemented in the third term as prescribed by the WCED. We follow the exact prescriptions of the WCED. We do not deviate. Everything is explained at a staff meeting in the third term.*

Principal E shared similar views to deputy B in the implementation of the appraisal process, elaborating that the IQMS is prescriptive in its timeline and that they adhere to this timeframe. He went on to elaborate:

*A teacher actually runs the IQMS in this school. He is a head of department and he has an assistant who is a post level one teacher. He keeps all the paperwork up to date. The Department is pretty prescriptive in how they want the IQMS implemented and what dates things must be completed by so we just follow that.*

Interesting similarities in the implementation process can be drawn from this data obtained from the principals. As the IQMS is very prescriptive in its requirements, all schools tend to follow the exact dates and time frames given. In school A and school C, the principal is the main implementer of the appraisal process, whereas in school B and E, the principals have delegated this task to specific teachers. The deputy in school D assumes responsibility for the process.

The feedback from the teachers seemed to correlate what was reported by their respective principals or deputy principals, namely that the appraisal process was implemented efficiently and that ample information was given prior to the beginning of the actual process. An exception to this finding was teacher 2 from school D, who said that it took her four years to fully understand what the IQMS actually wanted from her, and that she was totally confused by all the paperwork. She did not find the pre-appraisal information meeting helpful. It therefore can be deduced that the five former model C schools that served as my research sites successfully adhere to the implementation guidelines as set out in the IQMS policy documentation. The negative perceptions held by and experiences of teachers therefore are not brought on by insufficient information about the process.

#### **4.4 Teacher and curriculum development**

During my interviews I asked the participants if the appraisal system contributed to the development of teachers in relation to the curriculum and professional development. Principal A responded to my question in the following manner:

*All development requests will be discussed by the SMT and the process will be implemented. It is necessary for staff to be involved, and then this will be implemented at a staff meeting. Staff meet every second Tuesday for a staff meeting or a developmental session. Every staff member also needs to indicate what they want to develop throughout the year and this will be implemented as far as possible for the whole staff or individual cases.*

Principal A stressed that the IQMS was not a direct reason why development of teachers occurred in school A. Instead, she ensured that her staff identified areas of potential development and this would occur even if the IQMS did not exist.

Deputy B confessed that very little development of teachers occurred as a result of the IQMS in his school. However, their own appraisal process tended to see to the development of their teachers, as can be seen in his response below:

*The teachers fill in a growth plan and they indicate areas where they would like to improve upon. They put in a timeframe as to when they would like to reach this level of development. If for example, they need academic assistance, then I as head of academics see to it they are assisted.*

Similarly, deputy D remarked that development did occur as a result of the IQMS, but did not offer much substantiation on this point. His answer was brief:

*If teachers indicate that they need development in any area, then they are given the support they need.*

It can be seen that principal A and deputy B both share similar sentiments about the IQMS and development – namely, that the two are not directly linked. Teacher development occurs as a result of the principal or deputy's initiative in encouraging and following through with developmental processes. The fact that the IQMS appraisal process exists is not the reason why development occurs in their schools.

Principal C had a different view. He saw a direct link between the IQMS and development – *The developmental needs of teachers at this school are taken very seriously. The teachers indicate what areas they need development in and have to give time frames. This is shown in*

*their groeiplan, in English you call it personal growth plan. If a teacher indicates that help is needed in a specific area, they have to stipulate what resources will be required to aid this development, as well as which person they wish to assist them in reaching their developmental goal.*

Principal C also explained that he saw a vital link between the appraisal and curriculum development. He used the appraisal system as a tool for ensuring his staff were adequately trained for the subjects they teach. If any teachers showed potential areas of weakness in a subject, he saw to it that they received training or support to ensure 100% competence in their learning area.

Principal E pointed out an interesting fact that they allowed for developmental needs to be met if their budget could handle the expenses. He also pointed out that he had had no cases where teachers actually stated in the IQMS appraisal process that they had areas that need to be developed.

*Teachers do not use the IQMS process to indicate developmental areas ... but if any teacher wants assistance or training, let's say in computers, then we have a limited training budget which will allow for that. But I don't get cases where teachers come and ask to go on courses to develop themselves. Our support staff will sometimes ask to attend a computer course or a plumbing course and then we send them on that ... but no, I haven't had requests from teachers.*

The above data from the interviews raises many areas of concern regarding curriculum, professional development and the developmental appraisal. Evidently, principal C was the only principal who used the IQMS to promote curriculum and professional development in his school. This is cause for concern, as the IQMS's underlying principle is to promote quality learning and teaching, and the above findings thus imply that this appraisal system is ultimately failing to deliver on its goal.

When the same question was presented to the teachers, only two of them responded that development had actually occurred, and this was in the area of improving their IT skills. Twelve of the teachers stated that development could occur if you indicated that you needed assistance or growth in a certain area. The three teachers from school A noted that development had occurred for them, but not as a direct result of the appraisal process. Rather, their development was as a result of their principal's (principal A) focus on the professional development of her teaching staff. Teacher 2 from school D wrote that she was much too afraid to indicate that she

needed assistance in an area, fearing that she would be told to attend a WCED workshop, which in her mind is substandard. She would rather try to develop using her own initiative. Most of the other teachers viewed it as a process that just had to be done. The fewer areas that one identified which needed assistance, the better the outcome. As a teacher myself I am inclined to understand their attitude towards the process. Heavy teaching loads, co-curricular activities and extramurals make available time very limited. Therefore, if you ask for assistance in a certain area it would mean having to find the time to attend a workshop, which more than likely would be in a holiday.

It is possible to deduce from the principals and deputies' replies that teacher development is not a direct result of the IQMS. It does not just occur due to the fact that the IQMS has been implemented. It is the duty of the principal to offer the staff professional assistance in developmental areas and this would occur anyway, even if this specific appraisal process did not occur.

#### **4.5 Strategic planning of the school**

I wanted to ascertain if the findings on the developmental appraisal system were brought into the strategic planning of the school. I regarded this as a vital question to ask to see if post appraisal something actually gets done. Principals A and C and deputies B and D all remarked that the findings were discussed at their strategic planning meetings and were integrated into the long-term planning needs of the school. It is evident, however, that each institution has a limited budget and not all developmental needs can be met.

Principal A responded to this question by stating that:

*Each teacher must indicate their developmental needs. This will be discussed and will become part of the strategic planning.*

Similarly, deputy B expressed that the findings from the IQMS were brought into the strategic planning of the school. However, with their own in-house appraisal system he noted that

*Yes, our findings from our in school appraisal are brought into our general planning. We just have a time constraint. We need more time.*

He explained this statement by informing me that time was a major constraint in bringing about teacher development. If they had more time they would be able to pay more attention to

professional development, yet in the real scheme of things, in a large institution like theirs, time was against them in every manner.

Principal C, who displayed the most positive attitude to the IQMS from the outset, remarked that

*Yes – all findings are definitely strategised and discussed. As mentioned, this is shown in the school improvement plan. Findings are also discussed at the governing body meetings. If a major problem is indicated, then ways to improve or work on this problem are discussed. However, over the past years, the findings of the appraisal process have been positive and we haven't really had to work on any areas of our staff for improvement or development.*

Deputy D shared a similar view to principal C and explained that all findings were brought into the strategic planning of the school. He did not elaborate further, emphasising his vague and brief responses to anything I asked about the appraisal system.

In contrast to the above answers, principal E was forthright in his reply:

*No, as I said we don't bring this into the strategic planning as such, but if development of staff is a major weakness then we will look at it, but this has not actually ever happened.*

This information given by the principals/deputies strongly correlated with the replies from the teachers. All three teachers from school A stated that, where development needs had been identified, these were implemented in the staff development and planning. Teacher 3 from school A noted that the *principal and heads of departments get together to discuss teachers issues that they raise in the IQMS forms and incorporate them into the year plan*. Only one teacher from school B said there was no evidence that the findings of the IQMS or their own appraisal system were brought into the strategic planning of the school. In school C – where the principal was the most positive participant on appraisal, all three teachers mentioned that they have four strategic planning meetings per year where the findings are discussed. The three teachers from school D reported that there was no evidence that any findings of the appraisal are incorporated into the strategic planning. Teacher 2 said that she was totally unaware that the results or findings were used for anything. A similar finding was reported by the three teachers from School E.

The majority of the findings from the teachers were cause for concern. Apart from schools A and C, it became apparent that the teachers do not attend any form of strategic planning

meetings to deal with the outcomes of the appraisal. Perhaps this is due to the fact that only management attends strategic planning meetings. Yet this information is not filtered down to the teachers. The IQMS appraisal process in school E specifically appears to be a rather futile exercise, as the principal makes it very clear that he feels it is a waste of time and therefore does not pay much attention to it at all. Although deputy D indicated that the findings were brought into the strategic planning of the school, the teachers were not aware of this. The teachers feel the appraisal process is purposeless and this has a direct impact on their perceptions of the appraisal system. I understood from the teachers that the reason they found the developmental appraisal to be meaningless and lacked dedication and motivation is that they do not know for what the findings are used. To their minds it is a very futile exercise.

#### **4.6 Feedback**

An important facet of the appraisal process, according to the IQMS policy document (ELRC, 2003:8-9), is post-appraisal feedback. This feedback session should provide vital information to the teacher about what was observed in their lessons. Feedback should focus on performance, being objective and specific, information should be shared, alternatives given, that individual needs are taken into account and requests from the teacher are noted. Therefore, in my study, it was important for me to ascertain whether feedback was provided post-appraisal.

Principals A and C, as well as deputies B and D, all stated that adequate feedback was given post-appraisal. Principals A and C both explained that feedback was given in staff meetings or in individual sessions with the teachers. Principal E was straightforward in his reply that feedback was not afforded much time at their school. Deputy B pointed out that, in terms of the IQMS, absolutely no feedback was given. However, with respect to the school's own appraisal system, the response was somewhat different:

*We provide an interview in which we offer feedback and in addition to this we do letter feedback. In ordinary cases only one person will do the feedback; however, in some instances – like we have two at the moment where we are dealing with disciplinary issues regarding two teachers – ... then more than one of us is present in the feedback meeting. So if there is a behavioural issue involving a teacher, or if they are underperforming, then the principal and others are involved and present in the feedback session.*

On the same note, principal E explained that feedback in school E was done quite poorly and there just was not enough time to give it the attention it requires. He noted that

*Our feedback is poorly done – we don't have much time for this – let's say I maybe see ten teachers only – this will consist of top achieving teachers or very poor teachers... I look at their scores – I need to maybe work on this and see more teachers in a year for feedback. If I think a teacher is a poorly performing teacher and he gives himself a high score – I will call him in and say I don't think you are worth that. We can't just fire people so that's what I do. I can't have a poorly performing teacher getting an outstanding score, as I will never be able to eventually get rid of that teacher. The good teachers I pat on the back.*

The teachers, on the other hand, responded to the question on feedback in various ways. All three teachers from school A noted that sufficient feedback was given after appraisal. School B's teachers pointed out that no feedback was given about the IQMS appraisal, but that they did receive thorough feedback on their own, in-house appraisal. In this case they have an interview with the principal and they receive a letter stating the findings of their appraisal. The three teachers from school C responded that adequate feedback was received post-appraisal. Teachers from school D replied with a yes and did not elaborate further about the nature of feedback given. The responses of the teachers from school E correlated with principal E's reply that no feedback is given. This once again makes the appraisal system in school E seem ineffectual.

#### **4.7 Positive aspects**

When asked what they considered to be the most significant or positive effect of the appraisal system, principal A, deputy B and principal E responded that they could not really find anything positive about the IQMS. Deputy B noted that he found the school's own internal appraisal system to be very worthwhile and positive, but the same could not be said for the IQMS. Principal E basically summed up the shared viewpoints of the three participants by stating:

*Well, it's the only game in town so we are stuck with it. I can't find anything positive about it.*

In contrast to these views, principal C and deputy D both viewed the appraisal process as quite positive, with principal C responding with the following statement:

*I think teacher development is the fundamental outcome of appraisal in this school. This school has an excellent and solid reputation and provides a high quality of education to the learners. I feel very strongly about teacher development.*

Sharing similar sentiments, deputy D, who has evidently been in education the longest (since 1976), answered:

*To improve the education system by helping the teachers to grow and become better teachers.*

When the teachers were posed with this question, their responses ranged from aspects such as that it made them consider their strengths and weaknesses, it allowed them to learn from others and others could learn from them, it afforded an opportunity to show off their computer skills once a year and present a really effective PowerPoint lesson, it forced thoughts about teaching and encouraged them to look at their teaching skills. Teachers from school B responded that the positive aspects of their own appraisal system were that it led to recognition, affirmation and remuneration. Not one teacher interviewed considered the 1% salary increment as a positive aspect.

#### **4.8 Chapter summary**

Critical to the findings discussed above is that the appraisal system does not reflect a teacher's ability or dedication in the classroom. It is impossible to appraise a teacher based on one lesson. A few teachers noted that appraisal is always at the same time of the year, so in fact it is always the same part of the curriculum that is being assessed. This allows a teacher to pre-plan a lesson and allows "window-dressing" to occur in the classroom. A common finding was that teachers felt that the entire appraisal process was designed by people who were not actually teachers. It was noted that the appraisal system was assessing the wrong criteria. Teachers also expressed concern that the outcome of the appraisal process was dependent on the person who implements it and should take into account many contextual questions. A few teachers had previously taught at different schools and stated that the process was totally different there. It therefore is not a uniform system. This gives rise to a feeling of agitation, as some schools follow all steps carefully and timeously and other schools do nothing at all and still receive the same 1% salary increase. Teachers who have taught for many years find it increasingly difficult to be appraised by, and receive criticism from, inexperienced colleagues. This creates a sense of anxiety and defensiveness. As a result of the inconsistencies in the IQMS appraisal system, some former model C schools have adopted their own in-house appraisal system. The primary objective of these school-based appraisal systems is salary incentives and promotion. The perceptions and experiences surrounding these additional systems of appraisal tend to be more accommodating and positive. This is due to the fact that the monetary outcome is much more substantial than the mere 1% that the IQMS offers. In addition to the above, my findings led me to understand



that, if the person in charge of implementing the appraisal system is dedicated and positive towards the system, then this reflects in the staff.

## Chapter 5

### Analysis of findings, conclusion and recommendations

#### Introduction

In this chapter I present a summary of my research findings as constructed from an analysis of the IQMS appraisal policy, as well as from the interviews with principals, deputies and teachers. Careful consideration was given to the literature study provided in Chapter 2 and to the theoretical and analytical framework of the study. I have based my findings on the themes that I used to code my data, namely using my research questions to identify emerging patterns in the data I collected. These themes suggest that the IQMS appraisal policy is not working efficiently in the five former model C schools where this study was based. Moreover, the finding that the appraisal process, as implemented in the five schools, is not leading to teacher development will be discussed in relation to its implications for teaching and learning in South African public schools. In addition to offering an analysis of the main findings, this chapter concludes with recommendations for assisting the developmental appraisal process in public ordinary schools in South Africa so that teacher development might be achieved.

In exploring whether the developmental appraisal system is achieving its desired outcome of promoting teacher development, I collated my main findings according to the following thematic questions:

- How do teachers perceive and experience the developmental appraisal system?
- How is the appraisal process implemented?
- Does the appraisal system contribute to the development of teachers in relation to the curriculum and their professional development?
- Are the findings of the developmental appraisal system brought into the strategic planning of the school?
- How is feedback given after the appraisal process?
- What is the most significant or positive effect of the appraisal system?

In response to the above main and sub-questions for my research, I commence by offering a summary of the main findings.

## 5.1 Summary of main findings

It was revealed in my research that some public schools, specifically former model C schools, implement additional appraisal or evaluation processes. In some cases these are linked to salary progression. Alternatively, these additional policies are implemented to ensure teacher development. Some schools further use these policies to monitor staff with the aim of promoting quality education and learning. Of the five former model C schools, three implement additional policies over and above the IQMS. Schools A, B and E do this as they have very little faith in the IQMS policy and prefer to use their own methods of evaluation and appraisal. School B has a very structured additional appraisal process in place, which is used to appraise both WCED and SGB staff. The deputy interviewed at school B was extremely passionate about this system and was positive about the outcomes it achieved. All three teachers interviewed at this school had positive perceptions and experiences of this system and followed the process with motivation and acceptance. These teachers indicated that the IQMS appraisal was only implemented for WCED teachers and not much attention was paid to it. The WCED teachers completed the appropriate forms, ticked boxes, received their 1% salary increase and that was as far as the process went. School A, in addition to the IQMS, also had a system of evaluation that the principal used to monitor her staff. Although not linked to additional remuneration, the principal regarded it an essential tool that allowed her to assume a position as an indirect watchdog of her teachers. This system comprises of learner feedback on each teacher in the school. The principal uses the learners' constructive feedback as a platform for addressing teachers who may be lacking in certain skills, or who need support or developmental assistance. Furthermore, school E implements an informal policy of evaluation linked directly to financial incentives. Although nothing exists in writing for schools A and E, these systems are both considered as additional appraisal policies. In particular, schools B and E use these appraisal methods to offer monetary incentives. Although I had no direct access to these additional policies, I was nevertheless informed by the participants about the systems in detail so as to obtain a thorough understanding.

Collective agreement number 8 of 2003, as published on 23 August 2003, categorically states that all public ordinary schools in South Africa must implement the IQMS (ELRC, 2003:4). What is evident is that former model C schools, which are generally better resourced, design and implement their own systems of appraisal. It is these institutions that have the funding to offer substantial financial incentives linked to appraisal, as well as budgets that allow for the necessary development and support of their teachers. These schools do implement the IQMS

appraisal system, yet do not give it the full attention it requires as they do not regard it as a tool for aiding professional development. The evidence I gathered pertaining to the additional appraisal systems in richly resourced schools led me to ponder what happens in schools that do not have the resources available to implement appraisal policies over and above the seemingly failing IQMS. This appears to point to an ever-widening gap between public schools in South Africa. Spaul (2013:4) avers that, as it stands, the South African education system is grossly inefficient, severely underperforming and egregiously unfair. In Spaul's 2013 report on the quality of education in South Africa, he further refers to data that shows that there are in effect two different public school systems in South Africa. The smaller, better performing system accommodates the wealthiest 20 to 25% of pupils who achieve much higher scores than the larger system, which caters for the poorest 75 to 80% of pupils. The performance in this latter, larger category can only be described as abysmal. These two education systems are evident when splitting pupils by wealth, socio-economic status, geographic location and language. It therefore is a cause for concern that the same appraisal system is used in all public schools regardless of their socio-economic status.

By means of the aforementioned document analysis I was able to clearly conceptualise the appraisal process and gain a better understanding of why the IQMS is indeed such a resented appraisal tool in many schools. The additional appraisal systems gained the support of the teachers and there appeared to be a greater commitment to the process than to the prescribed IQMS. These additional methods were tailor made to fit the specific school and, due to them not being enforced by the DoE, they evidently were accepted by the teachers to a greater extent, as the feeling of being policed is eliminated.

### **5.1.1 Perceptions and experiences of the appraisal system**

My study revealed that, of the five principals/deputies interviewed, three had very negative perceptions of appraisal in their school. This was of grave concern, as the principal has the overall responsibility to ensure that the IQMS is implemented uniformly and effectively at the school (ELRC 2003:1). These negative perceptions filter down to the teachers and, if the principal is not passionate about the appraisal system, then the staff immediately pick up on this. Principals A and E and deputy B made it very clear that they did not support the IQMS. They found the system to be judgemental, open to abuse, lengthy, too prescriptive and not representative of a teacher's true worth. Furthermore, they doubted its value and questioned its credibility and reliability as an assessment tool. Principal E held the most negative views about

appraisal and admitted to not spending much time on it at all. He regarded the IQMS as an imperfect tool. Evidently, the three teachers interviewed at school E all admitted being pessimistic about appraisal. In contrast, principal C and deputy D both expressed their positive experiences and perceptions of the process. Principal C, however, did voice his concern about the process being very lengthy, causing certain sections to be rushed. Nevertheless he found it a worthwhile and important process.

What surfaced predominately from the fifteen teachers interviewed was that all had some unfavourable comments to make about appraisal. Their responses included feelings of it being a waste of time, rigid, not streamlined, not giving a true reflection of a teacher's ability, being a dishonest process, involving too much administration, an exposing process, requiring too much paperwork and being time consuming and complex. Furthermore, the majority of the teachers remonstrated that they found the process extremely lengthy and echoed a need for the process to be streamlined and simplified. Another factor mentioned by several teachers was the one-size-fits-all approach. There was uncertainty about how this policy could be implemented uniformly in all schools if all schools are coherently different. In addition to this concern, it was remarked that scores could be manipulated easily and that the process was marred by subjectivity.

The findings of my literature study reveal that teachers, both globally and locally, find appraisal to be a thorny issue. The introduction of the IQMS into public schools in 2005 was aimed at enhancing the competency of teachers and the standard of education in South Africa. However, the available literature and recent research studies all highlight the fact that the IQMS does not receive the necessary support, mainly due to the perceptions and experiences of teachers that it fails in achieving its objective – namely promoting teacher development. This perception is exacerbated by the common reality that schools that are most in need of teacher support and development do not receive it. To this end, the overwhelming perception of the IQMS is that it is a time-consuming process that does not contribute anything positive to the development and experiences of teachers.

According to Steyn and Van Niekerk (2008:252), among the negative perceptions of teachers are that they are inclined to feel pessimistic, because in many instances an honest discussion about weaknesses is unlikely to occur. Teachers inevitably are inclined not to point out any frailty in their teaching. Furthermore, principals do not have the time to see each and every teacher in order to provide valuable feedback. Monyatsi (2003:215) notes that teacher appraisal

can lead to evidence that can be used in disciplinary procedures. Some teachers, he feels, view the appraisal process as an instrument that is used to oppress teachers, and to reprimand and punish them. My research revealed similar negative perceptions among the principals, deputies and teachers. It would be worthwhile, however, to consider that the negative perceptions of teachers could be assigned to negative attitudes shared by the principals, which, in turn, could be understood in relation to the common scepticism associated with government policies – which is primarily due to the sense of disempowerment experienced by principals and teachers when they are not included in policy formulation and design.

### **5.1.2 The implementation of the appraisal process**

All five principals and deputies who were interviewed stated that they implemented the appraisal process as stipulated in the IQMS policy. At school C, both WCED and SGB teachers were expected to complete the appraisal process. At school A, the appraisal process was compulsory for WCED-appointed teachers, but voluntary for SGB teachers. At schools B, D and E, only WCED teachers were expected to complete the appraisal process.

Of the fifteen teachers interviewed, fourteen agreed with their respective principals or deputies and confirmed that the appraisal process was implemented properly – that is, that they were informed about the process and that the process was implemented properly. One teacher from school D explained that, although she was confused about the process, she did not seek any additional information from her seniors to help her obtain a more coherent understanding. The teachers all felt that the implementation process was being followed correctly by the principals. No one commented that the implementation stage of the IQMS was troublesome or cause for concern. One teacher's major criticisms of the appraisal process was that it was always conducted at the same time of the year. This meant that every year lesson observations were conducted on the same section of the curriculum being taught. This made it easy to 'window dress' the lesson. She was criticising the time frame of the appraisal process, however, and not the way in which the school implemented the process. Following on this criticism, it would be worthwhile for the DOBE to consider conducting appraisal processes throughout the year, rather than just once. This would allow the observation assessments to be more reliable in nature. It seems unlikely that the observation of one lesson would lead to anything beneficial. Conclusions and recommendations cannot be drawn from such a short period of observation. A method that would lead to trusted and substantiated deductions would be to observe many lessons at different times of the year. This would also prevent teachers from presenting the

same lesson year in and year out. I consider this a way of promoting quality teaching. I would even suggest further that it should not be known to the teacher when the particular lesson will be observed. This would allow for teaching in a natural setting to occur, which would diminish the chance of window dressing by a teacher.

One of the guiding principles of the IQMS policy is the need to use the instrument professionally, uniformly and consistently (ELRC, 2003:1). The implementation phase of the appraisal system in a school is the most important step of the process. It is very prescriptive and states that a baseline evaluation must be done in the first term, followed by summative evaluation in the last term. The first developmental cycle and reflection must run from the period commencing at the end of March to the end of June. Thereafter, the second developmental cycle and reflection period must run from the end of June to the end of September. By the end of February, all teachers should be provided with a timetable indicating when they can expect to be evaluated (ELRC, 2003:5) Teachers and other stakeholders would feel slightly more positive about the appraisal process if it was implemented efficiently. The literature reveals that the appraisal policy is a necessary tool to develop staff; however, it has been hampered by insurmountable challenges during implementation in schools. On the one hand, the roles and responsibilities of individuals and structures involved in implementing the IQMS are clearly laid out in the policy document. The principal has to ensure that a number of aspects take place. These include overseeing that the IQMS is implemented uniformly and effectively in the school, as well as making sure that every teacher is provided with a copy of the IQMS document or has access to one. Furthermore, together with the school management team, the principal must be responsible for the advocacy and training at school level. Workshops must be organised and all documentation must be sent to the district office. The principal also is responsible for the internal moderation of the results of the evaluation in order to ensure fairness and consistency (ELRC, 2003:1). On the other hand, however, this is not what actually occurs. There has been insufficient training of the principals of schools on how the appraisal system actually should be implemented. There also is very limited time to ensure that each step of the appraisal receives adequate attention. It is of great significance that the findings of my study are based on five former model C schools, which are evidently richly resourced and have completely different socio-economic challenges when compared to less resourced public schools. In this regard, the schools in this study are better equipped, especially financially, to deal with teacher development and support – as required – than the majority of

schools in South Africa. And, although the correct stages of implementation were adhered to at my research sites, the majority of them did so reluctantly and without any rigour.

Although lengthy, cumbersome and to some a seemingly worthless process, appraisal in these five former model C schools is done according to the policy. Dhanpat (2007:85) avers that the leadership role of the principal is one of the critical factors that influence the effective performance of teachers. This can only be achieved through good leadership, good decision making and a willingness to be held accountable. A commitment to the implementation of the IQMS is crucial. The problem in some public schools seems to stem from a lack of commitment and support for the implementation of the policy. However, it is easy to understand why principals are not committed to the process. Principals were not consulted during the design of this policy. So, although they are main role players in the implementation of the appraisal process, they were not granted the opportunity to provide any input into the process. Stronge (2005:2) explains that, regardless of how well an appraisal programme is designed on paper, it is only as effective as the people who implement it. Thus, in order for a conceptually sound, well-designed and properly implemented appraisal system for teachers to exist, the implementers must buy into the process. This highlights the need to incorporate principals and teachers in the design process of an appraisal system, as this will lead to a system that is implemented with vigour and enthusiasm.

### **5.1.3 The contribution of the appraisal system to the development of the teacher in relation to the curriculum and his/her professional development**

What surfaced predominately in the interviews was that the IQMS developmental appraisal brings about very little, if any, curriculum or teacher development. Yet – certainly as encountered at the five research schools – staff development would occur even if the IQMS did not exist. School B, for example, does not base staff development activities on the findings of the IQMS. In the same vein, principal A regards teacher development as one of her forefront responsibilities and, regardless of the IQMS, conducts staff development workshops on a weekly basis. Discussion points for these workshops are shaped by areas in need of potential development, and the means that are necessary to achieve growth in certain areas. In addition, principal A closely monitors learner results, and the learners have to complete questionnaires on their teachers. This allows principal A to identify any possible problems in the classroom or curriculum and allows her to deal with these immediately. Similarly, deputy B views assisting teachers to develop professionally as a pivotal element of his managerial



responsibilities. Ironically, both schools do not see a link between the IQMS policy and professional development. If the IQMS did not exist in these two schools, it would have no effect on how professional and curriculum development is regarded.

Principal C uses the teachers' personal growth plans to identify areas in which the teachers might need assistance. Once these areas have been identified, the relevant support is offered. Teachers must identify what resources are needed to assist them and, if the budget allows for it, these are allocated to the relevant parties. Principal D also stated that areas of potential growth for teachers must be highlighted in their personal growth plans. The teachers would then receive the necessary support. His answer did seem slightly guarded, however, as he did not offer any further elaboration on this focal point. In the years in which Principal E has filled this post, he has never had a teacher indicate that they needed developmental assistance using the IQMS as a platform. Although several teachers have requested help with computer literacy skills, this request was not a result of the appraisal process.

The responses from the teachers were slightly varied: twelve of the fifteen teachers stated that, if development was needed, it would occur. However, none of them ever indicated that they needed assistance. The teachers from schools A and B saw no link between the IQMS and professional growth. One teacher from school D was very apprehensive to state that she needed assistance, fearing that she would have to spend a Saturday at a workshop that she assumed would be of sub-standard quality. Her view provides further insight into the general negativity with which any government intervention is perceived.

The purpose of the developmental appraisal is to appraise individual teachers in a transparent manner with a view to determining areas of strengths and weaknesses and to draw up programmes for individual development (ELRC, 2003:1). In addition to the abovementioned objectives, teacher development is at the forefront of the IQMS's ultimate goals. The aim of developmental appraisal is to facilitate the personal and professional development of teachers in order to improve the quality of teaching practices and education management. The basic principle of appraisal, according to the PAM policy document (ELRC, 2003:27), is based on the fundamental principle of life-long learning and development. This implies that one has to prioritise areas for development and growth throughout one's career in education.

My study revealed that the appraisal system does not achieve teacher development or promote growth in areas of the curriculum. Mosoge & Pilane (2014:14) revealed in their study that PGPs are not fully developed, as teachers are reluctant to expose their weakness lest they lose out on

salary progression. Teachers evidently rush through the completion of their PGP, not affording it much time or thought and definitely not completing it honestly. His study further highlighted the weaknesses of integrating development with appraisal, since such integration leads to the neglect of development in favour of appraisal that is linked to incentives. What immediately became evident is that the word “budget” was used several times by the principals and deputies in my interviews. *If the budget allows for it* was a common response. The schools at which the research was done are fairly affluent schools catering for middle- to upper-class learners. They have well-established school governing bodies. If these principals are worried about budgets I cannot help cast my thoughts to schools that are substantially hampered by a lack of resources, mainly financial in nature. If one considers, then, that the majority of public schools do not have a budget for teacher development, then the only conclusion one can draw is that teacher development would in fact not occur.

With regard to the responses from the teachers, I feel that they remain guarded when they use their PGP to identify areas of possible growth and development. On the whole I think teachers protect their own interests and are reluctant to point out that they require assistance in certain subject areas, as this information could possibly be used against them in the future – most likely in relation to promotion. The IQMS tends to lean more towards a focus on merely completing a series of checklists and paperwork, rather than encouraging teacher development. There is so much paperwork and administration relating to its accountability demands that it tends not to focus much on its actual desired outcome. The principals have been told what needs to be completed, leading to a race to comply with the prescriptive nature of the document, tick all boxes and get the task out of the way. When accountability is mentioned here, it is more in the form of the accountability of the principals to complete all elements of the appraisal process. However, what in fact should occur is accountability to promote teacher development. This unfortunately is not the case due to all the paperwork involved in the IQMS process.

#### **5.1.4 The incorporation of the appraisal findings into the strategic planning of the school**

Schools A, B, C and D all confirmed that the findings of the appraisal are discussed at their strategic planning meetings and are integrated into the long-term planning of the school. However, as already noted, schools A and B both have additional appraisal processes in place, and it is the findings of these processes, rather than those of the IQMS, which are used for strategic planning. In contrast to these four schools, school E does not take into consideration any findings of the IQMS in their strategic planning for the school. Neither does the principal

look at any findings from the school's additional, informal evaluation policy. It is evident though that each learning institution has a limited budget and that not all developmental needs can be met. An example would be if the entire staff wanted to be trained in using an iPad, as this would involve an outside person coming in for training sessions and hence financial implications for the school. Teacher development therefore appears to be affected by the financial means of the school. Teachers are aware of this budget limitation and are often deterred from seeking professional development because of it.

Some of the teachers' responses differed from the responses given by the principals and deputies, making it apparent that some teachers are totally unaware that the findings of the appraisal process are actually used in strategic planning meetings. It is imperative that schools make this information known to their teachers and that management are not the only ones with this knowledge. This would empower teachers with regard to the appraisal process and would allow them to understand that the contents of their PGP and the findings from their lesson observations actually are discussed. This perhaps could lead to teachers finding value in the appraisal process. At the moment it appears as if the teachers do not understand what the outcome of the appraisal process is. The three teachers from school A were all aware that the findings were used for strategic planning, as were two of the three teachers interviewed from school B. All three teachers from school C also verified what was stated by Principal C. The three teachers from school D displayed no knowledge of any findings being used in strategic planning meetings, despite the deputy stated that this information was used. Principal E, as well as the three teachers from school E, confirmed that the information from the appraisal was not used as it should be.

The IQMS policy document states in section 4.1 that the completed instrument is required to serve as a report and that it is used for official purposes. Furthermore, the personal growth plan must be used to inform the school improvement plan (SIP), which in turn will be submitted to the local departmental office to inform their planning and support of staff (ELRC, 2003:8). Section 4 of the IQMS policy sets out how all information gathered from the observations and data gathered must be used in the school development plans. A responsibility of the principal is to complete a SIP. This is a blueprint of the actions and processes needed to produce school improvement (ELRC, 2003:9). This SIP is informed by the findings of the appraisal and PGPs of the teachers. School improvement therefore is about developing strategies for educational change that strengthen the school's organisation, as well as implementing curriculum reforms (ELRC, 2003:10).

Van Wyk and Moeng (2014:3) define a school's strategic plan as "the physical document that embodies the guiding orientation regarding how to manage the school within a larger national and local development perspective. Such a plan can lead to school effectiveness, improvement and development strategies". Furthermore, they aver that it is only through a strategic plan that a school can be effective because it helps to identify and express goals, key improvement strategies and progress action plans and, finally, to monitor and evaluate the school's progress for the purpose of change management. School strategic plans can contribute to the quality of planning, reporting and accountability in the schooling system (Motale, 2007, in Van Wyk & Moeng, 2014:4).

My findings reveal that there appeared to be some conflicting understandings of how the appraisal findings are used, if at all. While some principals noted that the findings from the appraisal were integrated into the long-term planning needs of the school, some teachers had no knowledge of this. Furthermore, school E admitted not using any findings in its strategic planning. Yet the IQMS policy states that this is what must occur. What becomes more apparent is that there does not appear to be any monitoring by the relevant district offices – which means that it does not matter whether the appraisal findings are implemented in the strategic planning of the school. Of course, the counterargument could be that it should not be necessary for the district office to follow up – that principals should take full responsibility for the development of their teachers. Clearly, however, as this research shows, when principals have a negative perception of the appraisal process, its findings are not taken into account.

### **5.1.5 Feedback post-appraisal**

The IQMS policy document is very clear about how feedback ought to be given. Every teacher has to be offered the opportunity to receive adequate feedback and any differences need to be resolved (ELRC, 2003:2). Bisschoff and Mathye (2009:3) remark that the appraisal process framework can only work if teachers know what is required of them, receive feedback on how they are doing, and are supported to achieve expectations. The way in which the performance system is advocated therefore is paramount to its success. The IQMS policy sets out the focal areas which need to be covered when feedback is given. These include a focus on performance and not personality, observations and not assumptions, objectivity and not subjectivity, the specific and concrete and not the general and abstract, sharing information and not giving instructions, alternatives and not "what you should do is this", individuals needs and, lastly,

requests from the individual (ELRC, 2003:6). Stronge (2005:4) views communication as the hallmark of sound evaluation.

Principals A and C and deputies B and D shared similar sentiments, namely that adequate feedback is given post-appraisal. Again, it must be emphasised that schools A and B both use additional appraisal policies, and whatever feedback is given is not related to the IQMS. Principal E admitted to a very poor attempt at IQMS feedback. He does not meet with the teachers and does not put any effort into the feedback process. He stated that the lack of time was a huge encumbering factor. The focal areas for feedback discussion outlined in the IQMS policy and mentioned in the above paragraph are somewhat unrealistic. School D, for example, has a total of 74 teachers. It would be an impossible task to provide substantial feedback, tailored the way the IQMS prescribes, for each and every teacher.

Of the fifteen teachers interviewed, twelve replied that adequate feedback was received post-appraisal. Teachers from schools A and B, however, did not receive feedback based on the IQMS appraisal, but only on their in-house appraisal system. The teachers from school E said that they did not receive any feedback whatsoever. It becomes apparent that the lack of feedback is indeed an element that contributes to the negative attitudes surrounding the IQMS. Inadequate feedback, or none at all, makes the process appear worthless. Teachers do not want to give 100% of their time and effort to a process that concludes with nothing substantial or informative.

#### **5.1.6 Most significant and positive aspects of the appraisal system**

Principals A and E and deputy B could not offer any positive aspects of the IQMS appraisal process. However, Principal A and Deputy B both found their own methods of appraisal and evaluation to be very worthwhile and to achieve what the process set out to do. Principals C and D both viewed the appraisal in their respective schools as positive and mentioned that it promoted quality teaching and learning.

A variety of responses from teachers was captured, with no one really being committed to promoting the IQMS appraisal system. Replies were rather limited. Positive comments included that it allowed teachers to examine their strengths and weaknesses, allowed them to learn from others, created an opportunity to show off their computer skills when presenting a lesson, and challenged them to grow and to reflect on their teaching. Five teachers stated that they could not think of even one positive aspect about appraisal in their school. I found it

interesting that none of the participants mentioned anything about the IQMS's 1% salary incentive as a positive factor.

## **5.2 Implications for teaching and learning**

In the light of the main findings of this research, the implications for teaching and learning must be reviewed critically. The failure to promote teacher development has equally serious consequences for both teaching and learning. Mestry *et al.* (2009:1) indicate that the continuing professional development (CPD) of teachers is essential in creating effective schools. The IQMS policy was developed mainly to improve the culture of teaching and learning in schools. With so many negative perceptions of and general scepticism about the appraisal system among teachers, it is clear that this policy will not succeed in achieving its outcomes. Firstly, the appraisal process appears to be plagued by inconsistencies, dishonesty and a sense of dread. The dishonesty stems from teachers giving themselves high scores when these are not deserved and getting their peers to observe their lessons, which leads to colleagues plotting among each other to give each other unwarranted high scores. The density of the documents and time factor involved has led to teachers ticking all the boxes without giving the criteria any thought. Peers appraise peers and give each other high scores, because they recognise that if they give low scores it will affect staff relationships and put them at risk of also receiving a low score. Personal growth plans are not completed honestly. All of these have serious implications for teaching and learning. In schools where there are no additional appraisal systems, there is no way of developing teachers or holding anyone accountable.

Secondly, principals seemingly are not interested in the IQMS and view it as cumbersome and overflowing with bureaucratic limitations. Principals are poorly training with regard to advocacy for the IQMS. The negative attitudes and perceptions held by principals are automatically picked up by the staff. Teachers can sense that the principal does not support the system, so why should they? Thirdly, even if the appraisals were to be implemented correctly, and even if development areas for teachers were to be identified, schools do not necessarily have the means – financial or otherwise – to address these development areas. To this end, the findings of the appraisal process remain a theoretical documentation of either good practices, or challenges, which might never be addressed. Fourthly, it would appear – certainly from my engagement with the five research schools – that unless there are clearly defined accountability structures, which will ensure that teacher development does in fact occur, schools will not take this mandate seriously.

While the IQMS as a policy offers some merit in terms of teacher and curriculum development, there are a number of factors that hinder it from being properly and adequately realised within school settings. Certainly, as the findings of this research show, the appraisal process is approached as a technical requirement that simply needs to be completed for the sake of a bureaucratic process. Moreover, questions certainly need to be asked about the role of the institutional management and governance structures, as vested in the district offices, because if school principals are not attaching any value to the appraisal processes, then who is? The implications for teaching and learning are, of course, deep and immense. If teachers are not openly identifying areas of weakness and potential growth, and are not receiving adequate assistance in order to develop professionally, then they will persist in weak or inadequate teaching practices, which, in turn, will continue to compromise the learning of thousands of learners. The implications of an appraisal process that does not realise what it sets out to do therefore not only hinders teacher development and growth, but more importantly, hampers generations of learners, schools and communities.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

The following recommendations are suggested based on the findings of this study. These recommendations are for the DoBE as well as for public ordinary schools in general. It is hoped that these recommendations might lead to the IQMS actually achieving teacher development.

#### **5.3.1 Recommendations for the Department of Basic Education**

- The DoBE, via the district offices, needs to monitor both the implementation and findings of the appraisal process. At present, some schools follow all the procedures, while others get away with doing nothing at all, yet everyone who has achieved the threshold score receives a 1% salary progression. The district offices should be responsible for implementing the IQMS and should not shift responsibility to the principals.
- The IQMS at present does not cater for the continued professional development of teachers. It is always implemented at the same time and only once a year. In order for it to achieve its desired outcomes, it has to assess more than what it is doing currently. There is a need for the continuous assessment of teachers. Peer reviews should not be done once a year. This understandably undermines the reliability of the IQMS.

- Not all teachers should have to go through the appraisal process every year. More feedback should be given to inexperienced teachers or ones that signal they need development in certain areas. Competent teachers who have many years' teaching experience should not have to go through each and every step of the process annually. It is suggested that they could be appraised every three years.
- There needs to be a movement away for the "one-size-fits-all" notion. Public schools in South Africa differ vastly and in particular have differences in contextual and financial aspects. One cannot appraise teachers using the same instruments in schools that are worlds apart in terms of socio-economic factors.
- To create a positive attitude towards the appraisal process, and to make it more consistent, multiple data sources should be used as the basis for evaluation. Instead of basing overall evaluation on one lesson observation, which can lead to fabrication and window dressing, multiple facets should be incorporated. Stronge (2005:10) suggests that these should include observations of, for example, formal classroom/work-setting observations, ongoing anecdotal observations of performance and the observation of students' work. Student performance data should be evaluated, such as matric results, portfolios must be perused, for example lesson plans, and there should be a self-evaluation consisting of self-reflection and an analysis of performance. Integrating multiple data sources in a teacher assessment and evaluation system offers a much more realistic picture of actual job performance.
- The 1% salary increment needs to be revisited. Due to the fact that appraisal is linked to financial incentives, there is an opportunity for dishonesty when completing forms and appraising peers. Either the 1% needs to be increased and the appraisal process strictly monitored, with checks and balances in place, or the link to financial gains must be eliminated. Teachers must be motivated to complete the appraisal process based on developmental incentives, not monetary rewards. Currently, the 1% salary incentive is causing many teachers to fabricate scores and to window dress their lessons when observed.
- If my first recommendation cannot be met and the district offices are unable to assume full responsibility for the IQMS process, then the Department of Education should provide appropriate training for all stakeholders in order for IQMS to be implemented



effectively in schools. The school management team responsible for teacher professional development in schools must encourage teachers to attend development programmes that will assist them in improving their knowledge, skills, values and attitudes in order for them to become better equipped to manage their classrooms.

- A need exists to streamline the process. It is very evident that disgruntled teachers are opposed to the fact that there are three disparate processes all aiming to measure their work. The appraisal process should consist of a well-defined, concise system. The IQMS as it stands needs to be rebranded and teachers' inputs have to be included in the process. It is essential that teachers' perceptions and experiences of the current appraisal system in public schools are taken into cognisance.
- The issue of financial constraints is a real one, and one that cannot simply be wished away. One way of addressing the shortcomings of teachers is through clearly structured mentorship programmes, which draw upon the strengths of good teachers to assist those who are in need of skills and development. The problem of recruiting the services of external service providers is discounted through building a database of good teachers and good practices that can be drawn upon within, also across school districts.

### **5.3.2 Recommendations for the principals**

- At the moment, some schools do not incorporate any appraisal findings into the strategic planning of the school. Teachers are aware of this and this makes them feel that the process is worthless and totally insignificant. Findings from the appraisal must be added to the strategic planning of the school and staff must be made aware of this. In this way, teachers' attitudes towards appraisal may become more positive.
- It is difficult to find enough time in the teaching cycle to provide constructive and adequate feedback to each and every teacher. Feedback is vital to the success of this appraisal system and is being overlooked for various reasons. It is essential to examine a different system of providing feedback.
- Principals need to understand that the success of the IQMS actually depends on how well they implement it and support it. They need to have a positive attitude towards the system and use it as a means to identify areas of professional development for their teachers.

### **5.3.3 Recommendations for the teachers**

- Teachers need to realise that a commitment to professional development will result in quality teaching and learning. Teachers need to take responsibility for developing themselves in terms of skills, values and attitudes.
- As professionals, teachers should be honest about their own strengths and weaknesses, as well as when they appraise their peers.

### **5.3.4 Recommendations for further research**

Further research is needed on how to ensure that the findings of the appraisal process are actually used to improve teacher and curriculum development. It remains unclear what schools are supposed to do when confronted with a teacher who does not have the necessary skills to teach adequately, or who needs more focused development in a particular area. This research has revealed that schools use parallel systems of evaluation to which they attach greater value. Research is needed into what these schools take into account when they design their own processes, and whether these processes have a better chance of giving rise to teacher and curriculum development.

### **5.4 Significance of this study**

This study, its findings and its recommendations have potential value for the DoBE, principals and teachers. The DoBE can use the findings of this research to understand why the appraisal system is perceived so negatively. They can gain an understanding of why the professional development of teachers is not occurring in public schools successfully. Furthermore, they could use this study to understand that one appraisal system for all public schools is something that possibly needs to be revised.

Principals can use these findings to realise the importance of their attitudes and how these are automatically transmitted to the teachers. They need to promote appraisal and approach it with enthusiasm. Furthermore, they need to encourage teacher development, have feedback meetings and use the findings of appraisal in their strategic growth plans for the school. They must also take responsibility and be accountable for the development of their staff.

### **5.5 Conclusion**

In conclusion, it is important to reflect on what this study set out to explore. Since I qualified as a teacher in 1999, the appraisal system has been a topic of interest to me due to the fact that there was no such process when I started teaching. There was no accountability and no channel to indicate that development was needed in certain areas. My teaching career then experienced the introduction of the IQMS in 2005. Since then I have taught at various schools, all of which have adopted different views on the IQMS. Personally, I have yet to undergo any form of staff development as a result of appraisal and admittedly note that all my lessons that have been observed were all window dressed in order to achieve a high score. I therefore wanted to explore how other teachers perceive and experience the developmental appraisal. I focused on former model C schools as very little research, if any, has taken place in such research sites. While my research focused on former model C schools, the findings can be extended to other schools and might even give rise to more reasons for concern when one takes into account that the majority of public schools in South Africa function at a minimal level, with little or no focus on teacher and curriculum development.

Furthermore, I wanted to explore how the appraisal system is implemented systematically in schools. This was of interest to me, as the principal is the person responsible for the effective implementation of the IQMS. Given the negative perceptions among some of the principals, as well as the teachers, questions need to be asked about how the uniformity and reliability of the IQMS can be preserved if each and every public school follows different ways of implementation. I also wanted to probe if the appraisal process makes any contribution to teacher and curriculum development. In theory, the problem of unqualified and underqualified teachers should be addressed immediately on the basis of the results of the IQMS. However, an article in the Independent media dated 4 August 2015, titled “Alarm over Grade R teachers, (Mkhwanazi) stated that the Department of Basic Education had thousands of teachers without qualifications to teach Grade R. It was revealed that loopholes have allowed teachers with no diploma or any qualifications to be employed. It was further exposed that, in seven of the nine provinces, half of the Grade R teachers did not have qualifications. This alarming revelation led me to reflect on what is going on in schools when they complete the appraisal process? Why is no development of teachers taking place? In the former model C schools, where more resources admittedly are available, teacher and curriculum development is still not prioritised. While the underlying objective of the IQMS is to promote quality teaching and learning, this research has revealed that this is not the case at the five schools investigated. Moreover, the

findings from the appraisal process – even when there is evidence that certain teachers are in need of development or assistance – are not taken into account.

As a policy, the IQMS appears to be a viable tool with which to identify and implement teacher and curriculum development. However, in practice, the objectives of this policy are not being implemented – in terms of offering substantial feedback to teachers, and offering the necessary development or assistance. To this end, if the desired outcome of the IQMS is to promote teacher and curriculum development, then – certainly at the research sites – this is not being realised. This finding is reflected in the huge discrepancies between public schools across South Africa, where sixteen schools achieved a zero percentage pass rate in 2014. It appears unjustified to implement the same appraisal system in these schools as in schools that achieve a 100% pass rate annually. Bernstein (2015:2) states that one of the greatest challenges facing the South African education system is the production of sufficient, qualified, competent teachers who can provide quality teaching for all school subjects and phases. If the IQMS has been in place since 2005, and ten years later, in 2015, South Africa still has over 10 725 underqualified or unqualified teachers, and sixteen schools achieve a zero percent pass rate, then it would be justified to state that the IQMS is not achieving its desired outcome of promoting teacher development. The government must realise that sufficient funding is needed to back the IQMS policy to achieve success. It is a futile exercise to implement the annual appraisal process, involving a heavy administrative load, if, other than the 1% salary increment, it leads to nothing worthwhile. If teachers and principals were assured of appropriate and sustainable measures and interventions for development, then the IQMS would not only realise its objectives, but could well serve to begin to address the needs of the unacceptably high numbers of unqualified and underqualified teachers in South Africa.

## References

- Bernard, H. (1998). *Research methods in cultural anthropology*. London: SAGE.
- Bernstein, A. (2015) *CDE in depth. Teachers in South Africa*. Available at <http://www.cde.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Final-Revised-ES-TeacherSupplyandDemand2025.pdf>. (Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> August 2015)
- Bertram, C. (2014). Shifting discourses and assumptions about teacher learning in South Africa development policy. *Southern African Review of Education*, 20(1): 90-108.
- Bisschoff, T. & Mathye, A. (2009). The advocacy of an appraisal system for teachers: A case study. *South African Journal of Education*, 29: 393-404.
- Bopape, J. (2009). *Professional development of teachers for effective environmental education*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Pretoria: UNISA.
- Brinsden, K. (2011). *Improving teacher appraisal through action research: One school's journey*. Auckland: Unitec Institute of Technology.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education*. 7<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: Routledge.
- De Clercq, F. (2008). Teacher quality, appraisal and development: The flaws in the IQMS. *Perspectives in Education*, 26(1): 7-18.
- De Marrais, K. & Lapan, S. (2003). *Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences*. London: Lawrence Associates Publishers.
- Department of Basic Education (1998), *Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Department of Basic Education. (1998). *Terms and conditions of employment of educators determined in terms of section 4 of the Educators Employment Act*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Basic Education. (1999). *Personnel administration measures (PAM) determined by the Minister of Education in terms of the Educators Employment Act*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Basic Education. (2004). *Integrated quality management system*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Dhanpat, K. (2009). *Decision making and accountability as aspects of the IQMS*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC). (2003). *Integrated quality management system (Agreement no 8, 27 August)*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Fidler, B. (1995). *Staff appraisal and the statutory scheme in England*. Available at [http://www.researchgate.net/publication/249015192\\_Staff\\_Appraisal\\_and\\_the\\_Statutory\\_Scheme\\_in\\_England](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/249015192_Staff_Appraisal_and_the_Statutory_Scheme_in_England). (Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> May 2015)

Figazzolo, L. (2013). *The use and misuse of teacher appraisal. An overview of cases in the developed world*. Available at <http://download.ei-ie.org/Docs/WebDepot/TeacherAppraisal.pdf> (Accessed 15 May 2015).

Gratton, R. (2004). Teacher appraisal: A lesson on confusion over purpose. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(5): 292-296.

Griffin, C. (2010) *The advantages and limitations of qualitative research in psychology and education*. Available at [http://www.pseve.org/Annals\\_el/UPLOAD/griffin2.pdf](http://www.pseve.org/Annals_el/UPLOAD/griffin2.pdf) (Accessed 6th April 2015)

Grobler, I. (1993). *Educational management 1. School organisation 2. Study guides*. RAU, Johannesburg: College for Education and Health.

Grobler, P., Warnich, S., Carrell, M., Elbert, N. & Hatfield, R. (2000). *Human resource management in South Africa*. London: Cengage

Groenewald, T. (2004). A phenomenological research design illustrated. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(1): 1-26.

Guskey, T.R (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Hariparsad, I.D., Bischoff, T.C., Conley, L., Du Plessis, P.G., Hlongwane, S., Loock, C. & Mestry, R. (2006). *Quality assurance in South African schools: An integrated report (symposium presentation)*. Available at <http://www.topkinisis.com/conference/CCEAM/wib/index/outline/PDFS/BISSCHOFF%20Thomas%20Charles.pdf> (Accessed 9 April 2015).

Hofmeyer, J. (2000). *The emerging school landscape in post-apartheid South Africa*. Available at <http://stbweb01.stb.sun.ac.za/if/Taakgroepe/iptg/hofmeyr.pdf> (Accessed 11 May 2015).

Jansen, J. (2006). *Autonomy and accountability in the regulation of the teaching profession: A South African case study*. PDF Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. London: SAGE.

Kamlawathe, D. (2007). *Decision-making and accountability as aspects of the integrated quality management system (IQMS)*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Keller, S & Conradin, K. (2015) *Semi-structured interviews*. Available at <http://www.sswm.info/content/semi-structured-interviews>. (Accessed 4<sup>th</sup> April 2015)

Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step by step guide for beginners*. London: SAGE.

Larsen, A.L. (2009). Stressful, hectic, daunting. A critical policy study of the Ontario performance appraisal system. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 95. Available at [https://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/pdf\\_files/larsen](https://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/pdf_files/larsen) (Accessed 5 April 2015).

Locke, C., Grobler, B. & Mestry, K. (2006). *Human resource management*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Machingambi, S. (2013). Teachers' perceptions on the implementation of the performance management system in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Science Education*, 5(3): 217-225.

Mahlala, K. (2012). *Teacher assessment for teacher professional development*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.

- Mathula, K. (2004). *Performance management: From resistance to IQMS – From policy to practice*. Available at [www.thutong.doe.gov.za/resourcedownload](http://www.thutong.doe.gov.za/resourcedownload) (Accessed 20 May 2015).
- McGregor, S. & Murname, J. (2010). Paradigm, methodology and method: Intellectual integrity in consumer scholarship. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 34(4): 419-427.
- Mchunu, M. (2014). *Linking appraisal with professional development in the IQMS in South African Schools*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- McMillan, J. & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education – Evidence-based enquiry*. Boston: Pearson.
- Menzi. (2001). *Education in South Africa: Achievements since 1994*. Available at <http://www.dhet.gov.za/Reports%20Doc%20Library/Education%20in%20South%20Africa%20Achievements%20since%201994.pdf> (Accessed 11 May 2015).
- Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Mertens, D. (2005). *Journal of mixed methods research*. Available at [https://study.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/Ch\\_10-4.pdf](https://study.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/Ch_10-4.pdf) (Accessed 14<sup>th</sup> April 2015)
- Mestry, R., Hendricks, I. & Bisschoff, T. (2009). Perceptions of teachers on the benefits of teacher development programmes in one province of South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 29: 475-490.
- Middlewood, D. (2002). *Managing teacher appraisal and performance*. London: Routledge Falmer Press.
- Mji, L.M. (2011). *Investigating factors inhibiting the implementation of IQMS in a South African school*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Mkhwanazi, S. (2014) *Alarm over Grade R teachers*. Available at <http://www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/gauteng/alarm-over-grade-r-teachers-1.1895341#.VhAf8tKhfIU>. (Accessed on 20<sup>th</sup> August 2015)
- Monyatsi, P. (2002) *Teacher appraisal: An evaluation of practices in Botswana Secondary Schools*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Pretoria: UNISA



- Monyatsi, P. (2003). *Teacher appraisal. An evaluation of practice in Botswana secondary schools*. Unpublished DEd dissertation. Pretoria: UNISA.
- Monyatsi, P (2009). *Teacher appraisal: An evaluation of practices in Botswana secondary schools*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Pretoria: UNISA.
- Monyatsi, P., Steyn, T. & Kamper, G. (2006b). Teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher appraisal in Botswana. *South African Journal of Education*, 26(3): 427-441.
- Mosoge, P. & Pilane, M. (2014). Performance management: The neglected imperative of accountability systems in education. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(1): 1-18.
- Mouton, J. (2001). *How to succeed in your master's and doctoral studies*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Mouton, N., Louw, G. & Strydom, G. (2012). A historical analysis of the post-apartheid dispensation education in South Africa (1994-2011). *International Business and Economics Research Journal*, 11(11): 1211-1222.
- Naidu, S. (2011). *An autobiography of teaching and teacher evaluation in apartheid and post-apartheid South Africa*. Available at <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED530236.pdf> (Accessed 20 May 2015).
- Namuddu, J. (2005). *Staff appraisal systems and teacher performance at AGA KHAN schools in Kampala District*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Uganda: Makerere University of Uganda.
- Nkosi, T. (2010). *Views of educators on development appraisal system in Vryheid district of the KwaZulu-Natal province*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Kwadlangezwa: University of Zululand.
- Punch, K. (2005). *Introduction to social research – Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. London: SAGE.
- Queen-Mary, T. & Mtapuri, O. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of the integrated quality management system: Lessons from Mpumalanga, South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(1): 1-14.

Rabichund, S. & Steyn, G. (2014). The contribution of the integrated quality management system to whole school development. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(4): 348-370.

Ramnarain, S. (2008). *The IQMS – Exploring the tension between accountability and professional development*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Durban: University of KwaZulu-Natal.

*Report to the portfolio committee on the Intergrated Quality Management Systsem 2006. Available at <http://pmg-assets.s3-website-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/docs/2006/060620iqms.htm> (Accessed 19th March 2015)*

Republic of South Africa. (1998). *Terms and conditions of the Educators Employment Act, 1998. Personnel Administrative Measures (PAM)*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. (2001) *The National policy on whole school evaluation*. Government Gazette 433 (22512) Pretoria: Government Printer

*Research Methods Knowledge Base* (2015) Available at <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/unitanal.php>. (Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015)

*SACE. (2014). IQMS: Personal growth plans and developmental needs of educators. Mini-seminar presented. Available at <http://www.sace.org.za/upload/files/IQMS%20and%20Developmental%20Needs.pdf> Accessed 18 March 2015).*

South African Democratic Teachers Union. (2013) *Quality Management system (QMS) for School based educators*. Available on <http://www.sadtu.org.za/docs/collect/2013>. Accessed March 1<sup>st</sup> 2015.

South African Democratic Teachers Union. (2005). *Quality teachers for quality education training for a stronger teaching force*. Available at [www.sadtu.org.za/docs/disc/2014/performance\\_based\\_reward.pdf](http://www.sadtu.org.za/docs/disc/2014/performance_based_reward.pdf) (Accessed 17 May 2015).

Spaull, N. (2013). *South Africans education crisis. The quality of education in South Africa (1994-2011)*. Available at <http://www.section27.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Spaull-2013-CDE-report-South-Africas-Education-Crisis.pdf> (Accessed 12 July 2015).

- Springett, K. & Campbell, J. (2006). *An introductory guide to putting research into practice. 2 - Defining the research question*. Available at [www.gahec.org/Library/researchfindtopic.shtm](http://www.gahec.org/Library/researchfindtopic.shtm) (Accessed 10 March 2015).
- Stewart, V. (2013). *Teacher quality: The 2013 International Summit on the Teaching Profession*. Available at <http://www.teachersummit.org> (Accessed 20 March 2015).
- Steyn, G.M. & Van Niekerk, E. (2002). *Human resource management in education*. 1<sup>st</sup> edition. Pretoria: UNISA Press.
- Steyn, G.M. & Van Niekerk, E. (2007). *Human resource management in education*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Pretoria: UNISA Press.
- Stronge, J.H. (2006). *Teacher evaluation and school improvement: Improving the educational landscape*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Corwin Press.
- TerreBlanche, M. & Durrheim, K. (1999). *Applied methods for social science*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Trethewey, A. (2012), *Is there a place for 360 degree appraisal in assessing teacher performance?* Available at <https://www.ikmco.org> (Accessed 13 May 2015).
- Tuckman, B. (1994). *Conducting educational research*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Van Deventer, I. & Kruger, A. (2011). *An educator's guide to school management skills*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Van Wyk, C, Moeng, B. G. *The Design and Implementation Of A Strategic Plan In Primary Schools*. International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER), [S.l.], v. 13, n. 1, p. 137-144, Dec. 2013. ISSN 2157-9393. Available at: <http://www.cluteinstitute.com/ojs/index.php/IBER/article/view/8364/8389>. (Accessed: 1<sup>st</sup> May 2015.)
- Wadesango, N., Nduna, D. & Kurebwa, M. (2013). An investigation into teachers attitudes towards performance management in Zimbabwe. *Anthropologist Journal*, 15(2): 157-165.
- Waghid, Y. (2013). *Educational research methodology*. Stellenbosch: SUN MeDIA.
- Weber, E. (2005). New controls and accountability for South African teachers and schools: The Integrated Quality Management System. *Perspectives in Education*, 23(2): 63-72.

Yin, R. (2014). *Case study research*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. London: SAGE

## **Addendum A**

### **Consent letter**



UNIVERSITEIT • STELLENBOSCH • UNIVERSITY  
jou kennisvennoot • your knowledge partner  
**STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY**  
**CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH**

---

#### **An exploration into whether the developmental appraisal system delivers on its desired outcome to promote teacher development:**

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Miranda Jane Whitley from the Department of Education Policy Studies at Stellenbosch University. The results of the research will contribute to the fulfilment of a Master's Research Thesis.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are involved in the developmental appraisal process implemented in your school.

#### **1. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of the study is to explore whether the appraisal process actually promotes teacher development, as well as to determine teachers' perceptions of the appraisal system, its implementation process and whether the findings of the developmental appraisal process are brought into the strategic planning of the school as a whole.

#### **2. PROCEDURES**

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to participate in an individual interview with the researcher at a venue convenient to yourself.

The interview schedule containing the interview questions will be made available to you beforehand. The duration of the interview will be between 1 and 1.5 hours.

Due to the requirements of the study, this interview will be recorded via note taking. No audio recording will be done.

#### **3. POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS**

There is no physical threat from volunteering to participate in this study. Participants will be responding to the interview questions in a professional capacity, therefore there is no risk for discomfort. All experiences shared during the interview will be gathered with respect for the participant's dignity. The researcher will strive to remain as objective as possible during the data construction.

#### **4. POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY**

The interviewee could gain professional insight and reflection into appraisal systems, both in a global and local context. Findings and feedback can be made available to the participants should they require this information.

The study is significant to society as it aims to explore whether the developmental appraisal system actually promotes teacher development in the researched schools. Appraisal is a contentious issue worldwide and it would be beneficial to note other participants' perceptions and experiences.

## **5. PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION**

Involvement in this study comes without remuneration, as the participants will participate voluntarily.

## **6. CONFIDENTIALITY**

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be linked to you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Confidentiality will be maintained by means of the removal of identifying details wherever required. The data collected during the interview will be safeguarded in a research file. The data will remain in a secure file and will only be seen and used by the researcher and the research supervisor.

The notes taken during the interview and identifying details will not appear anywhere in the research report. The participant has the right to request to view the transcripts of the recordings.

## **7. PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL**

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to respond to any questions you don't want to respond to and still remain in the study. The researcher may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so.

## **8. IDENTIFICATION OF RESEARCHER**

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please contact Miranda Whitley (0824689236) or [mirryj@gmail.com](mailto:mirryj@gmail.com)

## **9. RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS**

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact Ms Maléne Fouché [mfouche@sun.ac.za; 021 808 4622] at the Division for Research Development.

Research Supervisor: Dr Nuraan Davids (021 808-2877) [nur@sun.ac.za](mailto:nur@sun.ac.za)

**SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH SUBJECT OR LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE**

The information above was described to me by Miranda Whitley in English and I am in command of this language. I was given the opportunity to ask questions and these questions were answered by her to my satisfaction.

I hereby consent voluntarily to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**I. Name of Subject/Participant**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**II. Signature of Subject/Participant**

**Date**

**SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR**

I declare that I explained the information given in this document to \_\_\_\_\_ [*name of the participant*] and/or [his/her] representative \_\_\_\_\_ [*name of the representative*]. [He/she] was encouraged and given ample time to ask me any questions. This conversation was conducted in English and no translator was used.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**III. Signature of Investigator**

**Date**

## Addendum B

### WCED approval letter



Directorate: Research

[Audrey.wyngaard@westerncape.gov.za](mailto:Audrey.wyngaard@westerncape.gov.za)

Tel: +27 021 467 9272

Fax: 0865902282

Private Bag x9114, Cape Town, 8000

wced.wcape.gov.za

**REFERENCE:** 20150410-46099

**ENQUIRIES:** Dr A T Wyngaard

Ms Miranda Whitley  
Box 2539  
Durbanville  
7551

**Dear Ms Miranda Whitley**

**RESEARCH PROPOSAL: AN EXPLORATION INTO WHETHER THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM DELIVERS ON ITS DESIRED OUTCOME TO PROMOTE TEACHER DEVELOPMENT**

Your application to conduct the above-mentioned research in schools in the Western Cape has been approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Principals, educators and learners are under no obligation to assist you in your investigation.
2. Principals, educators, learners and schools should not be identifiable in any way from the results of the investigation.
3. You make all the arrangements concerning your investigation.
4. Educators' programmes are not to be interrupted.
5. The Study is to be conducted from **02 May 2015 till 30 June 2015**
6. No research can be conducted during the fourth term as schools are preparing and finalizing syllabi for examinations (October to December).
7. Should you wish to extend the period of your survey, please contact Dr A.T. Wyngaard at the contact numbers above quoting the reference number?
8. A photocopy of this letter is submitted to the principal where the intended research is to be conducted.
9. Your research will be limited to the list of schools as forwarded to the Western Cape Education Department.
10. A brief summary of the content, findings and recommendations is provided to the Director: Research Services.
11. The Department receives a copy of the completed report/dissertation/thesis addressed to:

**The Director: Research Services  
Western Cape Education Department  
Private Bag X9114  
CAPE TOWN  
8000**

We wish you success in your research.

Kind regards.

Signed: Dr Audrey T Wyngaard

**Directorate: Research**

**DATE: 10 April 2015**



## Addendum C-ethical clearance



UNIVERSITEIT • STELLENBOSCH • UNIVERSITY  
Jou kennisvenoot • your knowledge partner

### Approved with Stipulations New Application

15-Jul-2015  
whitley, Miranda MJ

Proposal #: DESC/Whitley/June2015/7

Title: An exploration into whether the developmental appraisal system is achieving its desired outcome of promoting teacher development

Dear Ms Miranda whitley,

Your New Application received on 04-Jun-2015, was reviewed  
Please note the following information about your approved research proposal:

Proposal Approval Period: 10-Jun-2015 -09-Jun-2016

The following stipulations are relevant to the approval of your project and must be adhered to:

Please make all changes on the ORIGINAL proposal/relevant documents using TRACK CHANGES on MICROSOFT WORD. Furthermore, it is required that a letter be sent to the REC, responding to each of the REC's concerns and comments in NUMBERED FORMAT, indicating the page numbers/documents on which the changes were made.

The researcher should respond to all the requests made by the REC for final ethics clearance to be issued.

If the research in any way deviates from the undertaking that were made in the original submission for ethical clearance to the REC, the researcher should undertake to notify the REC of these changes.

1) The researcher should take note of the time parameters for the research set by the WCED – to be completed by end of June 2015. If not, an extension of the deadline must be sought from the WCED – this is the responsibility of the researcher.

2) Besides the letter from the WCED, written permission from the heads of the different schools that will partake is also needed and should be sent to the REC for record-keeping.

Please provide a letter of response to all the points raised IN ADDITION to HIGHLIGHTING or using the TRACK CHANGES function to indicate ALL the corrections/amendments of ALL DOCUMENTS clearly in order to allow rapid scrutiny and appraisal.

Please take note of the general Investigator Responsibilities attached to this letter. You may commence with your research after complying fully with these guidelines.

Please remember to use your proposal number (DESC/Whitley/June2015/7) on any documents or correspondence with the REC concerning your research proposal.

Please note that the REC has the prerogative and authority to ask further questions, seek additional information, require further modifications, or monitor the conduct of your research and the consent process.

Also note that a progress report should be submitted to the Committee before the approval period has expired if a continuation is required. The Committee will then consider the continuation of the project for a further year (if necessary).

This committee abides by the ethical norms and principles for research, established by the Declaration of Helsinki and the Guidelines for Ethical Research: Principles Structures and Processes 2004 (Department of Health). Annually a number of projects may be selected randomly for an external audit.

## Addendum D

### Interview questions for principals

**Research title: An exploration into whether the developmental appraisal system is delivering on its desired outcome to promote teacher development.**

**Interviewer: Miranda Whitley**

**Interviewee: Principal/Deputy at a former model C school**

Before the actual interview I will request to see the documentation that is used for the implementation of the appraisal process.

The following questions will be asked

1. What do you see the objective of the appraisal process as being? Do you consider it as being a valuable and worthwhile process?
2. How is the appraisal process implemented in the school? (This question will deal with all aspects of the implementation process – who is in charge, the timeframe of appraisal and all other details relating to the actual implementation process.)
3. Does the school use any documentation for appraisal other than the standard IQMS policy?
4. If teachers indicate that areas of development are needed, what is the process that the school follows?
5. How is feedback provided to the teachers?
6. What are teachers' responses to the feedback? Do they view the feedback in a positive light, or is it seen as a criticism?
7. If so, how is the feedback garnered through the appraisal system incorporated into the curriculum planning and/or teacher development of the school?
8. What is the general impression of the appraisal process in the school? Positive or negative? Explain in detail.
9. Is the appraisal outcome linked in any way to salary increments? If yes, how is this implemented?

10. In your opinion, what has been the most significant or positive effect of the appraisal system?
11. In your opinion, what has been the most problematic or negative effect of the appraisal system?
12. Post-appraisal, are the findings of the whole process brought into the strategic planning of the school? If so, then how?

## Addendum E

### Interview questions for teachers

**Research title: An exploration into whether the developmental appraisal system is delivering on its desired outcome to promote teacher development.**

**Interviewer: Miranda Whitley**

**Interviewee: A teacher at a former model C school**

The following questions will be asked

1. What do you see the purpose of the appraisal process as being?
2. What are your experiences of the appraisal process? Please elaborate.
3. Explain your perceptions of the appraisal process as a whole?
4. For how long have you been a teacher and have you been appraised every year?
5. Who is involved in your appraisal? By whom, and how, is feedback provided – if indeed feedback is provided?
6. Appraisal is a contentious issue globally – if you could change any elements of the process, what would they be?
7. Have you ever indicated that you needed development in any particular area? If so, did you receive the necessary support and did personal growth occur?
8. Did you receive adequate information about the appraisal process and was feedback given to you?
9. What do you consider as the positive aspects of the appraisal system?
10. What do you consider as the negative aspects of the appraisal system?
11. Have you ever been appraised and the outcome linked to a salary increment?
12. Do you feel that the appraisal process leads to a better quality of teaching?
13. Are the outcomes of the appraisal system incorporated into the overall curriculum and strategic planning of the school?

